



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 148 • NUMBER 303 • 1st SESSION • 42nd PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Tuesday, May 29, 2018

—

Speaker: The Honourable Geoff Regan

CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, May 29, 2018

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayer

•(1005)

[*English*]

POINTS OF ORDER

PROCEEDINGS ON GOVERNMENT MOTION NO. 22—SPEAKER'S RULING

The Speaker: I am now prepared to rule on two points of order raised yesterday by the hon. opposition House leader regarding government Motion No. 22. I would like to thank the hon. opposition House leader for having raised these matters, as well as the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons for his comments.

[*Translation*]

On the first matter, the hon. opposition House leader argued that since in her view no debate had taken place on the motion on Friday, May 25, the *Journals* for that day were inaccurate as they state, and I quote, "Debate arose thereon." She asked that the *Journals* be revised accordingly.

[*English*]

As recognized by the opposition House leader herself, this is a point of order for which I have already ruled on last Friday. At that time, members questioned whether, due to issues with simultaneous interpretation and disorder in the chamber, the motion was properly before the House. I indicated that the motion was, in fact, properly before the House and that interpreters had successfully interpreted the reading of the motion into the record. I also indicated that the wording of the motion was available for examination in the Order Paper in both official languages. I have not changed my view on that question; consequently, the *Journals* accurately reflect the proceedings of last Friday.

[*Translation*]

House of Commons Procedure and Practice, third edition, states the following at page 564, with respect to what is considered debate:

A Member initiates the process of debate in the Chamber by moving (i.e., proposing) a motion.

It also adds at page 566:

If the motion is found to be in order, and has been moved and seconded, the Speaker proposes it to the House. Once the Speaker has read the motion in the words of its mover, it is considered to be before the House....

After a motion has been proposed to the House, the Speaker recognizes the mover as the first to speak in debate. If the mover chooses not to speak, he or she is nonetheless deemed to have spoken (by nodding, the Member is considered to have said "I move" and this is taken as the equivalent of speech in the debate).

[*English*]

I also refer members to a ruling by the Acting Speaker on March 19, 1992, which can be found at pages 8479 and 8480 of the *Debates*, which provides clarification as to whether a mover of a motion should be counted as forming part of the debate on a motion. The Acting Speaker said:

Since the minister presented the motion, even if he did not speak, according to the Standing Orders his speaking time is deemed to have expired.

He later said:

The first speaker was for the government and is deemed to have spoken, even if he did not actually do so. The government presented a motion to table [a] bill. So that was the first speaker....

These citations confirm that the motion, having been read out by the Chair and the mover having been recognized to speak to it, initiated debate on the item.

In a ruling by Speaker Fraser on April 3, 1990, that can be found at pages 10155 and 10156 of the *Debates*, on a point of order that questioned whether debate had properly begun on a bill, which in turn could invalidate a notice to curtail debate on a bill, he confirmed that, despite the mover not having the opportunity to rise to speak to the item, debate had started, and the matter was properly before the House:

It is true that the hon. member for Gloucester was not on his feet on debate, but I think I would be stretching things a very long way indeed if I should rule today that the House was not seized of the Order of the Day.

Similarly, it is clear to the Chair that, as I stated on Friday, government Motion No. 22 was properly before the House, and debate on it had commenced.

I would now like to address the second point of order raised by the hon. opposition House leader immediately following the point of order by the government House leader, whereby she gave notice of closure with respect to proceedings on government Motion No. 22.

In her arguments, the opposition House leader questioned the validity of the notice on the basis that, in her view, it had yet to be determined that debate on the motion had commenced. Essentially, she contended that until the Speaker had ruled on the first point of order, notice of closure could not be given.

Speaker's Ruling

In his intervention, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons reiterated that page 19675 of *Hansard* clearly indicated that debate had commenced, and therefore the notice of closure was appropriately given.

[*Translation*]

At that point, the chair occupant indicated that:

...until such time as the Speaker has given a ruling on this question of whether the debate has begun on Motion No. 22 or not, we will reserve whether the motion for closure on Motion No. 22 is in fact in order. It is not at the moment. We will wait until such time as a decision on the previous point of order earlier today is rendered, at which point, depending on that outcome, the government House leader may then proceed accordingly.

[*English*]

As I have just now confirmed that debate had indeed commenced, it follows that the notice of closure, as given by the government House leader yesterday, was indeed valid.

I thank all members for their attention in this matter.

• (1015)

MAIN ESTIMATES 2018-19—SPEAKER'S RULING

The Speaker: I am now prepared to rule on the point of order raised on May 25, 2018, by the hon. member for Elmwood—Transcona regarding the form of the main estimates 2018-19.

The hon. member for Elmwood—Transcona was concerned with vote 40 under Treasury Board Secretariat, also referred to as the budget implementation vote. That vote, in the amount of \$7.04 billion, gives Treasury Board the authority to supplement other appropriations in support of initiatives announced in the budget of February 27, 2018.

The hon. member contended that this vote was not in the proper form, in that it failed to provide sufficient information regarding the government's spending plans. He pointed out that many of the initiatives which vote 40 might fund are not addressed in the various departmental plans, which are considered part III of the estimates. He also felt that it was improper that the breakdown of the proposed spending is referenced in an annex to the budget documents rather than in the estimates themselves.

[*Translation*]

The hon. opposition House leader, who supported the point of order raised by the member for Elmwood—Transcona, argued that, when the Standing Orders were amended to delay the tabling of the main estimates, it was with the expectation of receiving more complete and accurate information. She did not feel that was the case with vote 40 and feared that its wording would allow the government to allocate funds without sufficient scrutiny by Parliament.

[*English*]

When the matter was raised, I expressed concern about whether the timing of the point of order was appropriate. I recognize that questions relating to the estimates are occasionally complex, and that my predecessors have sometimes agreed to hear arguments early to allow sufficient time to properly consider them. While the estimates are still before committee at this time, I am prepared to rule on the point of order now.

[*Translation*]

When the government presents estimates to the House, each vote contains an amount of money and a destination, which describes the purpose for which the money will be used. In some cases, the description is quite detailed and in other cases it can be rather general. That said, the estimates are referred to committee specifically to allow members to study them in further detail, which can involve calling witnesses or asking for further information regarding the government's plans. While committees have no power to change the destination of the spending, as this would violate the crown's right to initiate spending requests, they do have the power to reduce or even reject the amount of a vote if they are not satisfied with the information provided.

[*English*]

The authority of the Speaker to intervene as sought by the hon. member for Elmwood—Transcona is more limited than he might wish or believe. In fact, when past Speakers have found procedural irregularities with items in the estimates, these have generally been cases where the funds requested depended on an authority that required supporting legislation.

In the present case, the hon. member is asking the Speaker to rule vote 40 out of order on the basis that it does not contain sufficient information about the proposed spending. This is not so much a procedural issue on which the Speaker can rule, but rather a policy disagreement with the government over the way it has chosen to request these funds.

[*Translation*]

The member's objection to vote 40 seems to mainly be that it is a central fund granted to Treasury Board, which has the authority to then allocate monies to various other departments.

I concede that the use of a budget implementation vote is unusual and I can understand why members may have preferred that these funds be requested in a different manner, under each of the specific departments, for example. That said, I cannot conclude that proceeding in the manner provided for in vote 40 is out of order. There are ample precedents of monies being granted to a central fund. The most well-known of these is vote 5 under Treasury Board for government contingencies.

[*English*]

Ultimately, the government determines the form its request for funds will take. While the government does have a responsibility to provide Parliament with sufficient information to allow it to make an informed decision, I do not believe it is for the Speaker to determine if the explanation of the particular request is sufficiently detailed or if the destination is the appropriate one. These are matters for members to consider when studying and voting on the estimates.

The Speaker's role is limited to determining if the request for funds is in a form that does not require any separate legislative authorization, and if it respects the limits of the supply process. With that in mind, there are no grounds for the Chair to rule vote 40 out of order.

Routine Proceedings

I thank hon. members for their attention.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[Translation]

AUDITOR GENERAL OF CANADA

The Speaker: I have the honour to lay upon the table the spring 2018 reports of the Auditor General of Canada.

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(3)(g), these documents are deemed to have been permanently referred to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

* * *

[English]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Mrs. Deborah Schulte (King—Vaughan, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 15th report of the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development in relation to 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. The committee has studied the bill and is pleased to report the bill back to the House with amendments.

I want to thank the many organizations and individuals who provided information and recommendations for consideration. Many have been incorporated in the amendments adopted.

* * *

ASSISTED HUMAN REPRODUCTION ACT

Mr. Anthony Housefather (Mount Royal, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-404, an act to amend the Assisted Human Reproduction Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, today on the Hill we are joined by Leia Swanberg and a group of intended parents, donors, surrogates, doctors, attorneys, and people involved in the fertility industry across Canada. It is an honour to present before them a bill to amend the Assisted Human Reproduction Act.

In 2010, the Supreme Court of Canada struck down many provisions of the act, and since then it has become untenable. It is an act that does not allow the federal government to work, and we need to step out of the way and let provinces properly regulate in this area. We also need to make sure to protect the vulnerable.

The bill I am putting forward would decriminalize payment for donors and surrogates, but it would remain illegal to assist someone to donate or be a surrogate if they are underage, if they lack capacity to consent, or if they are being coerced.

I look forward to working with members on all sides of this House to advance the bill forward, and to make sure that our laws in Canada related to assisted human reproduction are from 2018 and not from 1988.

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

● (1020)

[Translation]

PETITIONS

BANKING SERVICES

Mrs. Carol Hughes (Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapuskaing, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to table a petition signed by many residents of Dubreuilville who are concerned about the fact that the only financial institution in their community, the RBC, closed its doors last fall. They are calling on the government to work with financial institutions to implement a federal regulation to guarantee consumers and businesses in rural areas access to a physical financial institution in their community. They are also calling for the introduction of a three-month penalty-free period to move financial business elsewhere when closures occur. They added that many members of their community do not have access to cellphone or broadband Internet services, and those who do cannot count on reliable service. I am proud to table this petition.

[English]

CANADA SUMMER JOBS PROGRAM

Ms. Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am presenting a petition from the residents of Sarnia—Lambton regarding the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, which identifies, among other things, freedom of conscience, freedom of thought, and freedom of belief as fundamental freedoms that the Government of Canada must defend. The petitioners call on the Prime Minister to defend the freedoms of conscience, thought, and belief and withdraw the attestation requirement for applicants to the Canada summer jobs program.

[Translation]

RAIL TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Robert Aubin (Trois-Rivières, NDP): Mr. Speaker, with respect to VIA Rail's high-frequency train project, it is safe to say that there is a very broad consensus, and perhaps even unanimity. When he was last in Trois-Rivières, the Minister of Transport asked residents whether they intended to use the high-frequency train. Since then, hundreds of my constituents have written to me and signed this petition calling on the government to make public transportation between large urban centres a priority. This would contribute to the economic development of the region, help reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and ensure a healthier environment for everyone. Once again, I am pleased to present this second phase of the petition in support of VIA Rail's high-frequency rail project in the Quebec City-Windsor corridor.

HOUSING

Mr. Steven MacKinnon (Gatineau, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, a year ago, my riding, Gatineau, and many parts of western Quebec and eastern Ontario were devastated by spring floods. Hundreds of properties in my riding were seriously damaged. One of my constituents, Silvy Lemay, initiated this petition calling on the government to allow Canadians who wish to rebuild or renovate their homes to do so using their savings and their RRSPs without penalty, as is done under the program for first-time home buyers. I support this petition and wish to formally present it in the House of Commons.

Government Orders

[English]

DEMOCRATIC REFORM

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, a while ago I received a petition about unilateral changes to our electoral system, which should not seem immediately apropos after the government backed off its initial plan to make unilateral changes to our electoral system, but in light of Bill C-76, it seems apropos again. I am pleased to table today a petition from people who are concerned about the Liberal Party trying to unilaterally change aspects of our elections to its own advantage. In particular, the petitioners call upon the House of Commons to pass a motion affirming the need for a national referendum on any proposal to change Canada's current method of electing members of Parliament before the proposal is implemented into law.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

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

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

FEDERAL SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT ACT

BILL C-57—TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister of Small Business and Tourism, Lib.) moved:

That in relation to Bill C-57, An Act to amend the Federal Sustainable Development Act, not more than five further hours shall be allotted to the consideration of the report stage and one sitting day shall be allotted to the consideration at third reading stage of the said bill; and

That, at the expiry of the five hours provided for the consideration at report stage and fifteen minutes before the expiry of the time provided for Government Orders on the day allotted to the third reading stage of the said bill, any proceedings before the House shall be interrupted, if required for the purpose of this Order, and in turn every question necessary for the disposal of the stage of the bill then under consideration shall be put forthwith and successively without further debate or amendment.

● (1025)

The Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 67.1, there will now be a 30-minute question period. I invite hon. members who wish to ask questions to rise in their places so the Chair has some idea of the number of members who wish to participate in this question period.

The hon. member for Dauphin—Swan River—Neepawa.

Mr. Robert Sopuck (Dauphin—Swan River—Neepawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in a previous life, I used to manage a sustainable development fund and process for the Manitoba government. I was very much struck by the concept of sustainable development. However, I am deeply troubled by how the government misunderstands the concept of sustainable development. I will provide a short history lesson.

The term “sustainable development” was popularized by the Brundtland commission, chaired by Gro Harlem Brundtland, the then prime minister of Norway. The report came out in 1987, “Our Common Future”. The people who wrote “Our Common Future” stated very clearly that poverty causes environmental degradation. Environmental degradation is caused by a lack of economic development.

However, the current government, through its various processes, such as the proposed impact assessment act and other processes, is processing natural resource projects to death and eliminating any hope for small rural communities to advance our economic future.

Why does the minister have a sustainable development bill that the words “wealth creation” are not even a part of, when a lack of wealth creation in Canada would be a major cause of long-term environmental degradation?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to talk about this bill. Canadians have said they want a sustainable future for Canada. They also understand that the environment and the economy go together.

In June 2016, the House of Commons Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development issued a report with recommendations for legislative amendments to strengthen the act. In October 2016, as the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, I agreed with the recommendations and committed to report back within the year on action taken.

I am very proud that this bill supports our government's commitment to put sustainable development and the environment at the forefront of government thinking and decision-making. It also supports shared commitments in mandate letters, including delivering real results, pursuing goals with a renewed sense of collaboration, and setting a high bar in transparency.

As we have always said, we understand that the environment and the economy go together.

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to ask the environment minister a question. I know that we are both alumni of the London School of Economics, and this is truly a Jim Hacker-level move that we are seeing.

The government has been running down pipelines repeatedly. It has been doing everything it can to prevent the private sector from succeeding. It turns out that it was all about the Liberals trying to get a good price on pipelines. They wanted to run them down so they could buy one.

I have a serious question for the minister. Why have the Liberals refused to support private sector development and have put every barrier in place for private sector development of pipelines? Why will they not allow the energy east pipeline, for example, to be considered on the basis of the same rules that were used in the case of Trans Mountain?

Government Orders

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Madam Speaker, it is great to hear that my hon. colleague is also a graduate of my alma mater. However, we clearly have a diversity of views coming out of that institution.

We are here to talk about Bill C-57. I can only surmise, based on the comments from the member opposite, that he supports Bill C-57, which I think is great. As I noted, it was supported by a vote of 244 to zero at second reading and was passed at committee.

We believe it is a very important step that we need in order to make sure that we make decisions about a sustainable future in Canada, focus on results, and increase the accountability of departments and agencies for setting and achieving ambitious sustainable development targets. The bill would modernize the Federal Sustainable Development Act and incorporate into legislation our government's strong focus on results. The bill also promotes close collaboration and coordinated action across government through a whole-of-government approach.

We are very pleased that we are moving forward on Bill C-57.

• (1030)

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): Madam Speaker, I find it ironic that we are having closure of debate and time allocation on sustainable development the same day the government is choosing to purchase a private pipeline, which will be used to subsidize oil production to compete against other industries in Canada.

Does the minister find it ironic that this is happening on the same day?

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Madam Speaker, I can only surmise that the other party opposite supports Bill C-57.

Once again, we understand that the environment and the economy go together. We have one party that is not concerned about the environment and one party that is not concerned about the economy. However, we need to do both.

Bill C-57 is extremely important, to make sure that we look at sustainable development. We know that Canadians want a sustainable future for Canada. This bill would increase the focus on results and increase the number of departments that are reporting. It would also provide a whole-of-government approach and set a higher bar for sustainable development. We believe that this is a very important thing. This is a very good step, and I am very proud to support it.

Ms. Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am definitely a supporter of sustainable development and the goals of the bill to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and to be more open and transparent in the way projects are going forward.

However, the people who have audited the projects that the government has conducted have said that, first of all, those principles are not applied across all projects, that there have been no openness and transparency, and that, in fact, the government is not going to meet the targets of its plan.

If the minister is serious about the bill and this is not just lip service, would she be open and transparent and tell us how much the carbon tax will cost average Canadians? How would her plan affect greenhouse gas emissions?

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Madam Speaker, I was not entirely sure where that question was going because the focus, of course, is on Bill C-57. I assume, once again, that the party opposite supports this important bill.

The proposed principles that we are looking at were guided by a number of factors. First of all, the very helpful input from the standing committee provided insights, which were clear on specific principles, and also on where improvements could be made. In addition, some of the principles are fundamental to sustainable development and are reflected in most major international initiatives, such as the Rio Declaration and the very important 2030 agenda for sustainable development, which are missing from the current act. We also identified principles whose inclusion, while absent from the current act, would codify several key elements of the intent of the act.

Overall, we understand that the principles make explicit many of the key principles of the Federal Sustainable Development Act, such as transparency, accountability, and public engagement.

Mr. John Aldag (Cloverdale—Langley City, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the minister for recognizing the work that the environment and sustainable development committee did on Bill C-57. We did a study and made some recommendations to the government, and I am really pleased to see that this bill captures the essence of those recommendations. I believe it is very strong legislation that responds to much of the testimony that we heard from Canadians.

I wonder if the minister would have a moment to provide a comment respecting the scope of Bill C-57. Could the minister perhaps give us an idea of how Bill C-57 would provide a whole-of-government approach? As well, I wonder if she could provide a comment on how the bill would apply to federal entities, because that is an important piece of the Federal Sustainable Development Act. If the minister could comment on the whole-of-government approach and federal entities, it would be appreciated.

• (1035)

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my hon. colleague for the question and for the very hard work of the environment and sustainable development committee. There was a unanimous report. I think everyone worked in a cross-partisan way, which is extraordinarily important. I have always said that the environment should not be a partisan issue. We need to protect our planet.

In terms of the scope, the bill would extend the coverage of the Federal Sustainable Development Act from 26 to more than 90 departments and agencies. It would formalize the role of the Treasury Board in leading efforts to green government operations, enabling the consistent application across government of Canada's policies affecting sustainability.

Government Orders

It is incredibly important that we have a whole-of-government approach. While I might be the minister of environment and climate change and be responsible for my portfolio, clearly a federal sustainable strategy has to apply across government. I am very pleased that the bill would now cover more federal entities not previously subject to the requirements of the act. It would increase the number of federal organizations from 26 to more than 90. It would allow for the addition of crown corporations to the schedule of the Federal Sustainable Development Act, which would make them subject to the requirements of the act.

[Translation]

Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault (Sherbrooke, NDP): Madam Speaker, I want to come back to the essence of this morning's debate, the time allocation motion.

Although my colleagues across the way seem to want to focus on the substance of the bill this morning, the essence of today's debate is to determine why the government is choosing to limit debate on a bill for the 34th time.

The most recent experience with this related to the bill to amend the Canada Elections Act. In the last Parliament, the Prime Minister swore that he would never limit debate on electoral reform legislation. Last week, he did exactly the same thing as the Conservatives. This is the 34th time in the 42nd Parliament that a minister moves a time allocation motion, even though members like the one from Winnipeg North constantly rose to oppose time allocation motions in the last Parliament.

I would therefore like to know why the minister is defending a time allocation motion today when her party always stood against these motions in the last Parliament and before that.

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Madam Speaker, this bill is the result of unanimous recommendations from the Standing Committee on the Environment and Sustainable Development. It was supported by a vote of 244 to 0 at second reading. It was approved in committee and every party indicated their support for Bill C-57.

I think that it is very important that we move forward with this bill because it will make a huge difference. As I said, we need more transparency. We have to focus on results, and more departments must be covered by Bill C-57. I think that it is important to move forward.

[English]

Mr. David Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC): Madam Speaker, one of the things sustainability requires is trust from the people. I want to ask the minister her opinion on this.

When the community pastures were turned over a couple of years ago, one of them ended up being turned over to Environment Canada in my riding. At that point we had basically set up a pilot project with the members of the local community. We involved them. They were going to have a say. They had a community council that was set up to advise Environment Canada on the issues. There was going to be a commitment, making sure that research money that was spent on this pasture would go through the local community and that the community would have an active role in dealing with the sustainability of the pasture. These are people who have lived there for 100 years. They know the area and know it very well.

When this government came in, that was all thrown out. The pasture patrons have basically been ignored. The local community has been set aside, and every decision that is being made on that pasture is now being dictated to the community. In fact, we have had Environment Canada officials come down there in the middle of the night, drive around in their Suburbans, take a look at the place, and leave without even talking to local people. Local people knew they were there. They refused to meet with them.

Therefore, when it comes to sustainability, does the government not realize the need to actually involve local communities, allowing them to have a say and allowing them to participate, or is it going to continue to dictate to people out in the areas who have to live in these environments, who know far more than she and the government bureaucrats know about their conditions?

• (1040)

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Madam Speaker, once again, we are here to talk about Bill C-57, an incredibly important piece of legislation. It responds to recommendations in the second report of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development. As I said, these were unanimous recommendations. It was great to see all parties come together to support the committee report.

Part of the recommendations would shift the focus in the Federal Sustainable Development Act from planning and reporting to results. This is extremely important. We want to see results. We need to show that government departments understand the importance of sustainable development.

As we look at what is going on in the world, we see that countries around the world have come together around the sustainable development goals in the 2030 agenda. It is very important that Canada show leadership, and that is exactly what we are doing through the bill.

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I want to pick up on the last comment that the minister made around the sustainable development goals and the 2030 agenda.

We see that the international community is really moving toward them and reporting on what it is doing to ensure that the sustainable development goals, SDGs, are met and that no one gets left behind. We also are taking real, concrete, measurable steps to ensure that even domestically we are doing our part.

I am wondering if the minister could speak about Canada's leadership with this piece of legislation and how we are ensuring that we are taking concrete action in our leadership role in the world as everybody globally is trying to move toward achieving the sustainable development goals.

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Madam Speaker, I am delighted to answer the hon. member's question. I appreciate her leadership internationally in championing the sustainable development goals in the 2030 agenda.

Government Orders

It is about building a better, more inclusive world, making sure that everyone succeeds and prospers. The focus that we have taken with respect to the federal sustainable strategy clearly highlights our commitment to the environmental dimensions of the global sustainable development goals and outlines key international obligations that guide government action, including the Paris Agreement, the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, and the UN Convention on Biological Diversity.

The Government of Canada is fully committed to supporting the implementation of all of the sustainable development goals of the 2030 agenda. This legislation is an important piece. We are working across government to bring our full approach to the 2030 sustainable development goals. This legislation is a good example of how we can work across government, how we can demonstrate progress, how we can focus on results, how we can, at the end of the day, improve lives and improve sustainability and at the same time grow the economy.

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Madam Speaker, Bill C-57 would amend the way in which designated federal entities develop their own sustainable development strategies.

The minister's government is now the proud owner of the Kinder Morgan pipeline. It has shelled out over \$4.5 billion of taxpayers' money to this economically suspect project.

What I want to know from the minister is which federal entity is now going to be the proud manager of this project, and how on earth will that entity ever develop a sustainable development strategy when the Kinder Morgan project makes a mockery of our climate change commitments and presents a very real threat to the coastal environment of British Columbia upon which the B.C. economy depends?

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Once again, Madam Speaker, we are here to talk about Bill C-57.

Let me start by emphasizing that we understand that the environment and the economy go together and that we are committed to our international obligations.

Under the Federal Sustainable Development Act, we are focusing on our climate actions. We have shown leadership both internationally and at home. We know that we need to move to a low-carbon future, and that is why we have an all-of-government approach to this. The transition will not happen overnight.

The federal sustainable development strategy will be an important tool as we move forward. It will provide guidance and it will ensure that we have a whole-of-government approach, and that is extraordinarily important.

The good news is that I work with all ministers. I work with the Minister of Finance. I work with the Minister of Natural Resources. I work with the ministers responsible for working with indigenous peoples. We need to work together, and that is exactly our approach.

I am pleased that we are championing Bill C-57.

• (1045)

Mrs. Karen Vecchio (Elgin—Middlesex—London, CPC): Madam Speaker, I want to read a newspaper quote that came out

within the last month. Right now we are having some really nice fluffy things to talk about on how wonderful everything is, but maybe the minister could explain to me why we have a 1.5 out of 7 rating on this.

Here is the quote, and maybe the minister will take off her rose-coloured glasses because these are the facts: "Overall, the commissioner found that the Canadian government is not adequately prepared to do its part for this ambitious global agenda. The commissioner noted that the Canadian government, as of the end of the audit period, had no governance structure for SDG implementation; no system to measure, monitor, and report on national progress; and only limited national consultation and engagement."

That is the information that I am providing from the commissioner, as of May 2.

Could the minister share with me how this plan is going to work when it is given an extremely terrible failure rate?

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Madam Speaker, I have never heard anyone accuse me of wearing rose-tinted glasses. In fact, I live in the real world, where one has to make hard decisions about the environment and the economy.

I am very happy to talk about the federal sustainable development goals and the 2030 agenda. It is critical for the world that we move forward on the 2030 agenda, and that means that every country needs to do its part and that we need to do our hard work at home. We need to look at how we advance the federal sustainable development goals. Bill C-57 plays a huge role in that effort. It is focused on how we implement our commitments to the environmental dimensions of the global sustainable development goals.

As I said, our government is committed to fully implementing the international sustainable development goals. We are working across government. We will be reporting on this. It is a really important piece. We are committed to making sure that everyone has the opportunity to succeed and prosper in our country.

Mr. Brian Masse: Madam Speaker, again, as the government goes ahead with purchasing a private pipeline, we are limiting debate and discussion on Bill C-57 on sustainable development. It makes a mockery of many things. The sheer notion in the speaking points that the Liberals are the only ones who understand that the economy and the environment go together is such a childish approach to such a serious matter. We understand that sustainable development and the economy have always been integrated in terms of what we want to see for progress and for research and development.

How can the minister come here today and profess that Bill C-57 and the efforts that they are making are not undermined by her own cabinet and herself?

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Madam Speaker, I would hardly say it is a childish approach to acknowledge that in the 21st century, the environment and the economy do go together. That is the reality.

Government Orders

We are here to talk about Bill C-57. We believe it is extraordinarily important. We are very pleased that this bill is the result of the unanimous recommendation of the Commons environment committee. Once again, I would like to thank the committee for their extremely hard work. This was supported in a vote of 244 to zero at second reading. It was passed at committee, and all parties have indicated their continued support for Bill C-57. I certainly hope the parties opposite will indicate their support today.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, it is very regrettable to see time allocation. Time allocation should be used rarely. Under the previous government, it started being used frequently. It was a commitment of this incoming government that it would not be using time allocation in the House.

I agree that this is a bill that should be passed. I do not think it is so massively urgent that we should shut down debate at this stage. One would hope the House leaders could work together to manage debate so that it takes place in a reasonable time. However, on this day of all days, when the Government of Canada suddenly decides to pony up more money for fossil fuel infrastructure than it has committed for climate action, it is particularly galling.

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Madam Speaker, I am not entirely sure if that is an indication that the member opposite supports Bill C-57.

Once again, this bill was the result of unanimous recommendations of the Commons environment committee. I believe the member opposite was part of that. It was supported by a vote of 244 to nothing at second reading. It was passed at committee, and all parties have indicated their continued support for Bill C-57. I certainly hope they continue to support it, because it is a very important piece of legislation. It is very important to the international community to see that we are committed to the environment.

We are committed to sustainable development, to the Paris Agreement, and to our international obligations. Sustainable development is also very important to Canadians at home. They understand that sustainable development is the way forward, that we need to be incorporating it when we make decisions, and that we need to be recognizing that the environment and the economy go together.

• (1050)

Mr. Robert Sopuck: Madam Speaker, I noticed in the last answer that the minister did not even mention the economy as something that she was concerned about. Again, we are here to discuss the concept of sustainable development, which the act is a part of. It is about sustainable development.

My question is somewhat similar to the question from my friend from Cypress Hills—Grasslands. There is a major issue in Manitoba right now, and that is the building of the outlet out of Lake Manitoba to alleviate flooding that has so devastated communities around Lake Manitoba and across the entire province.

This project has been in the works for many years. It is critical. We are very lucky that this year is a low-runoff year, so we are going to get away, but why is her department putting endless delays in front of a vital project that is required to save farms, to save homes, to save communities, and to enhance the economy of Manitoba? If

this is the minister's example of sustainable development, I do not want a part of it.

Sustainable development is a development concept. That is what it is. Gro Harlem Brundtland, in *Our Common Future*, noted that poverty causes environmental degradation. The Sustainable Development Act, and indeed the entire government, should do whatever it can to enhance development. To go back to my question, why the delay in approving the Lake Manitoba outlet?

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Madam Speaker, maybe I was not clear. I actually did say “economy”. I said that the environment and economy go together, kind of like sustainable development goes together.

I do want to acknowledge that there are forest fires in Manitoba right now—certainly we are thinking of the people in Manitoba—and there have been floods. I also want to give a shout-out to the Premier of Manitoba, who stepped up and recognized that we need to be putting a price on pollution.

In terms of this bill, because of the comments related to it, I assume that the member supports Bill C-57, which is good. As I said, we had unanimous recommendations from the House of Commons environment committee, so I give a huge shout-out to the members of the committee. That is the way we need to be doing it. Action on the environment and sustainable development should not be a partisan issue. The bill was supported at second reading by a vote of 244 to zero and was passed at committee.

It is interesting today that I am speaking to this, because last night I hosted former ministers of the environment from the Conservative and Liberal sides. It was great to hear of their priorities in taking action on the environment and climate change. As I said, it is important that we come together in the House of Commons because, really, at the end of the day, we owe it to our kids: I owe it to my three kids; we owe it to our grandchildren and future generations.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): Madam Speaker, it is unfortunate that the government is moving to shut down debate on its new framework for sustainable development on the same day it has offered Kinder Morgan shareholders \$4.5 billion in Canadian taxpayer money for a failed project. The risks of that project were known before Kinder Morgan set out on it. It knew it was going to have to secure a social licence. That did not happen and now instead of letting the market do its work, the government is going to take taxpayer money to bail out those shareholders, despite the fact we hear many members of parties in this place singing the praises of private enterprises and the risks enterprises take and everything else.

Government Orders

Kinder Morgan took the risk and failed, and now the government, instead of allowing the market to do its job, is going to bail out those shareholders. It is kind of surprising to me that the government cares more about Kinder Morgan shareholders who come from all across the world than it does about the hard-earned money of Canadian taxpayers, and is buying into a project that, according to its main proponent, has already failed. How are we expected to trust the government to be the arbiter of sustainable development and support closure on its bill when it is doing these silly things?

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Madam Speaker, I assume once again that the focus of our very important discussion today is Bill C-57. As I said, it was supported unanimously by the House of Commons environment committee in its report. It was supported by a vote of 244 to nothing at second reading. It was passed at committee. All parties have indicated their continued support for it. I appreciate that. It is important that we move forward to implement these changes. We need to focus on results. We need a better whole-of-government approach. We will now have more government departments covered and have included other changes that have come from the committee. This is a very important example of how we can come together to do important things that matter to Canadians. They care about sustainable development; Canadians have been clear about that. I am proud of this bill.

• (1055)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, we are at report stage after an amendment was moved by the Conservatives at committee. It was actually accepted in committee and now it comes to report stage and the Conservatives are moving an amendment to get rid of the amendment they brought forward at committee. Could the minister provide her thoughts on that?

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Madam Speaker, I actually cannot. It is very confusing to me and to everyone else. It makes no sense and it is also unclear why we would waste time on an amendment the Conservatives supported and then want to remove at this stage. I cannot explain it. That is it.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The question is as follows. Shall I dispense?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

[*Chair read text of motion to the House*]

[*Translation*]

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): In my opinion, the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Call in the members.

• (1135)

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

(*Division No. 675*)

YEAS

Members

| | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| Aldag | Alghabra |
| Amos | Anandasangaree |
| Arseneault | Arya |
| Ayoub | Badawey |
| Bagnell | Bains |
| Baylis | Beech |
| Bennett | Bibeau |
| Bittle | Blair |
| Boissonnault | Bossio |
| Breton | Brisson |
| Caesar-Chavannes | Carr |
| Casey (Cumberland—Colchester) | Casey (Charlottetown) |
| Chagger | Chen |
| Cormier | Cuzner |
| Dabrusin | Damoff |
| DeCoursey | Dhaliwal |
| Dhillon | Drouin |
| Dubourg | Duclos |
| Duguid | Duncan (Etobicoke North) |
| Dzerowicz | Easter |
| Ehsassi | El-Khoury |
| Erskine-Smith | Eyking |
| Fergus | Fillmore |
| Finnigan | Fonseca |
| Fortier | Fragiskatos |
| Fraser (Central Nova) | Fry |
| Fuhr | Gameau |
| Gerretsen | Goldsmith-Jones |
| Goodale | Gould |
| Graham | Grewal |
| Hajdu | Hardie |
| Harvey | Hébert |
| Hehr | Hogg |
| Holland | Housefather |
| Hussen | Hutchings |
| Iacono | Joly |
| Jordan | Jowhari |
| Khalid | Khera |
| Lambropoulos | Lametti |
| Lamoureux | Lapointe |
| Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation) | Lebouthillier |
| Lefebvre | Leslie |
| Levitt | Lightbound |
| Long | Longfield |
| Ludwig | MacAulay (Cardigan) |
| MacKinnon (Gatineau) | Maloney |
| Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia) | |
| May (Cambridge) | |
| McCrimmon | McDonald |
| McGuinty | McKay |
| McKenna | McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam) |
| McLeod (Northwest Territories) | Mendès |
| Mendicino | Mihychuk |
| Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs) | |
| Monsef | |
| Morneau | Murray |
| Nassif | Nault |
| Ng | O'Connell |
| Oliphant | Oliver |
| Ouellette | Paradis |
| Peschisolido | Peterson |

Government Orders

| | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Petitpas Taylor | Philpott |
| Picard | Poissant |
| Qualtrough | Ratansi |
| Rioux | Robillard |
| Rodriguez | Rogers |
| Romanado | Rota |
| Rudd | Ruimy |
| Rusnak | Sahota |
| Saini | Sajjan |
| Sangha | Sarai |
| Schiefke | Schulte |
| Serré | Sgro |
| Shanahan | Sheehan |
| Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon) | Sidhu (Brampton South) |
| Sikand | Simms |
| Sohi | Sorbara |
| Spengemann | Tabbara |
| Tan | Tassi |
| Tootoo | Trudeau |
| Vandal | Vandenbeld |
| Virani | Whalen |
| Wilkinson | Wilson-Raybould |
| Yip | Young — 164 |

NAYS

Members

| | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Aboultarif | Albas |
| Albrecht | Allison |
| Anderson | Angus |
| Arnold | Aubin |
| Barlow | Beaulieu |
| Benson | Benzen |
| Bergen | Bernier |
| Berthold | Bezan |
| Blaikie | Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis) |
| Block | Boucher |
| Boulerice | Boutin-Sweet |
| Brassard | Brousseau |
| Calkins | Cannings |
| Carrie | Chong |
| Choquette | Christopherson |
| Clarke | Clement |
| Cooper | Davies |
| Deltell | Diotte |
| Donnelly | Dreeshen |
| Dubé | Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona) |
| Dusseauil | Eglinski |
| Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster) | Falk (Provencher) |
| Fast | Finley |
| Fortin | Garrison |
| Généreux | Genuis |
| Gladu | Godin |
| Gourde | Hardcastle |
| Harder | Hoback |
| Hughes | Jeneroux |
| Jolibois | Kelly |
| Kent | Kusie |
| Kwan | Lake |
| Laverdière | Liepert |
| Lloyd | Lobb |
| Lukiwski | MacGregor |
| MacKenzie | Maguire |
| Malcolmson | Masse (Windsor West) |
| Mathysen | May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) |
| McCaughey (Edmonton West) | McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo) |
| Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound) | Moore |
| Motz | Mulcair |
| Nantel | Nater |
| Nicholson | O'Toole |
| Plamondon | Poilievre |
| Quach | Raït |
| Ramsey | Rankin |
| Rayes | Reid |
| Rempel | Richards |
| Saganash | Sansoucy |
| Saroya | Schmale |
| Shields | Shipley |
| Sopuck | Sorenson |
| Stanton | Stetski |
| Strahl | Stubbs |
| Sweet | Tilson |
| Trost | Trudel |

| | |
|--------------|--------------|
| Van Kesteren | Van Loan |
| Vecchio | Viersen |
| Warkentin | Waugh |
| Webber | Weir |
| Yurdiga | Zimmer — 122 |

PAIRED

Members

| | |
|---------|---------------|
| LeBlanc | Thériault — 2 |
|---------|---------------|

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

I wish to inform the House that, because of the proceedings on the time allocation motion, government orders will be extended by 30 minutes.

• (1140)

[English]

REPORT STAGE

The House resumed from May 24 consideration of Bill C-57, An Act to amend the Federal Sustainable Development Act, as reported (with amendment) from the committee, and of the motion in Group No. 1.

Mr. Marco Mendicino (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to speak in support of C-57, an act to amend the Federal Sustainable Development Act.

I will describe how our government is taking action to ensure that a clean environment and a strong economy go together, including our support for the global 2030 agenda for sustainable development, and our work with provinces, territories, indigenous people, and international partners to address climate change.

I will go on to discuss how Bill C-57 would support our strong commitment to sustainability and how the proposed changes, including clause 5, would contribute to more effective, inclusive, and accountable sustainable development strategies in the future.

Bill C-57 is about advancing sustainable development in Canada. This is a top priority for our government. We have always maintained that a clean environment and a strong economy can and must go hand in hand in the modern world. The well-being of Canada's future generations depend on it.

We face serious challenges, including the continued threat of global climate change. Canadians are already experiencing the effects of a warming planet, from wildfires that rage longer and harsher than ever before to thinning sea ice in the Arctic to rising sea levels that threaten communities from coast to coast to coast.

Our federal sustainable development strategy demonstrates our commitment to the 2030 agenda, with 13 aspirational goals that are a Canadian reflection of the global sustainable development goals. Its specific medium-term targets, short-term milestones, and actions show how we will implement the 2030 agenda's environmental dimensions over a three-year period.

Government Orders

The amendments to the act would support future strategies that would continue to align the goals and reporting of the federal sustainable development strategy with the 2030 agenda, ensuring that Canadians could see a comprehensive picture of our sustainable development priorities and complementing national action to advance the 2030 agenda. This includes, crucially, amendments to clause 5, which seek to ensure that the federal government strategy reflects the diversity of backgrounds and perspectives in Canada.

We are taking effective action to realize our vision of a clean environment, a strong economy, and a better quality of life for all Canadians. Much is being done, but more progress is needed to meet the challenge of sustainable development and to take advantage of its opportunities.

Bill C-57 would make important improvements to the sustainability approach established by the 2008 Federal Sustainable Development Act, which requires the government to prepare and report on sustainable development strategies. It would make these strategies more effective, inclusive, and accountable, accelerating our progress toward a more sustainable Canada.

I would like to take this opportunity now to share the specific amendments proposed in Bill C-57.

First, the bill proposes a new purpose which clarifies that the focus of the act and the federal sustainable development strategy is sustainable development, not only the environment. It would shift the act's focus to driving action in improving Canadians' quality of life, not just planning and reporting. It would specify that the federal sustainable development strategy must respect Canada's domestic and international obligations. Bill C-57 would also add a number of principles to the act and guide our whole-of-government strategy and the strategies of each federal department and agency, for example, the principle of intergenerational equity, which is clearly at the root of the concept of sustainable development.

Under the current act, all departments or agencies must develop strategies that are consistent with and contribute to the federal sustainable development strategy. Bill C-57 would continue this dynamic as more than 90 federal government organizations would work together and act in a coordinated manner to achieve common goals.

The bill would also support our government's commitment to an inclusive approach to sustainability by strengthening the advisory council on sustainable development. Under clause 5, the number of aboriginal peoples on the council would be increased from three to six, and the council would have a clear mandate to advise on the issue of sustainable development. It also seeks to reflect the diversity of Canadian society by taking into account demographic considerations, such as age and gender, when appointing representatives to the sustainable development advisory council. This would increase the degree to which the council would reflect the diversity of Canadian society and increase transparency.

• (1145)

Finally, and most critical, it would strengthen the government's accountability for achieving concrete, meaningful, sustainable development results.

For the government to be held accountable, we need strong targets, targets that are measurable and include a clear time frame for their achievement. Bill C-57 proposes to ensure that future strategies will continue to clearly set out what the government aims to achieve and when. This will enable Canadians to closely track whether the government has met its commitments.

Taking into account these improvements, how will Bill C-57 support greater progress toward our vision for sustainable development in Canada? Quite simply, through better sustainable development strategies that focus on results and reflect the priorities of Canadians.

What does this mean in practice? It means that future strategies will continue to include goals and targets that will take into account that our efforts today will affect the quality of life of Canadians tomorrow. It means that ministers and organizations across the federal government, more than ever before, will contribute to developing sustainable development strategies, and will work together with our partners to put them into action. It also means that future strategies will benefit from a clear shared understanding of the breadth of actions that will contribute to achieving sustainable development, not only protecting the environment but also protecting health, promoting equity, and conserving cultural heritage.

Future strategies will also continue to benefit from engagement with indigenous peoples, stakeholders, and Canadians. We saw the importance of this in the development of the current federal sustainable development strategy. Comments received through public consultations helped make our plan more aspirational, more measurable, and more inclusive.

Bill C-57 is important and significant legislation that supports our government's strong commitment to sustainable development. It would improve all aspects of the government's sustainable development approach, from developing and consulting on our sustainable development strategies to implementing them to achieving and reporting on results.

I would like to once again thank the members of the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development for their ideas, their commitment, and their collaboration. As I have described, their work has resulted in significant improvements to Bill C-57. With their contributions, the bill would provide a more effective and inclusive framework for advancing sustainable development in Canada.

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Madam Speaker, with respect to Bill C-57 and the provisions in it that require various federal departments to come up with their sustainable development plans and so forth and the fact that the Liberal government has now purchased the Kinder Morgan pipeline, I tried to get an answer to this from the Minister of Environment earlier. However, I would like to hear if the parliamentary secretary can help me out.

Government Orders

Under the provisions of Bill C-57, which federal department is now going to be responsible for the Kinder Morgan pipeline and how on earth is it going to provide a reasonable sustainable development strategy when this project's environmental concerns make a mockery of the government's climate change commitments?

Mr. Marco Mendicino: Madam Speaker, regrettably, I disagree with my hon. colleague's characterization of this government's support and investment in the Trans Mountain pipeline. As our government and the Prime Minister have stated on numerous occasions, this pipeline is in the national interest. The reason it is in the national interest is that it will support thousands of jobs in Alberta and British Columbia and knock-on positive employment in many other provinces right across the country.

With respect to the member's specific question as to how Bill C-57 will promote the coordination of this project, and many other projects which will encourage sustainable development, as I said in my remarks, the bill fosters a whole-of-government approach. It will extend the coverage of the federal sustainable development from 26 to more than 90 departments and agencies so there is a coordinated approach to ensure the economy and the environment go together.

• (1150)

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster, CPC): Madam Speaker, I know I am hearing a lot of conversation that the environment and the economy go hand in hand, that the government is doing this because it cares about the next generation. Therefore, my question is on fiscal accountability. It seems like the party across from us has no problem leaving billions of dollars of deficit to the next generation. Do the Liberals care about that as well? I agree we need to leave our environment to our children, and I would like your comments on that.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I will not give you my comments. Unfortunately, I just want to remind the member that she is to address the questions to the Chair.

Mr. Marco Mendicino: Madam Speaker, without question, this is a government that believes in creating economic prosperity by growing the middle class. Our record on that is second to none. We have created hundreds of thousands of jobs since taking office. We have seen record unemployment since taking office. We will continue to drive that kind of growth from the middle class out by supporting projects like the Trans Mountain pipeline.

Regrettably, on the other side of the aisle, what we see are two opposition parties that have been completely polarized by taking a singular approach, either by supporting the economy without giving consideration to the environment or vice versa.

This is a government that understands the importance of striking that balance. This project is in the national interest. It will drive jobs, tens of thousands of jobs, and it will ensure that we are protecting the environment by taking into consideration sustainability, which is at the core of what Bill C-57 would accomplish.

Mr. Alistair MacGregor: Madam Speaker, I fail to see the sustainability part of this project. If we are in fact going to be leaving a planet for future generations, with all the evidence of climate change that exists, I fail to see how this member can make the connection.

With regard to economic opportunities, there are now more Canadians employed in alternative and renewable energy sectors than there are in oil and gas. We are very much in favour of economic development, but it has to be done in an environmentally sustainable manner.

Mr. Marco Mendicino: Madam Speaker, that was more of a comment than a question, but I take the remark about the need to invest in renewable, green tech jobs as well as right across the sector.

It is thanks to the government's investments in green tech, in sustainable development, which Bill C-57 would attempt to accomplish, and will accomplish once passed into law, that we are seeing that job growth.

Let me specifically answer what I think was implied in this remarks. What Bill C-57 would do, among other things, is make decision-making more transparent. It would promote coordinated action across all of government. It would respect Canada's domestic and international obligations, including COP21.

That is how the government will ensure that the economy and the environment are balanced, will go together, and will be reconciled so that we can grow the economy for the middle class and continue to see our prosperity grow for future generations.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Greg Fergus (Hull—Aylmer, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to speak in support of Bill C-57, an act to amend the Federal Sustainable Development Act. I want to focus on what federal departments and agencies are doing to build a more sustainable Canada. First, I will talk about how departmental action is supporting the government's vision for sustainable development. I will then talk about the concrete measures that departments and agencies are adopting as part of their own mandates, to ensure that Canada becomes greener and more sustainable. Lastly, I will talk briefly about how departments and agencies are fulfilling the shared commitment to lead by example by lowering the federal government's greenhouse gas emissions.

I would first like to explain how departments' actions fit into our overall sustainable development plan. In October 2016, we introduced the 2016-19 federal sustainable development strategy, which contains ambitious long-term objectives, medium-term objectives, and short-term objectives to support our vision for sustainability. We want to make Canada one of the greenest countries in the world where quality of life is continuously improving.

The strategy also includes action plans, major priorities for sustainability, and specific ways in which the government contributes to sustainable development outcomes, from working with partners on climate change, to investing in clean technologies, to protecting Canada's lands and oceans.

Government Orders

It is the strongest strategy ever. Introducing it in October 2016 was the very first step. Now our focus is on implementing it to achieve real results for Canadians. That means individual departments and agencies must take action to achieve our goals. Under the Federal Sustainable Development Act, 26 departments and agencies must prepare sustainable development strategies that have their own specific objectives and plans and that comply with and contribute to our overarching federal strategy.

Last October, our government met that requirement, tabling strategies for the 26 departments and agencies named in the act. We also introduced strategies for a number of organizations that are not bound by the act but have an important role to play in sustainable development, such as Infrastructure Canada, the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, and the Canadian Food Inspection Agency.

Departmental strategies complement the high-level action plans presented in the Federal Sustainable Development Strategy. They add substance and detail to our plan, setting out the concrete commitments that will help us realize our sustainable development vision.

Moving from an aspirational, high-level strategy to specific commitments is an important accomplishment, and I want to thank and congratulate all of my colleagues who are working to implement the Federal Sustainable Development Strategy. With their diverse mandates, each department and agency has its own unique role to play.

I want to stress that reducing the government's own environmental footprint is just one part of our strategy, and most departments are going far beyond greening their operations.

Sustainable development is also broader than the environment alone, and our departmental strategies reflect this. Environmentally focused organizations like Environment and Climate Change Canada and Fisheries and Oceans Canada make important contributions to implementing our strategy.

• (1155)

The same goes for departments with strong social and economic mandates, such as Health Canada and Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada.

I would now like to talk specifically about a few of the actions these departments are taking to support our government's sustainable development goals. Several departments and federal organizations are contributing to our federal strategy goal of effective action on climate change, one of the most pressing challenges of our time.

Here are just a few of the actions they are taking. Environment and Climate Change Canada is working to phase out traditional coal-fired electricity units and advancing the use of carbon pricing. Global Affairs Canada is delivering on Canada's pledge to provide \$2.65 billion in climate-financing to support developing countries' transition to low-carbon, climate-resilient economies. Also, Natural Resources Canada is leading Canada's climate change adaptation platform, a national forum that brings together key groups in Canada to collaborate on climate change adaptation priorities.

Protecting and enhancing Canada's ecosystems is also essential to meeting the goals and targets of the federal sustainable development strategy and realizing our vision of a greener Canada. Eight organizations contribute to our goal of lands and forests that support biodiversity and provide a variety of ecosystem services for generations to come. Six of those organizations contribute to ensuring that coasts and oceans support healthy, resilient, and productive ecosystems, while four ensure clean and healthy lakes and rivers that support economic prosperity and the well-being of Canadians.

I see that I do not have much time left, but I feel it is very important to emphasize that sustainable development is also about generating clean economic growth, harnessing innovation and investing in clean technology. That means Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada has an important role in implementing the federal sustainable development strategy. I want to highlight a priority that all departments and agencies share. When we tabled the 2016-2019 federal sustainable development strategy, we committed to leading by example by reducing greenhouse gas emissions from our own operations, to reducing federal emissions by 40% from 2005 levels by 2030 or earlier. We recently announced an ambitious new target to reduce emissions by 80% by 2050. All departments and agencies are taking action to increase the energy efficiency of their buildings, modernize their fleets, implement green procurement and sustainable travel practices, and increase their resilience to climate change.

In conclusion, as I have described, our government moved from intention to action by tabling departmental sustainable development strategies. These strategies demonstrate our government's whole-of-government approach. Bill C-57 will build our whole-of-government approach by applying the Federal Sustainable Development Act to more than 90 federal organizations, ensuring that they contribute to developing the strategy and its progress reports and requiring them to report annually on results. We look forward to reporting back to Canadians and parliamentarians on our sustainable development commitments. We also look forward to continuing to advance sustainability under the federal sustainable development strategy.

• (1200)

[English]

Mr. Robert Sopuck (Dauphin—Swan River—Neepawa, CPC):

Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind my colleague from Hull—Aylmer, in whose constituency I happen to live, that the great Winston Churchill said that however beautiful the strategy, you should occasionally look at the results.

What I hear from the government in terms of the Federal Sustainable Development Act is primarily of civil servants sending emails to each other. The lack of action on the ground dealing with real environmental issues is the tragedy of the current government. Let me give some specific examples.

Government Orders

I was just in the Maritimes, in particular, in Miramichi in New Brunswick. People and communities are absolutely devastated by the plight of the Atlantic salmon, a fish that is worth hundreds of millions of dollars to the recreational fishery of many communities. It supports 4,000 jobs. When I was on the fisheries committee, it produced a unanimous report with very detailed recommendations to rehabilitate those stocks. The current government has done absolutely nothing, and the people I have met with regarding the Atlantic salmon were scathing in their criticism of DFO and what it is not doing to conserve this very important fish.

Water quality in the Great Lakes continues to deteriorate. Under our previous government, we implemented a number of programs under the national conservation plan that the current government has cancelled.

Wetlands are being lost at a furious rate. The Liberals are doing nothing about that.

Regarding the Pacific salmon stocks, many stocks are in deep trouble. The chinook fishery has been closed on the west coast. I could go on and on.

Therefore, all the fine words by my colleague across the way mean nothing to people and communities that are affected by the environmental degradation the current government is completely ignoring. Why are the Liberals ignoring these problems?

• (1205)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Greg Fergus: Mr. Speaker, it is quite the opposite. Our government is taking these issues into account. We address them in our federal sustainable development strategy.

We are moving forward. For example, Environment and Climate Change Canada is working with its partners in order to protect ecosystems like the Great Lakes, which my colleague mentioned. The department is going even further by working with its partners to protect the St. Lawrence River, the St. Lawrence estuary, Lake Winnipeg, and other major watersheds across Canada.

I believe this illustrates our approach quite well. We have developed a strategy. We are having discussions with our partners. We have allocated resources, including financial resources, to keep our promises. We are now taking action in partnership with key stakeholders, the provinces, and all those interested in promoting a more sustainable and healthier environment in Canada.

[*English*]

Mr. Vance Badawey (Niagara Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there was mention of the Great Lakes and, of course, the ecosystem surrounding them. Could the presenter speak a bit about the most recent announcement by the Minister of Environment and Climate Change with respect to the Lake Erie action plan, and not only the plan to sustain the Lake Erie ecosystem but also what the minister has presented to ensure that what surrounds the Lake Erie ecosystem, such as the wetlands and other areas that contribute to a better and cleaner future for the Great Lakes, is addressed?

Mr. Greg Fergus: Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague from the Niagara Peninsula knows very well the importance of protecting the Great Lakes and the water basins around them. As he mentioned in

his question, I know that the member has worked hard on this and certainly talks a lot about it in our caucus. We have seen the action he has taken to ensure that we are protecting not only the Great Lakes but also the entire basin that contributes to them. We know that if we have a healthy watershed surrounding the lakes, then we will have healthier lakes. That is precisely why that is so very important.

I know that the good work the member is doing in Niagara will continue well beyond his mandate. I certainly know that my hon. colleague will be very proud of the work he has done there and the brighter legacy he is leaving his constituents and the people of Canada who depend, in that growing region of Niagara, upon clean water and a clean watershed. I could speak much longer on that, but let me just once again salute the work of my hon. colleague.

Mr. Robert Sopuck (Dauphin—Swan River—Neepawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honour for me to stand and discuss the concept of sustainable development under the Federal Sustainable Development Act..

What is often lost to people is that sustainable development is actually a development concept. The concept was popularized by the Brundtland commission report, *Our Common Future*, published in 1986. What spawned that report was the deep frustration about how environmental policy was being done in the world. The assumption was that economic development was always at the expense of the environment, which is clearly not true.

Also, what the Brundtland commission concluded is that poverty causes environmental degradation. When we have economies that are not firing on all cylinders, when we do not have innovation, and when we do not have free markets or free trade, the end result is environmental degradation.

In 1992, the Earth Summit happened in Rio. I was there as part of the Canadian delegation. The message from the Earth Summit, loud and clear, was that ending poverty was the best thing the world could do for the environment.

Again, as a true free market Conservative, it is very clear to me that free markets, free trade, and a thriving innovation sector create the conditions for wealth production and environmental protection. It is no secret that advanced industrial societies have the best environmental quality. Now the Liberals on the other side always talk about the environment and the economy going together, but in an advanced industrial society, the way they see it is backwards.

In an advanced industrial society, wealth creation is absolutely necessary for environmental conservation. It is wealthy societies that make the investments in environmental protection. We have many northern and remote communities, for example, that live in pristine environments. There is no industrial development. The land is much as it has been for eons and eons, yet those communities have terrible economies and very difficult social problems. The pristine environment around them does not generate the wealth they need to sustain their societies.

Government Orders

An economist named Kuznets came up with a concept of looking at per capita income in a country and environmental quality, for example. He did a unique analysis of sulphur dioxide. In the early 1900s, sulphur dioxide was being belched out of coal-fired power plants at a furious rate that caused the great smogs. People said they did not care about the environment. The whole point was to industrialize and to use those power plants to power an ever-growing society.

What happened in the early seventies, however, is that people said that enough was enough, because of acid rain and air pollution. They simply could not put up with that. Society changed dramatically. Technology was developed to put scrubbers in coal-fired power plants. Starting in the 1970s, sulphur dioxide emissions declined dramatically in the United States as it got richer and richer.

I am not one of those people who talks about balancing the environment and the economy. Quite frankly, there is no balance. A wealthy society creates a better environment. Society gets wealthier and the environment improves. The term "balance" implies it is a zero sum game and that economic development is at the expense of the environment. That is simply not the case. Actually, the greenest government ever in Canada was that of former Brian Mulroney in the eighties. In fact, he was awarded the prize of being the greenest prime minister in Canadian history.

One thing the Mulroney government did in Canada, an example of a rich society, was to implement pulp and paper effluent regulations requiring every pulp and paper plant in Canada to build a state-of-the-art wastewater treatment plant. I happen, in a previous life, to have run one of those wastewater treatment plants. Basically, what those plants did was to turn a toxic effluent into effluent that a person could drink.

● (1210)

Only rich societies do those kinds of things. We put scrubbers on smoke stacks, as I said a minute ago. In rich societies, we also set aside vast tracks of land as parks. I happen to live next to Riding Mountain National Park. It has great timber and soils, all the makings of a piece of land that could be developed for forestry or agriculture, yet we as a rich society have decided that Riding Mountain National Park shall remain in its natural state. That is a good thing, but again, wealthy societies are the ones that do that.

That is something the Liberal government has completely forgotten. The Liberals are doing their best to kill Canada's natural resource economy, which is 20% of our economy. The way they are killing the natural resource economy is with process after process. The just-announced purchase of the Kinder Morgan pipeline by the Liberal government is testament to the failure of its environmental policies.

We lost energy east. We lost the Petronas project. We lost northern gateway. In addition to the Kinder Morgan project, these would have produced thousands and thousands of jobs, especially in eastern Canada. I am talking about energy east right now and the absurd situation of Canada importing foreign oil for our eastern refineries when we produce enough raw material to supply those refineries ourselves. Only a Liberal would think that is a good thing. I hate to break it to the government, but process does not improve the environment. Actual work on the ground does.

The other thing that is implied by the Liberals and the NDP all the time is that somehow industry is either not doing a good job, or always wanting to skirt environmental regulations. Nothing could be further from the truth. All of our industrial projects these days are built with the highest environmental standards from day one. I saw it in person on the ground when I was doing environmental monitoring work in the oil sands. The care taken by energy companies and contractors with environmental protection was something to see. Everyone was trained in spill response. All of the technology was in place. Spill kits were everywhere. All of the proper environmental protocols were followed. In terms of the plants and the mines, all of the pollution control devices were world class.

As I said earlier, environmental results are critical. Under our government the environment improved significantly. Sulphur dioxide went down, nitrous oxide went down, and the amount of land devoted to parkland increased dramatically. Over 800,000 acres of extremely valuable land was secured under the national area conservation plan.

Contrast that with what is happening under the current government. I mentioned earlier the plight of the Atlantic salmon. I was in New Brunswick where people are devastated by the near collapse of the Atlantic salmon stocks. Their anger at DFO almost knows no bounds. They are being ignored by the government. The Atlantic salmon was an example of sustainable development, a sustainable fishery that sustained communities with 4,000 jobs and hundreds of millions of dollars of income, and yet the government is ignoring the unanimous report of the fisheries committee. As a result, the Atlantic is in deep trouble.

Again, the Liberals think that process is results. Process does not produce results. Doing environmental conservation and environmental remediation and fish stock enhancement on the ground produces real environmental results. When I hear about the Federal Sustainable Development Act, I know it is about bureaucrats sending emails to themselves.

I would also note with regard to the Liberals' emphasis on process that in hearings before our environment committee on the impact assessment act, the Canadian Energy Pipeline Association said that Canada has a "toxic regulatory environment". I guess that is why the Liberals are trying to buy their way out of it with the purchase of the Kinder Morgan pipeline.

The government is deliberately destroying Canada's natural resource industries and the communities, both indigenous and non-indigenous, that depend on them. This will have serious consequences for Canada's economy.

Government Orders

• (1215)

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the world moves toward meeting the sustainable development goals in agenda 2030, Canada needs to be one of the players who take an active leadership role in ensuring that no one gets left behind. As I look at the bill and the work the committee has done, as well as the work our government has done over the last couple of years, I can see that of the 17 goals, our government has put a lot of work, domestically, into ensuring that there is no poverty, into gender equality, and into sustainable action on climate change and life under water, and doing so in partnership with the provinces and territories.

I know the hon. member is quite versed in this particular area and has a high level of expertise. Has he not seen the government do tremendous work toward sustainable development and ensuring that we meet the sustainable development goals and the objectives of agenda 2030?

• (1220)

Mr. Robert Sopuck: Mr. Speaker, Canada started showing leadership in sustainable development under the provincial government of Gary Filmon and the leadership of Prime Minister Brian Mulroney, back in the late 1980s. We did it this way. Prime Minister Mulroney announced at the United Nations that Canada was going to be a leader in sustainable development and that we were going to create the International Institute for Sustainable Development, based in Winnipeg. I was very fortunate to be on the founding board of the International Institute for Sustainable Development. That institute is recognized around the world for its work.

The member talked about poverty reduction. As someone once said, "Prediction is very difficult, especially if it's about the future." I think it was Yogi Berra. The government takes great pride in virtue signalling about its concern for our indigenous people. I am going to make a prediction right now that after the term of this government, and this is probably the last term, if one looks at the social and economic indicators in our indigenous communities from the first day the Liberals took office to their very last day in office, not a single indicator will have improved. They can take that prediction to the bank.

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes: Mr. Speaker, I would like to challenge my colleague on that assertion. Goal number one is no poverty. We introduced the Canada child benefit, which supports nine out of 10 families and will lift hundreds of thousands of kids out of poverty. We are on target for 2021 to ensure that our indigenous population has no boil water advisories and has access to clean water, which is goal number six of the sustainable development goals. I could go on and talk about a number of different initiatives we have taken within the indigenous file to ensure our obligation and responsibility, to ensure that the rights of indigenous people are protected, and to ensure that they have the quality of life they deserve in this country.

Therefore, I will challenge the assertion the member just made, because we are well on track to do a lot of the initiatives that the previous government did not even bother with.

Mr. Robert Sopuck: Mr. Speaker, I certainly stand by my assertion that not a single socio-economic indicator in indigenous communities will have improved after the term of the Liberal

government. Let us just look at the numbers when the final term of the government is over.

The member talked about indigenous communities. Let us take Baker Lake, for example. Agnico Eagle built a gold mine at Baker Lake. Does the member know what the unemployment rate at Baker Lake is? It is zero.

Near Yellowknife, a number of aboriginal communities participate in a diamond mining industry. At committee, I asked the head of the Mining Association of Canada specifically about the socio-economic indicators in those communities. More young people are going to secondary education. There is a spring in their step. They are happy to have jobs.

Chief Ernie Crey, a strong supporter of the Kinder Morgan pipeline, talked about the excitement his young people were feeling about the potential of getting trained for pipeline jobs, and how devastated they would be if this pipeline does not go through.

Again, the best route to self-sufficiency is economic development and jobs. We need to get natural resources developed near our indigenous communities so they can all benefit and better their lives.

• (1225)

Mr. Vance Badawey (Niagara Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak to Bill C-57, the clean growth strategy that the government is bringing forward to the House. I am also pleased to join my colleagues on this side of the House to give support to the bill and I look forward to its passage, after second reading being 244 to zero and after the unanimous decision at committee level.

Our government is committed to protecting the environment, as well as building a clean growth strategy that benefits the middle class and every part of the Canadian economy. Canadians want an ambitious action plan on climate change, at the same time as economic growth and ensuring a good future for our children and our grandchildren. This is a huge opportunity, and we are extremely excited about this nation's future.

If we look at countries around the world, including Canada, we see that many have come to the same conclusions as we have here today. In China, it is estimated that by 2040, the cost of generating electricity from new solar cells will be lower than the projected operating costs of existing coal-fired power plants. In 2017, Germany generated 36% of its electricity with clean energy. Last year, our southern neighbours saw solar and wind industries create jobs 12 times faster than the rest of the economy. In fact, they have twice as many solar jobs as coal jobs. Finally, here in our great nation, wind energy in Prince Edward Island reduces its need for energy from outside the province. P.E.I. has no sources of oil, natural gas, or other fuels for traditional forms of electricity.

As the world's economies are shifting toward cleaner and more sustainable growth, it is essential that Canada remain competitive on the world stage.

Government Orders

Sustainable development includes supporting people and the nation toward a cleaner economy, which will help position Canada to take advantage of opportunities in the new global economy by diversifying our economy and opening up access to new markets while reducing emissions and generating good jobs for all Canadians.

Sustainable development includes clean technologies, which are a key component of our government's approach to promoting sustainable economic growth. I want to emphasize the word "sustainable". It is not just about economic growth, but economic growth that is done right and sustainably.

Among many things, sustainable development means tackling climate change. Canada was one of almost 200 countries that committed to the Paris Agreement. We agreed to take steps to support the transition to a low-carbon economy and limit the global temperature increase to less than 2° Celsius.

Together with our provincial and territorial partners, we developed a pan-Canadian framework on clean growth and climate change, which includes our approach to pricing carbon pollution and measures to achieve reductions across all sectors of our economy. We see carbon pricing as a key driver for technological innovation and helping Canada to transition to a low-carbon economy, because a carbon price creates a continuous incentive to develop innovative and inexpensive ways to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

A transition to a lower-carbon future will also require the involvement of the private sector to help increase the supply from alternative sources of energy, meet increasing demands while reducing greenhouse gas emissions, leverage investments in clean energy, improve energy interconnection, and ensure a smooth transition as Canada reduces its reliance on coal.

Our goal is to make Canada a world leader in green technology and clean innovation. That is where the future lies: the knowledge economy, where Canadians are applying their talents to solve collective challenges that face each and every one of us throughout this great nation.

• (1230)

Let me remind my hon. colleagues about some important steps this government has taken to encourage and support clean technology in Canada.

In 2016, more than \$1 billion was announced for such things as support for research and development; the deployment of infrastructure for alternative transportation fuels, including charging infrastructure for electric vehicles and natural gas and hydrogen refuelling stations; tax incentives for the generation of clean energy; and, finally, new money for Canada research chairs at Canada's leading universities.

In 2016, environmental and clean technology activities accounted for 3.1% of Canada's gross domestic product, or \$59.3 billion. In terms of employment, an estimated 274,000 jobs were attributed to environmental and clean technology activity in 2016 alone. These jobs represent 1.5% of jobs in the Canadian economy, which is 4.5% higher than in 2007.

The two largest components of the environmental and clean technology gross domestic product are clean electricity, at 43%, and

waste management, at 12%. In 2017, we continued the support for clean technology by announcing almost \$1.4 billion in new financing to be made available to help Canada's clean technology firms grow and expand. We also announced our plan to phase out inefficient fossil fuel subsidies, which are a barrier to investment in clean energy.

More recently, we announced historic investments, including the low-carbon economy fund and the investing in Canada plan, which support projects aimed at reducing greenhouse gas emissions and generating clean growth. Building on these commitments, budget 2018 focused on enhancing the role of federal science for the public good by proposing \$2.8 billion to renew federal laboratories. These investments contribute, in part, to achieving Canada's pledge to double funding for clean energy deployment from \$387 million in fiscal year 2014-15 to \$775 million in 2020. In fiscal year 2015-16 alone, we increased clean energy research and development funding by 24% over the previous year.

I look forward to members of the House supporting this legislation. As I stated, 244 members of the House voted unanimously to move forward to third reading, and there was a unanimous decision to move forward to third reading from the committee. I am more than happy to take questions from the opposition, as well as from the third party.

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the world moves toward meeting the targets of the sustainable development goals, we have to take leadership. I wonder if my colleague could expand on some of the work we have done to achieve those goals. I will give him some examples.

Goal 5 is gender equality. For the first time, we saw a budget that had a gender statement and gender-based analysis. Goal 1 and goal 2 are no poverty and zero hunger. We introduced the Canada child benefit, which will lift hundreds of thousands of kids out of poverty. Goal 6 is clean water and sanitation. In my previous comments, I mentioned our work in indigenous communities around getting rid of boil water advisories, which we are on track to do in the coming years.

I am wondering if my hon. colleague could talk a little more about how the government has been working over the last couple of years to ensure that we are leaders in meeting the sustainable development goals.

• (1235)

Mr. Vance Badawey: Mr. Speaker, the member outlined a lot of what we have done on this file in terms of benefiting Canadians not only today but well into the future.

However, I want to add green infrastructure, public transit, smart grids, energy-efficient buildings, and electric vehicle infrastructure. The federal government aims to help mainstream innovation in clean technologies, working with our institutions and working with our partners as well as investing in water and wastewater projects in indigenous communities. The list goes on in terms of our partnerships with municipalities.

Government Orders

Our biggest achievement to date is the fact that we are benefiting and investing in our future and our children. We are ensuring that we are taking responsibility today for a better tomorrow. We are leading by example, not only by giving example to others but also by leading by example from others.

Let us make no mistake about it: not only are we doing this as a government here in Ottawa, but we are also working in partnership with our partners and municipalities and schools. We are working with children as well as young adults to ensure that they are part of their future, and we are also taking responsibilities and setting examples as a federal government.

[Translation]

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my colleague always speaks very passionately about infrastructure projects. I had the opportunity to work with him on the Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, where we had some good discussions.

He said that he likes working with the municipalities and other levels of government, but I am wondering what he thinks about the government's decision not to work with all of the parties in the House on Bill C-57 and to move a motion to cut members' speaking time on a file where the input and opinions of everyone in the House are very important. It is true that the environment and the economy go hand in hand, but at the same time, we all have the right to speak.

Does he think that muzzling opposition members with regard to Bill C-57 is what co-operation is all about?

[English]

Mr. Vance Badawey: Mr. Speaker, I appreciated working with the member opposite on many opportunities. I find it interesting that when I first started speaking, there were only four people in the House on the opposite side, two from one party and two from the other—

[Translation]

Mr. Luc Berthold: Mr. Speaker, members are not supposed to make reference to either the presence or absence of members in the House.

[English]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The hon. member has a point. Does the hon. member for Niagara Centre wish to withdraw that comment?

Mr. Vance Badawey: Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw it.

At second reading, 244 members supported this legislation unanimously in this House, and support was unanimous as well at the standing committee. Again, the legislation was unanimously supported in the House. We have had ample debate time. We have had ample support. We have ample participation from members of all parties. Once again, as I mentioned earlier, I look forward to this legislation passing with the unanimous support of the members of the House.

[Translation]

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to rise in the House today to speak to Bill C-57. This bill is a mixed bag, in that does not go far

enough and fails to consider several elements included in MP John Godfrey's original bill from 2007, which was subsequently watered down.

Once again, the work is only half done, as the bill did not consider the recommendations of the Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development. It did not even consider the recommendations of the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development, which wanted to go much further on certain issues, especially creation. Back in 2007, it was Mr. Godfrey's idea to create a real environment commissioner position that would be independent of the Auditor General's office and Environment and Climate Change Canada.

Now, some kind of office of sustainable development is going to be created within Environment and Climate Change Canada. I doubt that office will be able to give good advice, because it is like making the inspector part of the company he or she is supposed to inspect. I do not quite see how that would work. Once again, we see another so-called solution that does not really get to the root of the problem. The government is not making the bravest and most useful decisions possible.

I will come back to Bill C-57 in a few minutes because it is basically a bill that refers to the environment, sustainable development, and the United Nations' 17 sustainable development goals, which we are far from meeting. I will come back to that when I speak about the report of the Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development, which was tabled recently.

I will take this opportunity to point out what a mind-boggling day this has been. I do not understand this shocking and unexpected news: the Liberal government has decided to become the owner of a pipeline that will transport an extremely dangerous substance. If there is a spill on the Pacific coast, it will be extremely difficult to clean up because this substance sinks rather than floats like many other substances derived from fossil fuels.

During the 2015 election campaign, the Liberal Party of Canada said that by voting Liberal we would be voting for real change: Canada would be back on the international scene, the Liberals would champion the fight against climate change, and they would turn the page on the dark days of the Harper and Conservative regime. However, the Liberal Party is going further than Stephen Harper dared to go. The Conservatives never purchased a pipeline. That was not in the Liberal platform and the Liberals did not say one word about it in 2015. Unless I am mistaken, I did not hear the Prime Minister say, during the election campaign, that if we voted for him, he would take \$4.5 billion of our money and buy a pipeline.

Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet: I do not remember that.

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice: The whip does not remember, and neither do I, Mr. Speaker.

Government Orders

I do not think that is what he told voters, which is why people are right to feel betrayed today. They are right to be angry, because the government is going to use their money to buy a pipeline that will outgrow its usefulness in 20 or 30 years. Who is going to buy that back from us? The rest of the world will have completed the just energy transition and will have created good jobs in renewable energy. We will be coming to the international market saying that we put \$4.5 billion into this pipeline and it would be great if someone could buy it back from us, because we have no use for it.

Kinder Morgan estimates that the finished pipeline will require about 440 permanent employees to keep it running, with all of the associated risks. On top of this, you have provincial jurisdictions, first nations treaties, social acceptability, and our greenhouse gas reduction targets under the Paris Agreement.

Kinder Morgan estimates that, once the pipeline is built, it could generate 3,000 direct and indirect jobs. If you divide \$4.5 billion by 3,000 jobs, that gives you \$1.8 million per job created. I guarantee that if you gave me \$1.8 million, I would be able to create more than one job. The \$4.5 billion is not even the end of it, since this figure would simply cover the existing equipment. There is still no talk of how much the expansion could cost.

• (1240)

The aim is to be able to transport three times as many barrels a day. I do not know how we will be able to do that and still respect the Paris Agreement and reduce our greenhouse gas emissions. We would have to remove millions of cars from the road to perhaps be able to achieve a balance, because the government has absolutely no plan. On the contrary, it is coming to the rescue of a Texas company that was clearly unable to take the risk associated with the expansion and development of the pipeline. Since it does not want to take that risk, it decided to place it squarely on Canadian taxpayers' shoulders. This is outrageous and unacceptable.

Another thing we need to consider is that the government will be paying \$4.5 billion of our money to purchase a pipeline that already exists. Kinder Morgan paid \$550 million to purchase the Trans Mountain pipeline in 2007. Eleven years later, we are buying it for nine times that, and that is not even the final bill.

I think that when most people in every one of our ridings find out, they will be angry with the Liberal government because the decision makes no sense. The government is spending a considerable amount of money when it should be making the transition to other sources of energy and investing in energies and jobs of the future. Look at what is going on in Germany, Denmark, Spain, and the Netherlands. We in Canada are behind. We are taking a bunch of public funds, Canadians' money, and investing it in something that has no future and that is the result of extreme short-sightedness.

The oil will not even be refined in Canada. It will probably be sent to China. It is simply an export pipeline. It does not even create value for the Canadian economy. Billions of dollars are going to be invested in this project.

The Minister of Finance said that the government was going to find private partners to pay for the expansion of the Trans Mountain pipeline. They may not be interested, especially if they know that the Liberal government is standing there with its chequebook out asking,

“How much? No problem. Will that be \$5 billion, \$6 billion, or \$7 billion?” Today we are talking about \$4.5 billion, but it will probably end up being more like \$12 billion. Is this really the best use we can make of \$12 billion?

We have a responsibility to the world, and we could be a leader in investments in technologies of the future, in such areas as wind energy, solar energy, geothermal energy, and tidal flows. There are all sorts of things we could do. Instead of that, we have a bill that is neither here nor there, and a decision by the Liberal finance minister that goes completely against all of its goals. I think that Quebeckers and other Canadians must be aware of that. They are the ones who will be paying the price. They will pay the price out of their own pockets, with their own money, and they will also pay the price because the story is not over yet.

The indigenous peoples affected will go to court and ask for an injunction. The government of British Columbia will not take this lying down, either. It will want to defend its jurisdiction. Not only will the court battle go on forever, but this is a ridiculous expense, and we are missing an opportunity to invest in economies and energies of the future.

I am convinced that, today, in Kinder Morgan's offices, they are rolling in the aisles, passing out the champagne, scotch and cigars. They must be having one heck of a party. They have just been given \$4.5 billion, and they are taking absolutely no financial risk. They are not the ones who will have to deal with the legal problems or the spills. They are not the ones who will have to clean up the ocean. They have washed their hands of the whole affair.

It is over. Their work is done. They will be able to give their shareholders gifts and dividends, all paid for by Quebeckers and other Canadians. I think it is absolutely unacceptable. It goes against everything the Liberal government keeps saying about sustainable development.

• (1245)

[*English*]

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-57 would basically mandate that various federal departments come up with sustainability plans, and it would extend the reach. I have tried to ask the Liberal government on a couple of occasions which particular federal department is now going to be in charge of Kinder Morgan, and how on earth that federal department is going to be able to release a sustainable plan that will bear the scrutiny of scientific consensus.

Despite the way our planet is going and despite this being 2018, we are investing in expanding a diluted bitumen pipeline and not even getting the value out of the product, as my colleague mentioned in his speech. We are going after bottom-barrel, basement prices. We are not looking toward the future.

I would like my friend to comment on the Liberals' plan of action and how, with all of the evidence out there, this project flies in the face of sustainability and flies in the face of what Bill C-57 purports to do.

Government Orders

[Translation]

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice: Mr. Speaker, I would like to sincerely thank my colleague from British Columbia for his question and for having shared his concerns.

It is a shame to have a hypocritical government when it comes to sustainable development and the environment. We no longer have a minister of the environment and climate change, we have a minister of the environment and pipelines. It is a shame that the government is betraying Canadians' trust. It does not take the environment seriously, and it is not doing its share by reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

If we do not manage to go carbon neutral by 2030 or 2050 and the average temperature of the planet increases by more than 2%, we are in for monumental and catastrophic consequences. That is when it will cost us billions of dollars, not only because of the loss of ecosystems and species, but because of extreme weather phenomena. There will be more floods and more forest fires. This is an extremely serious matter. It is our greatest responsibility here in the House as representatives of Canadians. Unfortunately, the Liberal government is talking out of both sides of its mouth and moving in the wrong direction.

• (1250)

[English]

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, one of the principles of this particular piece of legislation is to ensure that not only do we meet the sustainable development goals as a government and as a country but that we do it in very particular ways, ensuring that there is intergenerational equity that polluters pay. We introduced a price on pollution. We have a comprehensive oceans protection plan. We have introduced measures to reduce poverty.

We are certainly hoping that the hon. member will support this piece of legislation. I personally think the government has done a really good job in meeting some of these goals, and we have more to do. I am pretty sure I know his answer from what the hon. member was saying, but what are his thoughts on that?

[Translation]

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for her question. She probably wants to hear me say that the Liberals have made a few good decisions and that they have taken positive actions. When that is true, I try to acknowledge it as best I can, but when it is not enough, it is not enough.

I invite my colleague to read the Commissioner of the Environment's reports. In last year's report, she estimated that Canada will not achieve its greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets for 2030, and that it will miss the boat. The United Nations and the OECD agree.

Obviously, she should also read the Commissioner of the Environment's report for this year, which contains the United Nations' 17 sustainable development goals. Here again, the Commissioner says that the government's efforts are insufficient to achieve these goals, and that she is extremely concerned.

Once again, the words are there, but nothing is being done to achieve the desired outcomes.

[English]

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to address my hon. colleagues here in the House today. I would like to speak about the principles of sustainable development and Bill C-57 and how those will help advance the government's commitment to a clean environment and a strong economy.

Let me start with a bit of history. In 1993, the General Assembly of the United Nations established the World Commission on Environment and Development, which was chaired by then Norwegian prime minister Gro Harlem Brundtland. In 1987, the commission published *Our Common Future*, known as the Brundtland report. The report put sustainable development on the global agenda. It also coined and defined its meaning, as follows:

Humanity has the ability to make development sustainable to ensure that it meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.

That is often referred to as the standard definition of "sustainable development", and indeed, that is how sustainable development is defined in our current Federal Sustainable Development Act.

The Brundtland report paved the way for an unprecedented 1992 United Nations conference in Rio de Janeiro, better known as the Earth Summit. I want to make a special point of noting that it was the late Maurice Strong, a distinguished Canadian, who led the organization of that event.

The Earth Summit brought together more countries and heads of state than any previous event. It established enduring and lasting mechanisms for international co-operation, following through on Gro Harlem Brundtland's vision of a sustainable future.

Among these important agreements were the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the UN Convention on Biological Diversity, and the development of the Commission on Sustainable Development. Canada was there. We supported the 1992 Rio declaration, and we have championed sustainable development since that time.

In 1995, following Rio, Canada became one of the first countries in the world to create a commissioner for sustainable development. Since 1997, government departments have been required to produce sustainable development strategies, in compliance with the 1995 amendments to the Auditor General Act.

In 2008, under the leadership of the Hon. John Godfrey, his private member's bill, Bill C-474, passed and became law as the Federal Sustainable Development Act. The act provides a legal framework for developing and implementing a federal sustainable development strategy every three years. It also requires 26 departments and agencies to prepare their own sustainable development strategies that comply with and contribute to the federal strategy.

Government Orders

Let us move forward to 2015, which was a watershed year for sustainable development globally. In September, Canada was among 193 countries to adopt the 2030 agenda for sustainable development. The 2030 agenda set out a global framework of action for people, the planet, prosperity, peace, and partnership, with the ultimate goal of eradicating poverty and ensuring that no one is left behind. The 17 sustainable development goals and their 169 associated targets built on the previous millennium development goals. They were universally applicable and fully integrated social, economic, and environmental dimensions of sustainable development. Just a few months later, in December of 2015, Canada was among the parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, which adopted the historic Paris agreement.

The Federal Sustainable Development Act is part of a legacy that began with the Brundtland report and the Earth Summit and that is still relevant today as we advance the government's commitment to a clean environment and a strong economy. It provides the framework to develop and implement the federal sustainable development strategy, a guide to the Government of Canada's environmental sustainability priorities.

The most recent strategy for the period from 2016 to 2019 was tabled in the House on October 6, 2016. It sets out 13 long-term aspirational goals. In response to a recommendation of the standing committee, the strategy's goals are Canada's reflection of the United Nations' sustainable development goals, with a focus on the environmental dimensions.

• (1255)

We are continuing to move forward to improve what we are already doing. Bill C-57, an act to amend the Federal Sustainable Development Act, seeks to strengthen our commitment to sustainable development, further building on the Brundtland Report and Rio as well as on the 2030 agenda for sustainable development goals and the Paris agreement.

As in the past, principles have been the foundation of all our sustainable development commitments, and today I would like to take a few minutes to tell my colleagues about the principles we are proposing in Bill C-57, principles our government believes will strengthen the Federal Sustainable Development Act. I also want to acknowledge the important work of our colleagues on the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development, who, in their June 2016 report on the Federal Sustainable Development Act, highlighted the importance of modernizing our sustainable development principles.

Bill C-57 proposes to include the principles of intergenerational equity, polluter pays, internalization of costs, openness and transparency, involving indigenous people, collaboration, and results and delivery.

The principle of intergenerational equity is the essence of sustainable development. It is the recognition that the decisions we make are not just about today and about us but about the future and those who will be here after us.

The principles of polluter pays and the internalization of costs reflect our understanding that we need to move beyond conventional ways of thinking. To be sustainable, economic growth must take into

account the damages imposed on the environment. Polluter pays means that those who generate pollution must bear the cost. Internalization of costs means that goods and services should reflect all costs they generate for society, from their design to consumption to final disposal.

The principles of openness and transparency are intertwined with the purpose of the Federal Sustainable Development Act to make decision-making related to sustainable development more transparent and subject to accountability to Parliament.

From the very first day we took office, our government has been committed to a renewed relationship with indigenous people based on the recognition of rights, respect, co-operation, and partnership. We are working to correct the injustices that have persisted and have contributed to an unacceptable socio-economic gap. That is why we are involving indigenous people. We want to underscore that this commitment is supported by important provisions in the proposed act to increase the number of indigenous representatives on the Sustainable Development Advisory Council to better reflect the breadth of indigenous groups represented and the challenges they face here in Canada.

The principle of collaboration emphasizes the role parties must play to achieve sustainable development. We need to work together.

Last, the principle of results and delivery is about making sure that we get there. We need to ensure that we have the right objectives and strategies to meet all the goals, but we also need good indicators to measure progress and make sure that we report on the progress in a way people can understand and be proud of.

The principles set out in Bill C-57 reaffirm that we are up to the challenge before us. We are ready to seize the opportunities before us and to be bold. Sustainable development means growing a diversified, low-carbon economy while reducing emissions and generating good-quality jobs for Canadians.

• (1300)

Mr. Earl Dreeshen (Red Deer—Mountain View, CPC): Mr. Speaker, earlier in the discussion, we heard an NDP member mention that in 2007, Kinder Morgan had been purchased for \$550 million. Of course, we can see what has happened to that asset in the last few years. Kinder Morgan, as we have just heard, has had kind of a positive view of the project, which will free up money for Kinder Morgan to be able to invest in better and more stable economic jurisdictions around the world. They, of course, will be moving oil.

I am rather curious about whether the member feels that with the sustainability development programs we are speaking of, there would be encouragement for Kinder Morgan to go in and move oil, for example, for energy east, which would be a great opportunity for the extra money investment it will have because of the money it has now made in British Columbia.

Government Orders

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes: Mr. Speaker, the Trans Mountain expansion is in Canada's best interest. It was approved by our government. We understand that the economy and the environment go hand in hand. One of the benefits of this project is that it will create thousands of good paying jobs in Canada.

Our government wants to ensure we make investments and decisions that are in the best interests of Canadians. We want to ensure they are consulted and are the beneficiaries of those good paying jobs. In a lot of jurisdictions, many individuals face a lot of challenges. We want to ensure we take that into account.

This investment is an investment in Canada's future. It will ensure that Canadians are always at the forefront of our thoughts, and that we have good paying jobs for them.

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we have just heard some interesting interventions.

Kinder Morgan does not want to make a bad investment for its shareholders and it has now found a willing partner in the Liberal government to prevent that.

The finance minister has already started his snake oil salesman routine across the globe, looking for investors. Maybe he is going to go on *Shark Tank* or *Dragons' Den* and use them as venues to solicit more money.

How can the minister talk about partnerships and a thorough vetting of the environment, while at the same time not look at the fact that this bill is being circumvented by a shortening of time in the House to debate it and possibly improve it?

• (1305)

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes: Mr. Speaker, we can look at Bill C-57 and the role Canada has to play in its leadership around sustainable development. Over the last couple of years, we have actively worked toward that.

As I said in my previous comments, our government introduced the Canada child benefit, which moves hundreds of thousands of kids out of poverty and reduces hunger. It meets the first two goals of sustainable development, or tries to achieve some of that.

With respect to gender equality, our government has taken a whole-of-government approach. We see it in our G7 presidency. We are taking a leadership role not just on what we do domestically. Women and girls are the centre of our feminist international assistance policy.

This legislation is an ongoing and continuous focus on ensuring Canada is a leader in achieving sustainable development goals both here and around the world.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Steven Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be speaking today in support of the sustainable development bill before us. I am accompanied by staunch defenders of our ecosystems, including my colleague from Manitoba, who is with us today, and my colleagues from British Columbia and Saskatchewan.

We want to make sure that we are using our resources in such a way that future generations will be able to do so as well. That is the

core of the bill. This morning, my colleague from Saskatchewan reminded us that the concept of sustainable development is a recent development in the history of humanity. We need to go back to 1972. It was after I was born, but I think I was in elementary school at the time. In 1972, the Club of Rome raised the alarm, saying that the planet had limited resources and that we could not continue exploiting them relentlessly and irresponsibly. It predicted that, in the 21st century and, more specifically, around 2100, the continued pursuit of economic growth would result in a sharp drop in the population due to pollution, the loss of soil fertility and a shortage of energy resources. That was more than 46 years ago, at a time when resources were exploited with impunity and when there was no sewage treatment or pollution control.

Then, in 1987, awareness began to spread under the guidance of Gro Harlem Brundtland, who was prime minister of Norway at the time. She chaired a United Nations world commission on environment and development and published the landmark Brundtland report. That 1987 report, entitled "Our Common Future", was the first to define the concept of sustainable development.

Let us take a moment to review that definition, which is at the heart of the matter. It is always important to make sure we agree on definitions. We have had some major debates here because we could not agree or because the government refused to put forward a definition. Here is the definition:

Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.

It is about striking a balance between generations. One concept at the heart of sustainable development has to do with externalities, the environmental costs that are not measured in a transaction, but that still have consequences.

Sustainable development is based on three pillars: the environment, the economy, and the social aspect. Certain groups, including, dare I say, the current government, sometimes have a tendency to favour one pillar over the others, which creates an imbalance. This afternoon, I would like to share an example of an approach that would give all three pillars equal priority, thus ensuring sustainable development. I would like to point out that this is what the previous government did, under the leadership of its prime minister.

Before I start criticizing the work of the current government, I would like to offer an example of sustainable development for those watching the debate. As I was saying, sustainable development is based on three pillars: the environment, the economy, and the social aspect. I want to talk about the economic pillar. If we spend more than we earn, that is not sustainable. That would not be considered sustainable development.

The current government is shamelessly and irresponsibly spending money and cannot tell us when it will balance the budget. Future generations will have a guillotine hanging over their heads. Many of them are not yet old enough to vote, but as a result of decisions made by those who came before them, these future generations will be stuck with a tax burden when they reach voting age and join the workforce.

Government Orders

•(1310)

That is irresponsible. One of the main pillars of sustainable development is the economy, but the government is failing miserably on that front. Let me point once again to the Parliamentary Budget Officer's revelation that this government has set itself up for deficit after deficit. We are talking deficits in excess of \$17 billion, and the worst of it is that there is no telling when the budget will be balanced again, even without any sign of an impending economic crisis.

In April 2018, the Parliamentary Budget Officer reported that not only will this year's deficit be \$22 billion, but it will also continue to grow every year. That is four times what the Liberal Prime Minister promised. We are also seeing rising interest rates right now, which means that the interest on the national debt will grow to nearly \$40 billion by 2022. That is almost two-thirds higher than last year, and it is certainly much more than the Minister of Finance promised. We are stuck in a debt cycle. That is one pillar of sustainable development the government is not holding up.

The second pillar is the environment. Our government set targets. It created an environmental watchdog, the Commissioner of the Environment. Just a few months ago, the Commissioner of the Environment said that, although the federal government had established a framework for reducing greenhouse gas emissions, the measures in place would not be sufficient to achieve that goal.

The commissioner is raising the alarm. Despite the government's environmental rhetoric, one of the only increases in spending in the Minister of the Environment's budget was for communications. Moreover, the government has eliminated effective measures for preventing an increase in greenhouse gas emissions. Unfortunately, that is where we find ourselves today. The government is implementing a carbon tax, but no one knows how it will affect greenhouse gas emissions, although, according to the Commissioner of the Environment, it will definitely have an impact on the standard of living.

That is the third pillar of sustainable development, namely, the social aspect. The Liberals are increasing the tax burden on middle-class families. The Fraser Institute has clearly shown that Canadian families pay more tax.

In contrast, the previous Conservative government reduced taxes for the middle class. Those years saw one of the largest increases in quality of life for middle-class Canadians. We balanced the budget and reduced greenhouse gas emissions by more than 2%. We managed to stabilize greenhouse gas emissions while growing the economy. That was because we invested. Since I am going to run out of time, if people want to know more, they can take a look at the 2013 budget, which describes how, in the previous decade, the Conservative government injected almost \$17 billion in targeted actions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Among other things, Quebec was given more than \$400 million for its green plan, which has had a positive impact. Consider, for example, initiatives to foster the development of green technologies and investments in science and energy technology such as the energy efficiency technologies of CO₂ Solutions in the Quebec City area.

Time is running out, and I have barely had time to scratch the surface of today's topic. I will conclude with a quote from a former

Conservative prime minister who distinguished himself in the area of the environment. Members will recall the Montreal protocol, acid rain control, and the implementation of the first sustainable development strategy. He said that history will not judge us by our words, but on the results of our actions.

•(1315)

It is possible to lower Canadians' taxes, balance the budget, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. That is what our Conservative government did and I hope that the Liberal government, in the interest of future generations, will follow the Conservative government's example with this strategy.

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have just a quick comment before a question.

The member across the way made reference to tax cuts for the middle class a couple of times. Then he talked about actions versus verbiage. If we look at it, it was this government that introduced legislation and a budget with a tax cut for Canada's middle class. The Conservatives voted against that tax cut.

That said, I find it very interesting to have heard very little, if anything, about the amendment we are debating today. It deals with the sustainable development advisory committee. The Conservative members moved that amendment at committee, which all committee members came to an agreement on. It passed in committee. Now it comes to report stage, and the Conservative members are moving an amendment to delete the amendment they made at committee. It makes absolutely no sense whatsoever.

Could the member tell us why the Conservatives moved the report stage amendment? It makes no sense.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Steven Blaney: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question.

Basically, we want concrete measures. This is somewhat related to what I was saying when I quoted former prime minister Mulroney. This bill will add layers of bureaucracy. Even if one- or two-inch thick reports are produced, that is not going to have a real impact on sustainable development. Unfortunately, that is the current trend with the Liberals.

I wanted to go back to my colleagues' speech about the supposed tax cuts, which was full of nonsense. The facts show that the Liberal government is increasing the tax burden for all of Canada's middle class. The official opposition will always oppose this.

Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet (Hochelaga, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am curious what my colleague has to say about the fact that the federal government just spent \$4.5 billion of taxpayer money to buy the Trans Mountain pipeline.

Government Orders

Hon. Steven Blaney: Mr. Speaker, I thank my NDP colleague for the question. She is asking what I think about the fact that the current government is injecting \$4 billion into a foreign corporation in an attempt to get a domestic project back on track. Well, I am shocked. It may not be unprecedented but it sure looks a lot like another investment by a previous Liberal government.

It is shocking to see the government taking Canadian taxpayers for fools. It has gotten to the point where, in order to secure major development projects that create jobs, the Government of Canada has to try to repair the damage with taxpayer money. It created an administrative burden and is incapable of showing positive leadership. Worse yet, no one is sure if this will work. However, the one thing we do know is that we have been put on a slippery slope starting at \$4 billion and the work has not even begun.

Considering how it is running our country, I think this Liberal government is not done running deficits and injecting money into endless funds, which it is managing with the incompetence it has shown since coming to power.

• (1320)

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I loved my colleague's speech. It was very much to the point when it comes to sustainable development. I would like him to elaborate so that we can truly understand that the Liberal government is not a sustainable government.

Hon. Steven Blaney: Mr. Speaker, the government is basically raising taxes and putting Canadians further in debt. It has lost control of greenhouse gas emissions. This is a colossal failure and an example of what not to do when it comes to sustainable development.

Mr. Frank Baylis (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to support Bill C-57, which seeks to amend the Federal Sustainable Development Act.

Before I begin, I would like to thank the members of the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development for their excellent work, their positive approach, and their constructive suggestions. The committee's recommendations, which are set out in the report entitled "Federal Sustainability for Future Generations", contributed to the development of Bill C-57, particularly with regard to the adoption of the sustainable development principles. Those principles were very well received.

The amendments to the Federal Sustainable Development Act reaffirm the government's ongoing commitment to strengthening Canada's relationship with indigenous people and enforcing their rights.

Bill C-57 includes a new set of sustainable development principles, one of which is the principle whereby indigenous people must be asked to contribute because of their traditional knowledge and their unique connection with and understanding of Canada's land and water. This principle reflects the important role traditional knowledge plays in supporting sustainable development, as well as the government's commitment to reconciliation based on recognition of rights, respect, co-operation, and partnership.

However, there are certain environmental problems that disproportionately affect indigenous peoples. For example, climate change

and resource development alter wildlife migration patterns and ranges. These changes have an impact on indigenous peoples' access to traditional food sources, as well as on their food security and culture.

Furthermore, persistent organic pollutants and heavy metals can migrate long distances to northern Canada. Scientists have observed high levels of these contaminants in Arctic wildlife, so there is a health risk for indigenous peoples who use these animals as a food source.

Indigenous peoples' relationship to the land is particularly crucial to the mandate of the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, because her department is responsible for preserving, protecting, and improving the quality of the natural environment. At the same time, the government recognizes that indigenous peoples were the original stewards of the air, land, and water. Over many generations, they built up a vast store of knowledge about nature. That is why it is essential to continue to establish and maintain strong, positive relationships with indigenous communities and indigenous governing bodies. In the coming years, the government will continue to make use of all that knowledge, which is going to help shape our collective environmental future.

The Government of Canada committed to renewing the crown's relationship with indigenous people based on the recognition of their rights. We believe that adapting our work based on the recognition of rights is an important opportunity for us to build a relationship of trust with our indigenous partners; enhance the integrity of policies, research, and analysis; and obtain better environmental outcomes for all Canadians.

As part of our participation in the negotiation of various treaties and other conventions, we are working with indigenous partners to preserve and protect our wildlife and environmental resources. We are striving to implement transparent and rigorous consultation processes based on respect for the right of indigenous people to determine how land and resources will be used.

The government recognizes that there is still a lot of work to be done in this regard. We need to assess our contribution to the government's reconciliation agenda, including the implementation of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, on an ongoing basis.

• (1325)

We must also strengthen our commitment to our indigenous partners and look at opportunities for aligning programs, policies, and departmental rules and regulations with indigenous rights and interests. Like every federal department and agency, Environment and Climate Change Canada operates on the Principles respecting the Government of Canada's relationship with Indigenous peoples, drafted by the Department of Justice to be used as a guideline in shaping the work of the department in its relations with the indigenous peoples, including a rights-based approach.

Points of Order

At the heart of this change in culture and path to reconciliation is the recognition of the importance of our relationships with indigenous peoples. Consulting indigenous peoples is more than just a legal obligation, it is a way to make more informed decisions. Our government is determined to ensure that indigenous peoples have the opportunity to participate in, engage in, and contribute to this ongoing dialogue.

For the reasons I just mentioned, Environment and Climate Change Canada consults representative organizations and the governments of the first nations, the Inuit, and the Métis across the country. When the proposed changes were being drafted, indigenous peoples raised a few key themes. They told us that traditional indigenous knowledge is important for sustainable development and that indigenous peoples need to be heavily involved. They also mentioned that the government should implement measures that reflect respect for indigenous rights as a priority and recognize the role of governments in indigenous communities and societies.

The representative organizations and governments of the first nations, the Inuit, and the Métis also expressed the need to provide support to indigenous communities for activities such as implementing climate change adaptation plans and modernizing infrastructure. They also indicated that we need to set more ambitious objectives when it comes to the quality of drinking water for first nations.

The federal sustainable development strategy, which we introduced in October 2016, reflects what we heard. For example, we know that Canada's drinking water is among the safest in the world. In fact, 98% of Canadians have access to drinking water. However, access to drinking water remains a challenge in first nations communities living on reserve. The strategy contains a target to eliminate long-term drinking water advisories affecting public systems on reserve.

The Government of Canada is working with first nations communities to improve on-reserve water infrastructure, address drinking water advisories that are one or more years old, and prevent short-term advisories from becoming long-term ones.

All Canadians, including all levels of government, indigenous peoples, civil society, and the private sector have a role to play in advancing our sustainable development objectives and ensuring that no one is left behind. In 2016, our government undertook an extensive consultation process to review our international aid policy.

We also heard from indigenous peoples who want more say on environmental issues. Our bill proposes increasing the number of representatives of aboriginal peoples on the Sustainable Development Advisory Council from three to six, to ensure that the strategy reflects the rights and perspectives of indigenous peoples and the wide range of challenges they face across Canada.

Bill C-57 reflects what we heard from indigenous peoples. It also reflects the government's commitment to reconciliation based on the recognition of rights, respect, co-operation, and partnership.

● (1330)

[*English*]

POINTS OF ORDER

MAIN ESTIMATES 2018-19

Mr. Daniel Blaikie (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to start by thanking you for your acknowledgement as to some of the debate that has happened in this place about timing of points of order on the estimates and for your flexibility in hearing these points.

I also wanted to assure you that this point of order with respect to Treasury Board vote 40 speaks directly to some of the comments made earlier today about the Speaker having a role in ensuring that votes proposed in the estimates are done under the proper legal authority and that the government has authority for those votes.

I made an attempt to abbreviate this point as much as possible. As fair warning, it is probably not a short point, but I will deliver it as expeditiously as possible.

It is a well-established principle that departments may only seek spending authority for programs within their respective legal mandate. Indeed, the government recognized as much in the wording of vote 40, which says:

Authority granted to the Treasury Board to supplement in support of initiatives announced in the Budget of February 27, 2018, any appropriation for the fiscal year, including to allow for the provision of new grants or for any increase to the amount of a grant that is listed in any of the Estimates for the fiscal year, as long as the expenditures made possible are not otherwise provided for and are within the legal mandates of the departments or other organizations for which they are made.

The key phrase in this instance is “as long as the expenditures are within the legal mandate of the departments or other organizations for which they are made.” While the wording of the vote seeks to address the problem of Treasury Board potentially allocating funds to other departments for programs outside their legal mandate, it does nothing to address the problem of vote 40 itself not having any basis within the legal mandate of the Treasury Board Secretariat.

Consider the main powers and responsibilities conferred upon the Treasury Board by the Financial Administration Act that constitutes it, as stated in subsection 7(1):

The Treasury Board may act for the Queen's Privy Council for Canada on all matters relating to

(a) general administrative policy in the federal public administration;

Vote 40 clearly does not pertain to this responsibility.

(b) the organization of the federal public administration or any portion thereof...;

Vote 40 clearly does not pertain to this responsibility.

Subsection 7(1) continues:

(c) financial management including estimates, expenditures, or financial commitments, accounts, fees, or charges for the provision of services or the use of facilities, rentals, licences, leases, revenues from the disposition of property and procedures by which departments manage, record and account for revenues received or receivable from any source whatever.

I will return to this item, as I believe it warrants further discussion.

Points of Order

Then paragraph 7(1)(d), as abbreviated, in saying “the review of annual and longer term expenditure plans and programs of departments”, clearly does not provide any authority for a central vote like vote 40. In fact, it has arguably led to the exclusion of certain items from departmental plans.

Paragraph 7(1)(d.1) as abbreviated then refers to “the management and development by departments of lands”. That is clearly not related to vote 40.

Paragraph 7(1)(e) refers to “human resources management in the federal public administration”. Vote 40 clearly does not cover that.

Paragraph 7(1)(e.1) refers to “the terms and conditions of employment of persons appointed by the Governor in Council”. We are getting far into the weeds here, and I suggest that the other provisions in that act under that subsection will prove equally unrelated to any legal mandate for a vote like vote 40.

After even a brief review, I hope you will be satisfied, as I am, that all but one of these can quickly be discarded as a potential basis for vote 40 authority. The only one that has any *prima facie* possibility at all is perhaps paragraph 7(1)(c). This item gives the Treasury Board authority to act for the Queen's Privy Council for Canada on all matters relating to financial management, including estimates, expenditures, etc.

The Treasury Board's authority with respect to the estimates is exhausted by the preparation and presentation of the estimates. It does not include relieving departments of the effort involved in preparing their own new budget initiatives for approval through the estimates process. In respect of the Treasury Board's authority for expenditures and financial commitment, that also does not include relieving departments of the effort involved in preparing their new budget initiatives for approval through the estimates process.

It may include outlining the mechanisms for effecting an expenditure or making a financial commitment. It may even include detailing what is required for departments to obtain Treasury Board approval for including an item in the estimates. That is very different from Treasury Board appropriating funds for itself for programs that are not within its own mandate and then dispensing them to other departments later.

It also bears addressing that the other central votes for Treasury Board—and I believe you made some reference to them earlier—do fall within the legal mandate and do not serve as any kind of precedent for vote 40 being within the legal mandate of the Treasury Board's mandate.

I would like us to consider all of those votes to show why those votes can be argued to have a legal mandate, whereas the other ones cannot.

• (1335)

Vote 10, government-wide initiatives, is for the purpose of strategic management initiatives within the federal public administration, a purpose that seems to relate rather clearly to the Treasury Board's responsibility for the organization of the federal public administration or any portion thereof, etc.

Vote 20 is for public service insurance. You can refer to the wording of the vote, Mr. Speaker. I will dispense with that in order to save time. It is essentially payments for different insurance, pension, and benefit plans. You will find, Mr. Speaker, that this is consistent with its responsibility for human resources management in the federal public administration, including the determination of the terms and conditions of employment of persons employed in it, as well as its responsibilities under subsection 7.1(1) of the Financial Administration Act. I would quote it, but I will simply refer you, Mr. Speaker, to subsection 7.1(1) in the interests of time. The vote also appears to be consistent with powers granted under section 11 of the Financial Administration Act, including paragraphs 11.1(1)(c) and 11.1(1)(j), but again, instead of quoting them, in the interests of time I will leave it to you, Mr. Speaker, to consult those passages for yourself.

Another central vote under Treasury Board is vote 30, payroll requirements. Again if you refer to the wording of the vote, Mr. Speaker, you will see that this is for requirements related to parental and maternity leave, severance pay, etc. I would put it to you, Mr. Speaker, that the purposes of that central vote are also consistent with the legal mandate of the Treasury Board under the Financial Administration Act.

Vote 25 and vote 35 are the operating and capital budget carry-forward votes. These votes grant authority to Treasury Board to “supplement any other appropriation for the fiscal year by reason of the...carry forward from the previous...year”. Admittedly, the legal authority for these votes is less clear. In fact, it may be a good idea for the government operations and estimates committee to study how the funds from these votes are ultimately disbursed. Nevertheless, there are a few points worth making about these particular votes.

First, the money for these votes comes from appropriations already made by Parliament. It is not new money, but money that was already approved for some purpose, albeit a purpose that was not realized in the intended fiscal year.

Second, it is recognized in the public and private sectors that requiring a department to spend all of its appropriated funds for the year by year end can lead to a use-it-or-lose-it mentality that leads to perverse outcomes. Parliament has seen fit to allow some carry-forward in capital and operating budgets to help mitigate that effect.

Third, if the money is going to be carried forward, it makes sense to exercise some control over the money. Arguably, a repurposing of this money could be suggested with the department's own estimates and approved by Parliament at the beginning of the year instead of entrusting it to Treasury Board alone, but it has been the practice of Parliaments so far to leave that job to Treasury Board.

In summary, I am not committed to the view that the current way these votes are handled is the best way, but they nevertheless are substantially different from vote 40 in a few respects: Parliament has accepted them for some time, they help to avoid wasteful spending, and they are constituted by money that has already been approved by Parliament for a given purpose.

Finally, I would like to address the question of vote 5, the contingency vote, which some would argue does provide a precedent for this vote. I will argue to the contrary.

Points of Order

The wording of the vote 5 states:

- Authority granted to the Treasury Board to supplement any other appropriation
- Authority granted to the Treasury Board to provide for miscellaneous, urgent or unforeseen expenditures not otherwise provided for — including for the provision of new grants [etc.]

You can consult the wording of the vote outside the House, Mr. Speaker. I saved this vote for last because it is most like vote 40 in some ways, although there are still important differences that would defeat any attempt to invoke vote 5 as a precedent for Treasury Board vote 40.

These votes are similar in that there is no obvious authority for either of them and, unlike any of the other central votes, they both empower Treasury Board to provide for new grants without any further authorization from Parliament. To the extent that someone may want, on that basis, to say it is a precedent, it bears mentioning that this contingency fund has been roundly criticized over the years, including by the Auditor General. For example, in 2002, the Auditor General said in respect to the government contingencies vote:

In our view, this language is sufficiently broad that arguably it establishes authority for practically any payment if the funds are paid directly from the Vote without first being transferred to a departmental vote. We question whether this lack of clarity is appropriate given the increasing use of the Vote to temporarily fund grant payments.

● (1340)

There is more in that report, but I have now referred you to it and given a sampling of what is in it. I encourage you to consult the report in full for more information on the Auditor General's criticism of this kind of vote.

The concerns expressed about vote 5 echo concerns expressed more recently by the Parliamentary Budget Officer with respect to vote 40, so there is definitely some similarity in those criticisms. In the PBO's report, "The Government's Expenditure Plan and Main Estimates for 2018-19", he said the following:

The Government's approach to funding Budget 2018 initiatives provides parliamentarians with information that only marginally supports their deliberations and places fewer controls around the money it approves.

With respect to the former, virtually none of the money requested in the new Budget Implementation vote has undergone scrutiny through the standard Treasury Board Submission process, which as indicated by the Government, is to "ensure resources are directed to programs and activities that remain government priorities and achieve value for money." With respect to the latter, it is unclear that the proposed vote wording would restrict the Government to funding each Budget 2018 measure in the amount set out in the Budget Plan for each Department and Agency, rather than changing the allocations across any initiative mentioned in Budget 2018.

In other words, to the extent that vote 5 and vote 40 are similar, they are also suspect.

Nevertheless, there is a substantial and important difference between the two. The difference is that the contingency fund has a number of criteria for disbursement: that the expenditures be miscellaneous, urgent, or unforeseen. In other words, there must be a good reason for government to dispense these pre-approved funds instead of seeking appropriations through the regular supplementary estimates process.

Notwithstanding the concerns raised by the Auditor General and committees of Parliament that the government has not always done a good job of demonstrating that expenditures out of the fund meet these criteria, it is nevertheless important that those criteria exist.

Those criteria provide the rationale for ignoring the usual supply process, something which is not to be done lightly.

The contingency fund is meant to recognize, albeit imperfectly—and we may be able to improve the process—that certain things come up through the course of the year and that some flexibility is required to deal with unforeseen needs, particularly if the needs are urgent.

On January 31, 2011, the Treasury Board published guidelines for accessing the contingency vote, which begin, "Guidelines for reviewing departmental requests for access to the Government Contingencies Vote."

The guidelines state:

Treasury Board Vote 5 serves to supplement other appropriations in order to provide the government with sufficient flexibility to meet urgent or unforeseen expenditures....

I am just giving selections from the guidelines, not the entire passage, as follows:

This authority to supplement other appropriations is provided until parliamentary approval can be obtained, as long as the expenditures are within the legal mandate of the organization. The allocation from Vote 5 is provided on a temporary basis and is to be reimbursed once parliamentary authority for the expenditure has been obtained through the approval of the Supplementary Estimates.

These criteria make it very clear that using the contingency fund to circumvent the normal supply process should be done rarely, and only in cases of exceptional need. The funding is temporary, and requires that items funded out of vote 5 appear later in the supplementary estimates—and this is important—not just as information, but also for approval. This differs from what is proposed for vote 40. The government has committed to report on allocations from vote 40 online, and I believe also perhaps in subsequent supplementary estimates, but they will not appear as votes for approval. They would only appear as information.

While the government contingency fund authorizes upfront spending, it restricts the government's ability to make use of the fund without coming to Parliament for a formal, even if retroactive, approval. This approval requirement is an important difference between vote 5 and vote 40. The fact that a valid and compelling reason must exist as to why the government has to make a payment before the next supply period may have been in a quote that I did not read for the benefit of time, but I would refer my colleagues back to those Treasury Board guidelines.

It is part and parcel of why this House pre-approves a certain sum of money under vote 5. That sense of urgency is a critical justification for Parliament approving funding for programs that have not yet been developed. One cannot develop programs for needs that are unforeseen, and if there is a demonstrable urgency to respond to an unforeseen circumstance, then the flexibility to develop and fund a program on an urgent basis is needed. It is important to note that this is completely dissimilar to what is being proposed in vote 40.

Points of Order

Vote 40 is a pre-approval of funding for all of the government's new budget initiatives. The government can hardly claim that the entirety of their new budget initiatives are a collection of miscellany that have no place within the normal supply process, nor can the government claim that the needs it proposes to address with its new budget initiatives are unforeseen. The budget document is a forecasting document that proposes policies to deal with problems we know of.

• (1345)

That is not to say that the latest budget deals with all of the important problems that we are aware of, but by definition it does not deal with unforeseen problems. If the problems were unforeseen, they would not be in the budget. If they are in the budget, then they were foreseen.

Moreover, the government cannot claim any sense of exceptional urgency for these items. These items are to be implemented over the course of the fiscal year. The government is not pretending any differently. It has been very open about the fact that most of the programs it is requesting funding for under vote 40 are not ready to go. There are a number of examples from committee that I will not share at the moment. I shared some last Friday. I would refer you to those, and would be happy to provide other examples should you wish, Mr. Speaker.

The President of the Treasury Board and his officials have been very clear that most of these programs are not ready to go. In fact, to date, only \$220 million worth has actually been approved, and there is no sign that departments are expected to develop these programs with a sense of urgency.

Vote 5 offers an exception to the normal supply process for clearly defined reasons, according to clearly defined criteria. Vote 40 items do not meet these criteria, yet the government is trying to use a similar mechanism to circumvent the normal supply process.

There is one last precedent that might be invoked. I think it is important to discuss it up front. Here I refer to Treasury Board vote 35 from 2009 in the 40th Parliament. I could read the wording of the vote, but I will dispense with that in the interests of time. I would let you know, though, Mr. Speaker, that vote 35 has at least two properties that make it very different from vote 40 in 2018-19. These two things are related but distinct. In the first place, vote 35 of the 40th Parliament was a time-limited vote. The money had to be spent between April 1, 2009 and June 30, 2009. In other words, it was not meant to become and could not by inertia become a new way of appropriating funds for all of the new budget initiatives in a given year.

Second, the government had the support of the official opposition Liberals of the day for vote 35. This support was not given for the vote to become a new way of appropriating funds for new budget initiatives. Rather, that support came in the context of consensus among all parties that urgent action was needed to address the fallout of the 2008 economic crisis.

I would refer you to a few examples from *Debates*, Mr. Speaker, that show the importance of that criterion. The then president of the Treasury Board, the Hon. Vic Toews, said in debate with respect to vote 35 on March 24, 2009:

The plan is timely, it is targeted, and it is temporary.... Doing the right thing means responding to an unprecedented economic situation with extraordinary measures.... These are extraordinary times and we cannot wait for the normal supply period in June before giving money to some of the ready-to-go projects.

The Hon. John McCallum, speaking for the Liberals in the same debate, said:

The government has asked, through the estimates, to have this special \$3 billion fund under the so-called Treasury Board vote 35. These funds would be spendable over the period April to June of this year. Liberals do not have any objection to that in principle because we acknowledge the urgency of getting money out the door.

A second Liberal MP, Shawn Murphy, said:

Because of the urgency of the matter, the government wants approval from Parliament to spend the money. Parliament has considered this. It has debated it and it has said it is a reasonable request. We will bypass the ordinary chain of accountability and allow the government to spend the \$3 billion. Because of the time in which the Canadian public wants the money spent, there should be no delay.

Vote 35 was clearly conceived as an extraordinary tool to deal with an economic crisis in an urgent fashion, within a specific and clearly defined period of time. Using a similar mechanism as a routine way of appropriating funds for all new budget initiatives is in no way justified by the precedent of vote 35.

To conclude, I do not believe that the budget implementation vote is consistent with the legal mandate of the Treasury Board, nor consistent with the practices and procedures of this House with respect to supply. If Parliament's right to meaningfully oversee and authorize public expenditures is to be maintained, mechanisms such as these must not be allowed to take root. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I request that you order vote 40 struck from the main estimates.

• (1350)

The Speaker: I thank the hon. member for Elmwood—Transcona for raising his point of order and for his efforts to remain reasonably concise. I will return to the House in due course with a decision.

* * *

[*Translation*]

FEDERAL SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT ACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-57, An Act to amend the Federal Sustainable Development Act, as reported (with amendment) from the committee, and of the motion in Group No. 1.

Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault (Sherbrooke, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Pierrefonds—Dollard for his remarks earlier on Bill C-57.

This morning's announcement casts a pall over this bill to strengthen sustainable development laws. The government announced that it is prepared to spend \$4.7 billion to help a Texas company transport Alberta oil west to Asian markets.

Statements by Members

The government, the Prime Minister, and the Minister of Finance are ready to write a cheque for at least \$4.5 billion to transport Alberta crude oil west to Asian markets. That oil will make its way to refineries in those markets by oil tanker.

My question for my colleague is a simple one. How can he justify talking about sustainable development today when his government is doing the opposite?

Mr. Frank Baylis (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question. I am indeed very happy to talk about sustainable development because I believe it is a fundamental part of Canada's economy. We are a nation that develops and sells its resources, and doing so sustainably is, in my opinion, great news for all Canadians. I am very proud of this bill, and I support it 100%.

[*English*]

Mr. Earl Dreessen (Red Deer—Mountain View, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the member. Earlier today we talked about how Kinder Morgan in 2007 had a \$550 million investment. Of course, 10 years later we are looking at multiple times that. They are happy, as their shareholders perhaps would be, if they look at the investment.

Then we also have to look at the options they have for the money they have made. Perhaps one good place would have been energy east, which would have allowed a pipeline to be built to eastern Canada, but instead maybe they will go to other places around the world where it is easier to build pipelines. Maybe they will be building some to the other coast, so we can import oil from other countries, as we continue to do.

I am curious whether or not the member is looking at sustainability from the point of view of investments in Canadian oil and gas industries.

Mr. Frank Baylis: Mr. Speaker, sustainability in all of our natural resources, including oil and gas, is critical.

As I said in my previous answer, natural resources is an important sector of the Canadian economy. Anything the federal government can do to support that industry and to do it in a durable and sustainable manner, I fully support. The fact that we do it in a more transparent manner is also something to be celebrated.

The ensemble of all of those things in support of our natural resources is good news for Canadians.

• (1355)

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I just want to get back to where we are right now with this particular piece of legislation.

We are talking about an amendment brought forward by the Conservative member for Abbotsford. However, the interesting thing is that he was the member of the committee who put forward the motion that he is now trying to remove with this amendment.

In good faith, while I was on the environment committee, we had the opportunity to discuss his amendment. We then voted on it and adopted it. Now, with the bill as amended before the House, the member for Abbotsford has put forward an amendment to essentially delete this section of the bill.

I hate to be overly cynical about this, but what is the member's motive behind this? I am curious about what my colleague might suggest is the reason for even embarking upon this.

Mr. Frank Baylis: Mr. Speaker, it is a bit of a funny situation when one party puts forward something, the government agrees with it, and then suddenly they have an about face to change it and go against what was put forward.

The only thing I can think is that it is about politics. That said, let them play politics. The important thing is that this bill is going to bring good, sustainable development to our Canadian resources. That is the important thing. Whatever politics happen, that is okay. The government is moving forward in the right way.

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): Resuming debate. The hon. member for Mégantic—L'Érable has about a minute and a half left before question period. He can continue his speech after question period.

The hon. member for Mégantic—L'Érable.

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will make the most of this opportunity. I was going to talk about something, but I will come back to it right after question period.

The recent exchange I just witnessed between my Liberal colleagues leads me to speak about another aspect of the issue before us today, namely the hypocrisy on this side that they claim to condemn.

I want to remind the House of something. Very recently, in his commencement speech before New York University grads at the iconic Yankee Stadium, the Prime Minister of Canada asked 10,000 young men and women to respect people who look or think differently and engage with people with whom they may not agree. What does this government do instead? It imposes a time allocation motion on an issue as important as Bill C-57. He says one thing on the world stage and does the opposite here in Ottawa. After that, the Liberals have the nerve to lecture us, to tell us what to do, what to say, what not to say, because that would be playing partisan politics.

In closing, before question period, the only partisan politics here are happening on the other side of the House.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The hon. member will have nine minutes to finish his speech when we resume debate on Bill C-57.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*Translation*]

THE ENVIRONMENT AND TRANS MOUNTAIN

Ms. Monique Pausé (Repentigny, GPQ): Mr. Speaker, from now on, as climate change worsens, we can tell ourselves that we played a small part in that. We will have a \$4.5-billion interest in Trans Mountain, which is going to ship the dirtiest oil in the world without our consent.

Statements by Members

Ottawa cannot afford to maintain appropriate health transfers for Quebec patients who need them. Ottawa cannot afford transfers for post-secondary education. Ottawa cannot afford to improve an employment insurance system that negatively impacts the unemployed. However, it can afford to pay for a pipeline that costs billions of dollars. It just takes out its cheque book and, presto.

What is the next step? Will the government be talking to TransCanada and take over energy east?

Pipelines that are forced on the people and that harm the environment are not in the national interest. It is about time that the government understands that getting rid of dirty energy is in the national interest.

* * *

[English]

ORDER OF CANADA RECIPIENT

Mr. Bill Blair (Scarborough Southwest, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to rise today to acknowledge the extraordinary work of a remarkable woman in my city, a person who, driven by a profound commitment to social justice, has worked tirelessly on behalf of vulnerable children. On the front lines, Lynn Factor has had a distinguished career in child welfare, serving as a social worker, supervisor, manager, and philanthropist. She has also demonstrated an unflagging commitment to social justice, serving as the chair of the Children's Aid Foundation of Canada and on the board of Covenant House, a shelter for homeless youth, as well as many other service organizations, boards, and foundations.

Most recently, Lynn and her husband, Sheldon Inwentash, were leaders in establishing the Boost Child & Youth Advocacy Centre in Toronto, which has brought together a remarkable collaboration of all of the professionals involved in child abuse cases for a seamless interdisciplinary response to child abuse victims in Toronto. It could not have happened without her leadership and support.

For her extraordinary service and generosity, Lynn has been named to the Order of Canada, an honour for which we offer our most sincere congratulations and heartfelt thanks.

* * *

● (1400)

COMMUNITY SERVICE

Hon. Alice Wong (Richmond Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this Thursday I will have the great privilege of welcoming S.U.C.C.E.S. S. to Parliament Hill. Over time, this Vancouver-based organization has evolved from focusing on enriching new Chinese immigrants with the skills and tools they need to make Canada their home to a multi-city, multi-service, and multicultural agency. Its services range from the personal development of youth to the social engagement of seniors. It also provides excellent care in the several seniors homes it has built.

I invite all parliamentarians to come and check out S.U.C.C.E.S. S. on the Hill this Thursday at 11:45 a.m. in the Banking room to congratulate it for its 45 years of service to British Columbians.

I thank S.U.C.C.E.S.S.

HEALTH

Mr. Nathaniel Erskine-Smith (Beaches—East York, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Helena Kirk was diagnosed with cancer when she was three. Now 12 years old, and after 841 hours of chemotherapy, she is a cancer survivor who continues to fight. Helena has spearheaded a proposal to improve outcomes for young Canadians with cancer, supported by dozens of organizations and leading pediatric oncologists and researchers. The proposal calls for funding for equitable access to early-phase cancer clinical trials, as some promising trials are not available across our country, and provincial health insurance coverage is often denied for out-of-province treatments. It also calls for a working group to address health system issues, including support for pediatric oncology research.

I am thankful that our Minister of Health has met with Helena and is taking steps to investigate her proposal.

I ask all of my colleagues to join me in recognizing Helena's passion and perseverance and to heed her words when she says, "I want Canadian children to have fair access to trials and treatments, no matter where they live in Canada or how much money their families have."

* * *

[Translation]

EDDY LEFRANÇOIS

Mrs. Carol Hughes (Algoma—Manitoulin—Kapusking, NDP): Mr. Speaker, June is ALS Awareness Month. Eddy Lefrançois, from Dubreuilville, works hard to raise awareness about this illness, and has an extraordinary story to tell. When he was diagnosed in 1992, Eddy was told that he had three to five years to live. Since then, he has never stopped fighting.

[English]

Instead, he pursued a bucket list that most able-bodied people might find daunting. Eddy has travelled overseas, participated in indoor skydiving, and even hunted white-tailed deer. He maintains his own website and is a tireless advocate for others with ALS and for research. Eddy works to bring about greater public awareness and dreams of a day when ALS is treatable, not terminal. Last June, Eddy raised over \$43,000 in Sault Ste. Marie's annual ALS walk. This Saturday, Eddy and his team will be participating in the walk again.

I invite members to join me in thanking everyone taking part in ALS walks, and in congratulating Eddy for his tireless advocacy and indomitable spirit 25 years after being diagnosed.

With Eddy I say, "Let's roll."

Statements by Members

[Translation]

LAURENTIDES—LABELLE

Mr. David de Burgh Graham (Laurentides—Labelle, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last week, I was pleased to make an announcement that will greatly benefit young people in my region.

Through the “Le réemploi sous toutes ses formes, on en fait notre affaire” project developed by Inter Action Travail, an organization based in Sainte-Agathe-des-Monts, 16 young people will have the opportunity to acquire the skills and knowledge they need to better integrate into the labour market.

For 22 months, these youth will work at La Recyclerie and will help to preserve our environment by giving construction materials and other used objects a second life.

I am privileged to be part of a government that cares about young people, encourages people to integrate into the labour market, and is aware of rural realities in areas all across Canada, such as Laurentides—Labelle.

I am extremely proud to have announced a federal partnership of \$365,000 under the skills link program to support Inter Action Travail's wonderful project.

* * *

[English]

IMMIGRATION

Mr. Jim Eglinski (Yellowhead, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the government must make a stronger effort in bringing Widlene Alexis Earl home to Canada so she can be with her adoptive parents, grandparents, and friends. One of my constituents, residing in my riding of Yellowhead, is the grandmother of Widlene. Her adoptive parents are presently trying to legally bring her to Canada. She is a young lady without a country.

In my riding also, Niton School's grade 1 class has a new program. It is called “A Hug for the World”. The students are encouraging all Canadians to give each other a hug on May 31.

Canada can show the world that it is a welcoming country. Let us bring Widlene from the Dominican Republic home to Canada so she can be hugged by those who care. If a small grade 1 class in rural Alberta can lead the way, so can Canada.

Mr. Speaker, on May 31, be prepared for a hug.

* * *

● (1405)

RETIREMENT CONGRATULATIONS

Mr. Marwan Tabbara (Kitchener South—Hespeler, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, one minute is too short to adequately honour Ken Seiling, husband to Kathryn, father of five, grandfather of nine, hockey coach, organist, choir master, teacher, museum director.

Ken has announced his intention to retire after 42 years of public service, two years as a councillor, seven years as mayor and regional councillor, and 33 years as regional chair in Waterloo region.

During his time, our population has nearly doubled as Waterloo region has become one of Canada's economic engines. He has spearheaded policies to protect farm land and green spaces; protect groundwater resources; encourage urban intensification; build a regional transportation system, which includes light rail transit; and maintain strong public health services.

I thank Ken Seiling for his dedication, passion, and enduring stewardship of our region. We could not have asked for a better chair to represent Waterloo Region.

* * *

[Translation]

DUHAMEL FAMILY RESTAURANT

Mr. Pierre Breton (Shefford, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to pay tribute to the Duhamel family from Granby, who have owned Rôtisseries Duhamel since 1958.

This family business was created 60 years ago, when poultry farmers Bernard and Jacqueline Duhamel decided to open their first delivery service from their home on Dufferin Street.

In 1992, their sons, Alain and Claude officially took over the business. The next generation is also very involved, since the founders' grandchildren Jérémie, David, Roxane, Cédrik, Andrée-Anne, and Benjamin all joined the management team in 2008.

I would like to sincerely congratulate the Duhamel family and its 155 employees who make an outstanding contribution to the riding of Shefford's economy. They deserve our full recognition. Well done.

* * *

[English]

LONG SERVICE AWARDS

Mr. Larry Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in order for all of us to carry out our work as MPs, it is vital to have the support of our spouses and families, but it does not end there. It takes good staff. Today I want to recognize two of my staff who are being presented with long service awards later today.

Dianne Ackert started in my constituency office in Owen Sound in August 2007 as my executive assistant, and is my longest-serving employee. Chad Richards, who is from Chesley, started as my legislative assistant in Ottawa in April 2012. Dianne and Chad will receive their 10-year and five-year pins today.

We are all in the service industry, just like a motel or restaurant, and without staff like Dianne and Chad, our constituents would not get the service they expect and deserve.

For Diane and Chad, from Darlene and I, their colleagues Pam, Kara, Genielle and Shea, we are thankful for their years of loyal service, and congratulations on a job well done.

*Statements by Members***CAMBRIDGE YOUTH COUNCIL**

Mr. Bryan May (Cambridge, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment to highlight the great work being done by my constituency youth council. For the past eight months, the youth council has been engaging with its community, pursuing the issues that matter to it.

Youth councils shows us that when young Canadians are engaged and given the tools to succeed, they will find ways to contribute to the debates we have every day.

On June 2, my Cambridge youth council is hosting a comprehensive panel discussion in my community on harassment and mental health. It is working to educate others and create change in our community and make their voices heard on this critical issue.

I am so grateful to have such an excellent group of young people involved in my riding. I would encourage all of my colleagues to initiate a youth council of their own.

Listening to youth voices and hearing their ideas are part of our jobs as representatives. I am committed to making them a part of my work as the member of Parliament for Cambridge and North Dumfries.

* * *

• (1410)

INSURANCE BROKERS ASSOCIATION OF CANADA

Mrs. Alexandra Mendès (Brossard—Saint-Lambert, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today, we welcome over 60 members from the Insurance Brokers Association of Canada. They are visiting Parliament Hill from communities across Canada.

IBAC is the national voice of over 38,000 property and casualty insurance brokers across the country and a strong advocate for insurance consumers.

[*Translation*]

As owners of small businesses in practically every town and village in Canada, insurance brokers create jobs and support the local economy. They are also community leaders who make a difference in the communities where they live and work.

[*English*]

Brokers are in Ottawa today to discuss various issues, including the Bank Act, as well as the important role of insurance brokers in raising public awareness of natural disasters.

[*Translation*]

We have a great appreciation for their expertise and how they protect insurance interests and consumers, as well as for their contribution to Canada's public policy.

[*English*]

I want to thank them for providing Canadians with good and sound advice for so many years.

* * *

STRATFORD FESTIVAL

Mr. John Nater (Perth—Wellington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, last night should have been opening night of the 66th season of the

Stratford Festival. Instead of watching the famed Martha Henry take the stage as Prospero in *The Tempest*, we were evacuated from the theatre and the performance was cancelled due to a bomb threat.

This cowardly threat of violence may have delayed opening night, but it does not deter the will of this great cultural institution. The show will go on and Canadians will not live in fear or be intimidated by such threats.

I would like to thank the Stratford police, the Stratford fire department, and festival staff for their quick action and professionalism.

As we move forward, let the image of last night be that of Martha Henry emerging from the festival theatre defiantly with Prospero's staff still firmly clutched in her hand.

We will return to the theatre, not with fear but with hope that the theatre and the arts will continue to inspire and show us what dreams may come.

* * *

CHINESE CULTURAL CENTRE OF GREATER TORONTO

Mr. Shaun Chen (Scarborough North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in May, we celebrate Asian Heritage Month, a time to recognize the contributions and accomplishments of Canadians of Asian descent.

This year also marks not only the 30th anniversary of the Canadian Multiculturalism Act, but as well the 30th anniversary of the Chinese Cultural Centre of Greater Toronto in my riding of Scarborough North.

Over the past three decades, the CCC has developed into a multicultural hub, hosting a wide range of events, tournaments, and educational programs. It continues to serve as a venue for all Canadians to gather and learn about the diverse cultures, lived experiences, struggles, and successes of Canada's Chinese community.

Organizations like the CCC help to enrich Canada's diverse social fabric, promoting intercultural learning that leads to a more inclusive society.

I congratulate CCC's founding chair Dr. Ming-Tat Cheung, chair Dr. Adrian Cheung, governors, advisers, directors, staff, and volunteers on achieving 30 wonderful years. I wish them many more decades of success ahead.

Xiè xie. Do jeh.

* * *

[*Translation*]**SPECIAL RECOGNITION**

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Outremont, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank you for renewing a fine tradition in the House of Commons and giving us the opportunity to recognize those who, year after year, uphold the most noble mission of public service.

Four of my closest associates are here. They have close to 50 years combined of loyal service to my constituents.

Chantale Turgeon and I have worked together since early 2003. She played a vital role in the tour through Quebec that resulted in the Sustainable Development Act. She was attuned to the modern Quebec and made it possible for us to believe that the NDP could make a breakthrough in Quebec, and she was a key architect of the orange wave.

Graham Carpenter has also been at my side since my days as the Quebec environment minister.

[English]

Graham, "*jambon gris*" pour les intimes, is a tireless worker whose constant outreach to the myriad cultural, ethnic, and linguistic communities of Outremont has allowed the NDP to win the riding four times.

• (1415)

[Translation]

Mathilde Rogue is an exceptional woman who has been with me since the 2007 election thanks to the Quebec-France study vacation program. She has shown passion, conviction, and tireless dedication, especially in her work with arts groups and non-profits in the riding.

Miriam Taylor, the little newcomer, has been with us since the 2011 election. Her dedication to families caught in the bureaucracy of the immigration system is inspiring and she has put her heart and soul into helping them.

Constituents are fortunate to have had them as their champions and I am pleased and proud to profess my friendship and appreciation.

* * *

[English]

JUSTICE

Mr. David Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Conservatives in Canada believe that the number one priority of any government should be the safety of Canadians. The criminal justice system must strengthen these provisions, not weaken them.

In 2017, the Liberal government introduced Bill C-51. Ostensibly, it was intended to eliminate unnecessary and unconstitutional clauses in the Criminal Code, but buried in it were a number of additional Criminal Code provisions the Liberals decided to remove, including long-standing protections for clergy and places of worship. There was no logical reason why these were included, particularly at a time when incidents of religious intolerance are increasing. The government only backed down and removed these proposals after Canadians spoke up and said this was completely unacceptable.

However, they are back. Bill C-75 would reduce penalties for a whole range of serious crimes, including membership in a terrorist organization and political corruption, but it also would reduce sentences for obstruction and violence toward clergy.

Why is it that the Liberal government always puts terrorists and criminals ahead of victims?

Oral Questions

STUDENT SUMMER EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Randeep Sarai (Surrey Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, summer is my favourite season because I get to visit 67 Canada summer jobs employers, most of them non-profits and community groups that will hire over 200 youth to expand social media platforms, create neighbourhood reports, administer youth camps, foster the arts scene, plant trees, and help those in need.

This will include arts groups such as The Royal Canadian Theatre Company and The Flamingo, business groups like the Downtown Surrey Business Improvement Association, NGOs like the Surrey Urban Mission Society, the Lookout Housing and Health Society, and the Green Timbers Heritage Society.

It will also help church groups such as the Calvary Worship Centre, Green Timbers Covenant Church, and the Mennonite Central Committee hire counsellors for their summer programs. Students will get valuable work experience at places like Wedler Engineering, Allondale Animal Hospital, the Satya Paul boutique, and Sharons Credit Union.

Overall, this is a win-win-win situation. Students get jobs, work experience, and skills, employers get support, and our communities prosper and thrive.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[English]

NATURAL RESOURCES

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this is an extremely sad day for Canadian taxpayers. The Prime Minister is forcing them to fix his failure on Canada's energy sector. It did not have to be this way. Kinder Morgan was never asking for a handout. All it wanted was a clear path to get this project built, which is what the Prime Minister has failed to do. Now taxpayers are on the hook for the Liberals' mess.

Could the Prime Minister give a guarantee that these costs will exceed no more than \$4.5 billion?

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the sheer audacity of the member opposite—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order. Members know we have to be careful not to do indirectly what we cannot do directly, so I would avoid using a word that equates to a name at the same time. We cannot use the name of a member, so I would ask the Minister of Finance to try to avoid that.

Oral Questions

Hon. Bill Morneau: Mr. Speaker, I note the audacity of the member opposite in talking about not getting a pipeline to market, which is what he and his party were unable to do. We have stepped forward and said that we are going to take the decision to put a project in the national interest forward so that we can create the economic advantage we are seeking. The economic advantage for Canada is \$15 billion of advantage to our economy, and 15,000 jobs. We are moving forward in the national interest, for Canadians.

• (1420)

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, before the 2015 election, pipelines in this country were built without taxpayers' money. They were applied for, they were approved, and they were completed without a cent of taxpayers' dollars. The only thing that has changed between then and now is that we have a Liberal government.

Why is it that every time elements of our energy sector get nationalized is when there is a Trudeau in the Prime Minister's Office?

The Speaker: You are not making it easy for me. The same point applies. Members should avoid referring to someone who is currently a member by name. I can certainly interpret it that way.

The hon. Minister of Finance.

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let us evaluate what the member opposite just said. In the decade before 2015, not one pipeline to tidewater was built. We know this is a fact. We know the project is going to ensure that we create an advantage for Canadians, an economic advantage that goes along with our overall plan to ensure that the environment and the economy go hand in hand. This is in our national interest. It is creating jobs in Alberta, British Columbia, and across our country.

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, let us talk about where the advantage on this deal is going. The Prime Minister is now cutting a cheque of taxpayers' money, \$4.5 billion, which is going to shareholders in a Texas-based company. This is in addition to the hundreds of billions of dollars that have already left Canada's energy sector.

The Prime Minister claims he wants to attract investment into Canada. How much of the \$4.5 billion that is being sent to Kinder Morgan will be spent and invested in Canada?

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with no business experience, I understand the member opposite might not understand what we are talking about. We are talking about a \$4.5-billion investment in the assets of Kinder Morgan, creating long-term value for our country. We know that is the right thing to do for our country.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Calgary Signal Hill will please come to order.

Members will note that it is possible, without breaking the strict rules, to say things that cause disorder. I would ask members to be cautious in what they say, in order to try to avoid creating disorder.

The hon. Minister of Finance has the floor.

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are making an investment in Canada's future. We know that investing a fair amount of money into the assets of the Trans Mountain pipeline and the expansion will create economic advantage for our country. We are creating 9,000 jobs in British Columbia and jobs across the country that are going to make a real difference for Canadian families. At the same time, we are adding up to \$15 billion to our economy annually. We know this is important for our country.

[Translation]

Mr. Alain Rayes (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is not the Liberals, but rather private companies, that create jobs.

They left the Trans Mountain project to languish for months, and now they announce that they are buying the pipeline using taxpayers' money. What is even worse is that Kinder Morgan never asked for money and never asked to be purchased. The Prime Minister has failed again.

My question for the minister is simple. How much is this folly going to cost Canadian taxpayers?

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we know that the Trans Mountain project is very important to the Canadian economy. It is in the national interest. That is why we invested in the project, which will create 15,000 jobs in Alberta and British Columbia. It will also improve our national economy.

• (1425)

Mr. Alain Rayes (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Mr. Speaker, considering how the government and the Minister of Finance are managing public finances, we have good reason to be worried about mounting deficits year after year.

Now the Liberals have decided to pretend that they know how to build a pipeline using taxpayers' money. It is completely unacceptable. This is just one more failure on the part of this government, the Prime Minister, and the Minister of Finance, now that he is in on it.

My question, then, is simple. How much is this spending spree going to cost Canadian taxpayers?

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we decided it was very important to invest in the Trans Mountain project. We know that with a \$4.5-billion investment, we can protect its value and add value for Canadians. This project is in the national interest, and there is no doubt that our investment will help grow the Canadian economy.

Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the government is going to spend \$4.5 billion of taxpayers' money to nationalize a pipeline, \$4.5 billion of public money to assume all the risk. This from a government that promised to get rid of subsidies for the oil and gas industry.

Why are the Liberals insisting on investing so much in fossil fuels and so little in renewable energy?

Oral Questions

[English]

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we want to be very clear. We found a fair price for the assets of Trans Mountain. At the same time, we have ensured that there is no subsidy in this deal.

We are trying to ensure that we can move forward in an economically prudent way to protect jobs and create economic advantages for our country. We know this is in our best interest. We are going to continue to work to ensure that our natural resources can be brought to international markets.

[Translation]

Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP): Mr. Speaker, what is clear in the minister's response is that we are the ones talking about energy and the environment and they are the ones abandoning the environment for the economy.

The government is going to invest \$4.5 billion in a pipeline. In comparison, in 2016, only \$3 billion of public and private money was invested in clean energy. Countries that take the impact of climate change seriously do not build themselves pipelines. Reconciling the environment and energy means investing in clean energy.

Why are the Liberals bent on investing in fossil fuels?

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are staying the course and investing in our future. We know that the environment and the economy go hand in hand. It is very important. We have invested in clean energy, but in the meantime we know that it is necessary to invest in this project to protect the benefits that it offers our economy in the future.

[English]

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Mr. Speaker, does anyone want to buy a 65-year-old leaky pipeline? No? Wait, it is located next to schools and parks, and literally crosses hundreds of rivers.

The Liberals do, and they somehow decided that paying \$4.5 billion to buy an old pipeline, and not telling us how much it is going to cost to build some illusory new pipeline, is somehow a good "investment".

When did the Liberals decide that trampling over the rights of indigenous peoples and putting our coasts further at risk was somehow in the public interest?

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we approved this pipeline federally back in November 2016 after a robust environmental assessment. The B.C. government approved this pipeline. We know that to get investments made in this country we need to have the rule of law. We cannot have a situation where provinces delay, create uncertainty, and make it so that investors do not actually want to invest in our country. We are moving forward to ensure this project moves forward. We know that eventually it can move to the private sector, which is what we will aspire to do following this decision today.

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it would be \$3.2 billion to provide safe drinking water for every kid living on reserve in this country; it is \$4.5 billion to buy a 65-year-old pipeline. We have to ask ourselves what kind of

priorities the Liberals actually have. When a Texas oil company shows up and needs a bailout, the Liberals cannot find a shovel big enough to pitch in. It will not stop first nations in court and it will not stop people in the street. When exactly did the Liberals decide to trump first nations' rights and title, and protecting our coast, all in favour of some Texas oil company they want to help out?

● (1430)

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can only repeat that we think it is critically important that we ensure that a project that has been federally and provincially approved can move forward. We have decided to purchase these assets because we know this is the way to ensure that this project actually happens and that we deal with the squabbles between provinces. We will move forward, reducing the risk of this project so we can ensure that the economic advantages we are seeking are achieved for Canadians.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today the Liberals bought Kinder Morgan out of Canada. It is a loss of nearly \$8 billion that will be invested in other countries, and \$4.5 billion is just the beginning of the costs to taxpayers. For a year and a half, the Liberals failed to assert federal jurisdiction and to enforce the rule of law. Today, the Liberals are forcing Canadians to pay for their failures. Trans Mountain's opponents will keep fighting to stop it and to kill pipelines in Canada. It is a catastrophic indictment on the Prime Minister. When will he finally admit that today's announcement is really Kinder Morgan divesting from Canada, and Canadians paying for it?

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what today's announcement is about is our decision to step forward and ensure that we can actually get a project in the national interest done in this country. We know that the previous government was just unable to do that. Therefore, we have stepped forward with an approach that would ensure that this happens, by de-risking the project.

It is in the national interest. We know it will create 15,000 jobs. We know it will create significant advantage for our economy. That is why we are moving forward to make sure that this project happens.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the reality is that more than \$100 billion in energy investment has left and hundreds of thousands of Canadians have lost their jobs under the Liberals. Meanwhile, oil and gas are thriving around the world, especially in the U.S., Canada's biggest competitor. The Prime Minister is destroying future private sector energy opportunities, driving investment out of Canada into other countries, and sacrificing Canada's best interests. Now that the Liberals have chased away yet another private sector energy investor, how can Canadians possibly trust them to rebuild confidence in Canada?

Oral Questions

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member opposite is entitled to her opinions, but not to her own facts. The facts are that we have created 600,000 jobs in the last couple of years in this country. Canadians are doing significantly better because of the policies of this government. We know that we now need to move forward on a project that is advantageous for the country, but also for Alberta and British Columbia. In standing up for this project, we are ensuring that we will get a fair price for our resources, and we are doing it in a way that is respecting our approach to ensuring the environment is protected while we get proper prices for our resources.

Mr. Matt Jeneroux (Edmonton Riverbend, CPC): Mr. Speaker, not long ago, Kinder Morgan, a private company, was a proud owner of a pipeline with plans to expand. Today, Kinder Morgan is divesting its Canadian assets to the taxpayer for \$4.5 billion. The Liberals have screwed up this deal so badly that the only solution is to throw billions of taxpayer dollars at the project, and they still have not told us what it will actually cost to build the expansion. Will the finance minister tell Canadians the total cost of this Liberal failure?

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, not that long ago, about two and a half years ago, this country had a government that was unable to get things done. We have shown with our government that when we find obstacles, when we find issues around provincial jurisdiction, the federal government is willing to step forward in the national interest to make things happen. We have decided that a \$4.5-billion investment, a fair value for these assets, is the right approach for us to make sure this happens. We will work toward looking for a private sector solution as we de-risk the project.

Hon. Michelle Rempel (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, two and a half years ago, this country saw pipelines being built without a cent of taxpayer dollars going into a socialized, nationalized energy program. Kinder Morgan was prepared to invest billions into the Canadian economy, and that has gone because the Prime Minister politically destabilized the investment climate in Canada. We have no idea how much it is going to cost to build this pipeline, or how it is going to be built by a man who has not successfully managed to do much of anything. Why should Canadians pay for his failures?

• (1435)

The Speaker: Order. I would ask the hon. member for Don Valley East and others not to be speaking up when someone else has the floor.

The hon. Minister of Finance.

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we need to call it fiction when fiction happens. This is what did not happen under the last government: There were no pipelines bringing resources to international markets. The reality is that we accept a lower price for our natural resources in this country—

The Speaker: Order. Apparently, there is a problem with the interpretation. Is the interpretation now working?

It is now working. I am going to have to ask the hon. minister to restart.

Hon. Bill Morneau: Mr. Speaker, I was talking about a fictional story from the opposite side of the House. The Conservatives' fictional story is that they got pipelines done. The reality is that there

was not one pipeline to international markets. We know this to be true. The reason for the discount on Canadian resources is lack of access to international markets. That is why the Trans Mountain expansion is so important. It is why we are moving forward to invest in those assets. It is why we are de-risking the project, to make sure it gets done for Canadians.

Mr. Mark Strahl (Chilliwack—Hope, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals cancelled the northern gateway pipeline. They dithered on the Keystone XL pipeline. They killed the energy east pipeline. They have talked down our world-class energy regulator and have told audiences, both foreign and domestic, that they want to phase out the energy sector and the jobs that go with it. They botched the Trans Mountain project so badly that they have turned a multi-billion dollar private sector investment into a multi-billion dollar bill for Canadian taxpayers. Why should Canadians be forced to pay billions to Kinder Morgan to cover for the Prime Minister's embarrassing incompetence?

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are buying assets, assets that have value. These assets, of course, will enable us to ensure that we get this pipeline expansion built. We know this is important for Canadians. We know it is important for Canadians from the member's part of the country, because we are going to create jobs. We are also going to create economic wealth for our entire country.

When we are working in the national interest, we are going to move forward with an approach that absolutely deals with uncertainties so we can get this back into the private sector.

Mr. Mark Strahl (Chilliwack—Hope, CPC): Mr. Speaker, they are not buying assets. They are nationalizing a private pipeline. Yesterday, there were protesters willing to stop this project. Yesterday, the B.C. government was in court fighting against this pipeline. Yesterday, there were Liberal MPs from B.C. opposed to this project. Today, nothing has changed, except taxpayers are \$4.5 billion poorer. Will nationalizing the pipeline actually get Liberal members of Parliament from B.C. to back it?

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let us evaluate where we are today. For months, the members opposite were complaining that the Trans Mountain pipeline expansion was not happening. Today, we announced we are moving forward to ensure the expansion of the Trans Mountain pipeline.

What do we have? Are they upset that we are going to be able to get our resources to international markets and create value for Canadians, or are they upset about the fact that we are going to be able to create more jobs for Canadians? It is one of the two, or perhaps both, but it does not matter because our resolve is to get this project done, because it is in Canada's best interest.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

PUBLIC SERVICES AND PROCUREMENT

Ms. Karine Trudel (Jonquière, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Auditor General was clear: the implementation and management of the Phoenix pay system was an incomprehensible failure.

Those responsible chose to operate within their budgets and deadlines instead of implementing a working system.

The warnings were everywhere, but officials ignored them. What happened? Workers are still living with the consequences of this disaster.

When will the government launch a public inquiry to get to the bottom of what really happened?

● (1440)

Hon. Carla Qualtrough (Minister of Public Services and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Auditor General for his report, and we accept his recommendations. Today's report is a reminder for Canadians of the realities of 10 years under the Harper Conservatives. After we asked the Auditor General to examine Phoenix, he published two reports, and the government commissioned two reports from a third party, in addition to a study under way in a parliamentary committee. We know exactly how the Harper Conservatives set the system up for failure.

[English]

Ms. Tracey Ramsey (Essex, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure one can get any clearer than the Auditor General. The report calls the Phoenix fiasco “an incomprehensible failure of project management and oversight.” There was no oversight in the decision to implement Phoenix by the Liberals, even though they knew it had significant problems. Executives were more focused on meeting the budget and the timeline than actually delivering a working pay system.

Following the devastating report, will the government finally compensate all workers and implement a public inquiry to ensure that this never happens again?

Hon. Carla Qualtrough (Minister of Public Services and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Auditor General for his report. We are accepting all of his recommendations.

This is one of the most studied government projects in the history of the Government of Canada. We called in the Auditor General and had two reports performed, third party reports. We know very clearly what happened. The former government treated this as a cost-cutting measure, instead of the government-wide initiative that it so clearly was. The Conservatives set this project up to fail, and now they are paying the consequences publicly. Shame on all of them.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order. I remind members, including the hon. member for Calgary Signal Hill, the hon. member for Abbotsford, and the hon. member for Parry Sound—Muskoka, that the time to speak is when they have the floor.

The hon. member for Louis-Saint-Laurent.

[Translation]

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals' track record on energy matters is nothing short of disastrous. Since they took office, the energy sector has lost 125,000 jobs and over \$60 billion in investment.

What is the Liberal government's miracle solution? Take money from taxpayers and buy a Texas company for \$4.5 billion. That is the Liberal solution.

My question for my friend, the Minister of Finance, is very simple. A fat lot of good Bay Street experience does us. Why is he making such bad decisions?

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, experience is always an advantage. What we can say is that it is very important to consider our experience under the Harper government. The Conservatives did nothing. That is what we know from experience. At this time, we have decided that it is very important to have the courage to invest in a project that is in the national interest. It is clear that we need to invest now so that, in the future, the private sector can participate in a project that will benefit Canadians.

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this is unbelievable. We are talking about \$4.5 billion of taxpayers' money going to a company in Texas. Not even J. R. Ewing would have dreamed of this, and yet that is what the Liberal government is doing.

What is the Liberal government's track record when it comes to investments? Since those folks have been in power, American investment in Canada has dropped by 50%, while Canadian investments in the U.S. have increased by 66%.

Seriously, how can the Minister of Finance claim to be an authority on investments?

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, here are the facts. In 2017, investments in Canada grew by 8%. That is a fact. However, we know that it is very important to have a strong resource sector for the future. That is why we decided to invest in the Trans Mountain project. It is very important for our future and for growing our economy. We are talking about \$15 billion every year. That is what Canadians living in British Columbia, Alberta, and across the country stand to gain.

● (1445)

[English]

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, let us be clear about one thing. This \$4.5 billion handout of taxpayers' money will not build one inch of new pipeline. In fact, every penny will go into the pockets of a Texas oil company, which it will then take to build pipelines outside of Canada in competition with our industry.

How did we go from that company wanting to invest \$7 billion in Canada to sending \$4 billion of taxpayers' money out of this country?

Oral Questions

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are buying the assets of the Kinder Morgan Trans Mountain pipeline that are currently there, and the opportunity to expand that pipeline. These assets create value. We are buying assets that create value. What we are going to do is to create more value by ensuring that the project gets done. These advantages are going to help our natural resources sector. They are also going to help our broader economy and create jobs across the country.

We know it is the right thing to do. We will get this project done.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, what he did was spend over \$4 billion on a pipeline that Canadians have had for over 60 years. We get absolutely nothing new with this, except a lot of financial risk, and \$7 billion that was going to be invested by a private sector company has now vanished into thin air.

I have a very simple question: How much will it cost taxpayers to actually build the expansion, or is this all just a pipe dream?

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, fundamental to what we are doing is actually buying assets that were owned by someone else, so that we can actually make sure this project happens.

Of course, we want to make sure that we get the appropriate value for Canadians, and so there is commercially sensitive information. As we look towards how we might move this project into the private sector, we need to recognize that it is commercially sensitive.

Canadians will have a full understanding and transparency with regard to this project, and what it will do is create advantages for our economy and for jobs across the country.

* * *

CONSUMER PROTECTION

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we now have reports of two of Canada's largest banks saying that hackers have breached the private information of up to 90,000 Canadian consumers. This is just months after the data breaches at Uber, Equifax, and Bell Canada, which affected tens of thousands of Canadians and their private information.

The European Union took action and implemented new data protection last week. What did the Liberal government do? Absolutely nothing. In fact, this government has not even followed through on basic recommendations.

When will the Liberals take action to protect Canadian consumers with a digital bill of rights and stop letting these companies off the hook?

Hon. Navdeep Bains (Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member knows full well that we brought changes to the regulations to update PIPEDA, the Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act. These regulatory changes are very important, because if any private entity, a bank or otherwise, suffers lost or stolen data, they must report it immediately to the individual and to the Privacy Commissioner. Failure to do so will lead to an infraction and a fine of \$100,000 per data breach. That is a significant cost per data breach. It is an important signal that we are sending to protect the privacy of Canadians.

[Translation]

AIR TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Robert Aubin (Trois-Rivières, NDP): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of a real air passengers' bill of rights, a U.S. firm told us that Canadian travellers are being gouged to the tune of \$65 million a year.

We are familiar with the strategy. When the Minister of Transport cannot make a decision, he launches consultations.

Why bother with a consultation when the European charter is leading the way and the minister has already taken a position by rejecting the amendments proposed in the House and in the Senate? Does the minister take travellers for fools?

Hon. Marc Garneau (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, every Canadian knows that buying an airline ticket entitles the purchaser to a certain level of treatment. That is why we are very proud of bringing in air passenger rights.

They were announced in Bill C-49 and we also announced that we were going to consult Canadians. Some 13 million Canadians travel by plane. It is the right thing to do and the Canadian Transportation Agency initiated the process yesterday.

* * *

● (1450)

[English]

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Randy Boissonnault (Edmonton Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians elected our government in part because of our commitment to help strengthen and grow our economy, to help the middle class, and to create well-paying jobs for Canadians.

Can the Minister of Finance share with this House how today's decision to purchase the Trans Mountain pipeline and related assets will help to uphold this commitment?

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order, order.

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is great that we have at least one Alberta member of Parliament who is supporting Albertans.

What I know is that the member for Edmonton Centre and the other members of the Liberal Party support this project, because we recognize that what we are bringing to Albertans are huge advantages, advantages in terms of their economy—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Carleton will come to order. There is far too much noise in the House. Members and I are having trouble hearing the questions and the answers, especially the answers. Members will come to order. Order.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

The hon. member for Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis.

* * *

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Hon. Steven Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC): Mr. Speaker, like her Liberal Prime Minister, the Minister of International Development and La Francophonie is saying that illegal migrants are welcome, but the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship is saying that they are not. Who is telling the truth? What is the government going to do with these illegal migrants?

Meanwhile, businesses in Sainte-Justine, Sainte-Claire, and Saint-Anselme have been waiting a long time for the arrival of legal immigrants.

When will the Liberal government stop the wave of illegal immigration at the border?

Hon. Marc Garneau (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Harper Conservatives a question.

Yesterday, the member for Milton said that 600 people had crossed the border illegally. I would like to know where she got that information, because I do not have the same numbers. It is wrong to tell untruths in the House. I would like to know where she got that number.

Hon. Steven Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is simple. Illegal migrants are coming from all over the world.

The Liberals could have cut the budget, and that is what they did, in fact. The Liberals cut the Canada Border Services Agency's budget by \$302 million. They reduced the number of border guards. They also cut \$30 million from the budget of those responsible for stopping illegal immigration.

If the Liberals are serious about this, when will they deal with this problem and put a stop to this wave of illegal immigration at the border?

Hon. Marc Garneau (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, unlike the Harper Conservatives, who gutted our immigration system, we are investing \$173 million to strengthen security at the Canada-U.S. border—

The Speaker: Order. I have heard the hon. member for Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier a lot today, even when he does not have the floor. I would like him to stop yelling during the answers.

The hon. Minister of Transport.

Hon. Marc Garneau: Mr. Speaker, we are working with the provinces and the United States to plan for potential fluctuations. The task force on irregular migration will hold its 10th meeting tomorrow. While the Conservatives keep fearmongering, we are taking concrete action to manage the situation.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals give us a lot of rhetoric, but the Minister of Agriculture

and Agri-food refuses to promise that there will not be any new concessions on supply management as part of the NAFTA renegotiations with the Americans.

I asked this question a number of times in committee yesterday, and every time he abdicated his position and his role as an advocate for milk, egg, and poultry producers.

I am giving him one more chance to be honest with producers and to be transparent. What part of the market under supply management do the Liberals plan on handing over to the Americans as part of the NAFTA negotiations?

• (1455)

[English]

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government supports and is committed to maintaining supply management. This has been a clear position throughout the NAFTA negotiations. Every member of our government fully supports the Prime Minister and this government's policies.

This position is the opposite of the Conservative Party's, whose innovation critic, appointed by the Leader of the Opposition, is opposed to supply management. He even detailed the reasons why in a book that the Leader of the Opposition would not allow in public.

On this side of the House, we all support supply management.

[Translation]

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, who did the government hire? Who did the Prime Minister hire to advise him on supply management? Simon Beauchemin, a senior adviser who strongly opposes supply management. He has an unwavering vision: he believes that supply management is a regressive means of protecting our producers. Our leader and the official opposition definitely stand with producers and support supply management.

Will the Minister of Agriculture rise and assure us that he will not negotiate away one litre of milk, one egg, or one chicken to the Americans?

Hon. Andrew Leslie (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs (Canada-U.S. Relations), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, to be clear, we will always defend supply management. In fact, with the exception of certain members of the official opposition, including the member for Beauce, everyone in the House believes—

An hon. member: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order. I would ask the hon. member for Mégantic—L'Érable to listen to the answer.

Hon. Andrew Leslie: Mr. Speaker, our position on this issue is very clear: we have always defended this system and we do so at every opportunity, including during the NAFTA negotiations.

Oral Questions

[English]

LABOUR

Mr. Daniel Blaikie (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, CP Rail workers can go on strike legally as soon as tonight, and those workers, like all Canadian workers, have the right to free and fair collective bargaining.

The minister has addressed this issue before in the House, but she has not clearly stated that her government will not use back-to-work legislation to unilaterally end the strike, so I am giving her that opportunity now.

Will the minister commit to those workers today, on the record, that she will not use back-to-work legislation to end the strike?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as of today the parties continue to negotiate at the table in order to get a deal. I have spoken with the employer. I have spoken with both labour unions. They continue to have those conversations. We are there. The federal mediation service is with them. We encourage them to continue to work toward a deal.

* * *

[Translation]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Ms. Ruth Ellen Brousseau (Berthier—Maskinongé, NDP): Mr. Speaker, apparently a close friend and adviser of the Prime Minister once advocated for the elimination of our supply management system. The really bad news is that this adviser is now playing an important role in renegotiating NAFTA on behalf of the Liberal government. That is disturbing—scary, even. I see shades of the Conservative Party.

The government says it wants to defend our supply management system, but it hires people like that who want to eliminate it. That makes no sense. I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture.

Will he swear by all he holds dear that he will defend our supply management system in its entirety?

Hon. Andrew Leslie (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs (Canada-U.S. Relations), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our position on supply management has been and remains clear. We have always defended supply management, and that includes during NAFTA talks. The system works extremely well for Canadians. Protecting supply management is important for Canadian consumers, our industries, and all of us. We will always defend it.

* * *

[English]

JUSTICE

Hon. Rob Nicholson (Niagara Falls, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the government that this week is Victims and Survivors of Crime Week.

I know that the Liberals have made it clear that victims have not been a priority of theirs in the last two and a half years, and of course the latest example is Bill C-75, which would reduce the penalties for many serious crimes, including the abduction of a child under 14

years of age, forced marriage, participation in terrorist groups and criminal organizations, and many others.

Is there any hope that the government can change its philosophy before the next election and start putting victims first? Can it do that?

● (1500)

Hon. Jody Wilson-Raybould (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to stand to speak about Bill C-75, which will address delays and efficiencies in the criminal justice system.

The member opposite spoke about the reclassification provisions in terms of the reforms that were proposed. It is simply untrue that we are changing the sentencing regime. We are hybridizing offences, but providing prosecutors with additional tools.

I would like to ask my friend across the way what he feels about the provisions in terms of intimate partner violence, where we are supporting those victims of sexual assault and domestic violence in this bill. Does he not support that?

Mr. Michael Cooper (St. Albert—Edmonton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, while the Liberals have failed to appoint a victims' ombudsman after six months, when the prisoners' ombudsman position became vacant, they filled it immediately.

When it comes to filling a position to protect the rights of criminals, the Liberals could not move fast enough. However, when it comes to filling a position to protect the rights of victims, the Liberals are AWOL. Why do the Liberals always put the rights of criminals ahead of victims?

Hon. Jody Wilson-Raybould (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, certainly we are taking a broad approach to a review of the criminal justice system, a balanced approach that supports victims of crime, that ensures the offenders are held to account, and that promotes public safety.

We are committed to appointing a new federal ombudsperson for victims of crime. We are presently undertaking a review and identifying a potential candidate. This is a priority for our government. We will move forward at the nearest and closest time with the most appropriate and skilled individual.

[Translation]

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher (Beauport—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île d'Orléans—Charlevoix, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this is national Victims and Survivors of Crime Week. This year's theme is "Transforming the Culture Together".

Let me point out that the ombudsperson for victims of crime position has been vacant for over seven months. The government did, however, fill the correctional investigator position on January 2, so maybe it does not think victims need the help.

Why are the Liberals not giving victims of crime a strong voice by appointing an independent ombudsperson to protect them, as I proposed in my bill?

*Oral Questions**[English]*

Hon. Jody Wilson-Raybould (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I said, our government is committed to ensuring that the criminal justice system provides for safe communities, ensures and respects victims of crime, and holds offenders to account.

Our government is committed to a renewed approach, as we have said, in terms of the appointments process, based on openness, transparency, and merit. The process for the appointment of the new federal ombudsman for victims of crime is presently ongoing and remains a high priority for me. The position will be filled as soon as possible at the conclusion of this process.

* * *

TOURISM INDUSTRY

Ms. Gudie Hutchings (Long Range Mountains, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this week is Tourism Week in Canada. It is a chance to highlight the incredible work and phenomenal success of our tourism industry. From coast to coast to coast, our industry is world class. It has created over 26,000 jobs just since 2015.

Culinary tourism in my province of Newfoundland and Labrador is some of the best in the country, as we have seen from chef Ross Larkin's recent win on *Top Chef Canada*.

Could the Minister of Small Business and Tourism please tell the House what our government is doing to make 2018 the best year for Canadian tourism?

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister of Small Business and Tourism, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last year we launched Canada's new tourism vision. Budget 2017 stabilized Destination Canada's budget at \$95.5 million per year. We announced \$8.6 million to grow Canada's indigenous tourism industry. We are enhancing tourism data collection by providing Statistics Canada \$13.5 million over five years.

The year 2017 was the best ever for the tourism industry, with over 20 million international visitors spending \$21 billion across our great country.

Together with the member for Long Range Mountains, and I hope all members and all Canadians, we will build on this success, because our investments are working.

* * *

LABOUR

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Milton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this question is for the Minister of Labour. We know that a CP Rail strike may be happening this evening. We know as well that VIA Rail has already cancelled passenger service because of the operational uncertainty. We know as well that commuting services in Montreal, Vancouver, and Toronto could be affected.

In the past, an agreement had been sought and adhered to with respect to the provision of these services by the Teamsters and CP Rail. Could the minister tell me if she actually got her job done and secured these agreements so people can get to work tomorrow?

● (1505)

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are not going to take any lessons from the former Harper government on labour relations.

Let me just remind the member opposite what experts had to say about how the previous government handled labour disputes: "highly unusual", "a double-edged sword for employers", "wholesale departure from the roles of collective bargaining", "destabilizing", "abuse of the provisions in the Canada Labour Code", and "they did not understand how the system works."

We support a fair and balanced process. This is what is right for the Canadian economy, for workers, and for employers.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Mr. Speaker, to stop oil spills and protect jobs, the BC Chamber of Commerce on Saturday endorsed the same abandoned vessels solutions that I brought to the House.

Thirty-six thousand businesses joined hundreds of coastal communities that urged the transport minister to include solutions in his fix, like vessel turn in and recycling. Despite years of coastal advocacy, the Liberals' Bill C-64 still does not include coastal solutions to deal with thousands of wrecks off our coast. They have dragged anchor on resuming the debate.

Why is the government leaving abandoned vessels on our coast for another season?

Hon. Marc Garneau (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are extremely proud of Bill C-64, which addresses a long-standing issue that has not been taken care of by previous governments; that is the question of abandoned and derelict vessels. We have come up with an excellent bill. In fact, it has been through the committee in which my colleague had the chance to participate.

We are very proud of this bill and we hope the NDP and the Harper Conservatives will support the bill as we move it through report stage, third reading, and then quickly on to the Senate.

* * *

*[Translation]***HEALTH**

Mr. Yves Robillard (Marc-Aurèle-Fortin, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on March 1, 2018, a tragedy occurred in my riding, Marc-Aurèle-Fortin, when a young woman named Athena Gervais died after drinking a sugary, high-alcohol drink. My question is for the Minister of Health.

Oral Questions

Can she inform the House of the measures Health Canada plans to take to ensure that such a terrible tragedy never happens again?

Hon. Ginette Petitpas Taylor (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Marc-Aurèle-Fortin for his question and for his work on this file.

As he pointed out, even one tragedy is one too many. As soon as I heard about the incident, I immediately issued a proposal for consultation on restricting the amount of alcohol in single-serve, sugary, high-alcohol beverages. The consultation period just ended, and we are looking closely at the recommendations. I want to thank everyone who took part in the consultation as well as the Standing Committee on Health for its hard work on this matter.

* * *

[English]

DEMOCRATIC REFORM

Hon. Peter Kent (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals allowed Canadians to believe Cambridge Analytica whistle-blower Christopher Wylie, working in the Liberal leader's office in 2009, was terminated because his electoral data manipulation was too invasive. In testimony to the ethics committee today, Mr. Wylie said that was not why his contract ended.

In a 2016 email to the U.K.'s leave movement in the Brexit referendum, Wylie said that the outcome could be influenced by psychographic micro-targeting and that he was working on a similar project for a major Canadian political party.

Who is telling the truth?

Hon. Karina Gould (Minister of Democratic Institutions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as my hon. colleague knows, the Prime Minister has tasked me and our government to ensure that we defend Canada's next federal election against cyber-threats. It is also important that we ensure we look for new ways to deal with data and digital breaches. That is why in Bill C-76 we have a provision against the malicious use of computers.

I look forward to working with colleagues in the House to do what is necessary, as these new technologies evolve, to ensure the integrity of our elections.

* * *

[Translation]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mrs. Marilène Gill (Manicouagan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the government is preparing to buy the Trans Mountain expansion, a project that Kinder Morgan is backing away from due to its high risk. It is a project that poses a constant threat to the environment and is opposed by British Columbians and indigenous nations. Quebec is also not interested in assuming the economic, environmental, and social risks.

Will the government reimburse Quebeckers for their share of the \$4.5 billion it is going to spend to finance its irresponsible action so that Quebeckers can instead invest in renewable energy?

• (1510)

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.): We know that the investment in the Trans Mountain expansion is very important to

the national interest and to the future of our economy. It will help our economy by fostering economic growth. At the same time, we can also create jobs across the country, in British Columbia, Alberta, and in the other provinces. It truly is in the national interest. That is why we are clearly stating that this project is important for our future.

[English]

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada apparently just bought a pipeline from Kinder Morgan for \$4.5 billion, which it bought for \$550 million. There are 15 different court cases right now: indigenous rights cases, environmental group cases, and municipal cases. When the Federal Court of Appeal rules, if the court rules that the permits are invalid, what is the government's plan? Will it restart the environmental assessment process and restart consultations?

Hon. Jim Carr (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is asking the government to speculate hypothetically on what a court may or may not say. We could look retrospectively at what courts have said. Even very recently the Supreme Court has spoken about consultation and actually has sided with the proponent. However, it is not a good idea for us to speculate on what a future court might say on a case that has nothing to do with the ones that have been decided already.

We do know that through this process, there was unprecedented consultation with indigenous people. Forty-three communities signed on to benefit agreements, 33 in—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Regina—Lewvan.

Mr. Erin Weir (Regina—Lewvan, CCF): Mr. Speaker, as you may have heard, the government announced today that it would buy the Trans Mountain pipeline. Far be it from the CCF to question nationalization.

Could the minister confirm that the new federal crown corporation will honour the existing contract to buy 75% of the project's steel from Regina and make every effort to procure the remaining 25% from Canadian mills?

Hon. Bill Morneau (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can confirm that we have purchased the assets, and it is our intent that this project move forward in a commercial fashion. We will be seeking the approach that makes the most sense, which will include honouring contracts that have already been moved forward.

What we will seek to do is then move toward consideration of a private sector solution at the appropriate time, creating the value that we want to create for Canadians.

* * *

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: I would like to draw to the attention of hon. members the presence in the gallery of the Hon. Barton Scotland, Speaker of the National Assembly of the Co-operative Republic of Guyana.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: I have notice of a question of privilege from the hon. member for Medicine Hat—Cardston—Warner.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

FIREARMS ACT

Mr. Glen Motz (Medicine Hat—Cardston—Warner, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am rising on a question of privilege about online publications of the RCMP, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, respecting Bill C-71, an act to amend certain acts and regulations in relation to firearms. These documents, found on the RCMP website, were brought to my attention yesterday, which is why I am rising today, the earliest opportunity after I became aware of the documents.

On another question of privilege concerning advertising, Speaker Milliken ruled, on May 29, 2008, at page 6276 of the *Debates*:

In this case, as in others, it is not so much that the event or issue complained of took place at a given time, but rather that the members bringing the matter to the attention of the House did so as soon as practicable after they became aware of the situation.

Turning back to today's question of privilege, I am rising because these online government publications—

The Speaker: Order. I am going to ask members to take their conversations outside.

The hon. member for Medicine Hat—Cardston—Warner has the floor.

• (1515)

Mr. Glen Motz: Mr. Speaker, turning back to today's question of privilege, I am rising because these online government publications presume the adoption of Bill C-71 by Parliament. There is no caveat given by the RCMP that the legislation is subject to parliamentary approval, and there is no acknowledgement of the parliamentary process at all, in fact. This, in my view, is nothing but a contempt of Parliament.

Page 14 of Joseph Maingot's *Parliamentary Privilege in Canada*, second edition, explains contempt as follows:

As in the case of a Superior Court, when by some act or word a person disobeys or is openly disrespectful of the authority of the House of Commons or Senate or of their lawful commands, that person is subject to being held in contempt of the House of Commons or Senate as the case may be; therefore it will be seen that the Senate and House of Commons have the power or right to punish actions that, while not appearing to be breaches of any specific privilege, are offences against their authority or dignity.

Page 81 of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, adds:

The House of Commons enjoys very wide latitude in maintaining its dignity and authority through the exercise of its contempt power. In other words, the House may consider any misconduct to be contempt and may deal with it accordingly.

Let me read a sampling of the content found in “Special Business Bulletin No. 93”.

To begin with, we see:

Because not all CZ firearms will be impacted by changes in their classification, business will need to determine if their firearm (s) will be affected by these changes.

Bill C-71 also lists a number of specific Swiss Arms (SA) firearm that will also become prohibited.

Privilege

If you own CZ/SA firearms, the steps below can help you identify whether your inventory of firearms is affected by Bill C-71. They explain the grandfathering requirements and how to avoid being in illegal possession of a firearm.

That language is quite clear. It is “will be impacted”, “will... become prohibited”, and “is affected”, not “could be”, “may become”, or “might be affected”.

Later in the bulletin, we read:

Business owners will continue to be authorized to transfer any and all impacted CZ or SA firearms in their inventory to properly licenced individuals, until the relevant provisions of Bill C-71 come into force. For an individual owner to be eligible for grandfathering certain requirements must be met by June 30, 2018.

Now, before one might think that the language about the bill's coming into force possibly concedes the need for parliamentary approval, let me continue reading:

The proposed changes to classification status for CZ/SA firearms listed in Bill C-71 will come into force on a date to be determined by the Governor in Council. This date is yet to be determined.

It is my respectful submission that any conditional language one might read or infer in that document is left, in the mind of the reader, to be, therefore, a matter of cabinet discretion, not Parliament's.

Turning to a second document, entitled “How does Bill C- 71 affect individuals?”, we see additional presumptuous language. A lot of it mirrors what I quoted from “Special Business Bulletin No. 93”.

Other passages, however, include:

If your SA firearm was listed in Bill C-71, it will be classified as a prohibited firearm.

It says, “was listed”, as if Bill C-71 was a document from the past, not a bill currently before a parliamentary committee.

Later we read:

To qualify for grandfathering of your currently non-restricted or restricted CZ/SA firearm, the following criteria must be met...

There follows a list of details for firearms owners to meet, which, just coincidentally, happens to be laid out in clause 3 of Bill C-71, yet there is no indication that these are proposals before Parliament, let alone in need of parliamentary sanction to be enforced.

A leading ruling on the presumption of parliamentary decision-making concerning legislation is the ruling of Mr. Speaker Fraser, on October 10, 1989, at page 4457 of the *Debates*, in respect of the implementation of the goods and services tax.

• (1520)

The impugned advertisements in that case contained similarly unequivocal language, such as “Canada's Federal Sales Tax System will change. Please save this notice”, and, the GST “will replace the existing federal sales tax”.

In this instance, Mr. Speaker Fraser did not find the *prima facie* case of contempt. However, he could not have been more clear when he stated, and I quote:

I want the House to understand very clearly that if your Speaker ever has to consider a situation like this again, the Chair will not be as generous. This is a case which, in my opinion, should never recur. I expect the Department of Finance and other departments to study this ruling carefully and remind everyone within the Public Service that we are a parliamentary democracy, not a so-called executive democracy, nor a so-called administrative democracy....

Privilege

A vote on this issue might not support the very important message which your Speaker wishes to convey and which I hope will be well considered in the future by governments, departmental officials and advertisement agencies retained by them. This advertisement may not be a contempt of the House in the narrow confines of a procedural definition, but it is, in my opinion, ill-conceived and it does a great disservice to the great traditions of this place. If we do not preserve these great traditions, our freedoms are at peril and our conventions become a mockery. I insist, and I believe I am supported by the majority of moderate and responsible members on both sides of this House, that this ad is objectionable and should never be repeated.

Subsequent rulings have distinguished other factual scenarios from the 1989 ruling, and, I submit, are distinguishable from the circumstances I am rising on today.

On March 13, 1997, at page 8988 of the *Debates*, Speaker Parent held that a policy-promotion campaign concerning anti-tobacco legislation did not give rise to a prima facie contempt, but the Chair added the following advice, and I quote:

...where the government issues communications to the public containing allusions to measures before the House, it would be advisable to choose words and terms that leave no doubt as to the disposition of these measures.

That advice was put into practice by the Department of Citizenship and Immigration in its promotional materials respecting Bill C-50, leading to the 2008 ruling by Mr. Speaker Milliken, which I cited in my opening comments, that there was no prima facie contempt.

More recently, your immediate predecessor ruled, on September 28, 2011, at page 1576 of the *Debates*, that a procurement solicitation for advisory services for the implications of certain scenarios for the dismantling of the Canadian Wheat Board monopoly was “part of a planning process that might be expected in contemplating the possibility of the repeal of the Canadian Wheat Board Act.”

Last year, Mr. Speaker, you ruled on May 29, 2017, at page 11552 of the *Debates*, that advertisements to hire the leadership of the Canada Infrastructure Bank, then a matter before the House as part of a budget implementation bill, was not a contempt, because some, but not all, of the government's job postings conceded that parliamentary approval was required. In the ruling, the Chair said:

I was looking for any suggestion that parliamentary approval was being publicized as either unnecessary or irrelevant, or in fact already obtained. Otherwise put, I was looking for any indication of an offence against or disrespect of the authority or dignity of the House and its members.

As it turns out, I think the most relevant ruling in respect of the facts before us today is that of Mr. Speaker Stockwell, in the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, given on January 22, 1997, in respect of a government pamphlet explaining municipal reform legislation, not unlike the purpose of the RCMP's internet guidance. In finding a prima facie contempt, Mr. Speaker Stockwell held:

...I am very concerned by the Ministry pamphlet, which is worded more definitively than the commercial and the press release. To name but a few examples, the brochure claims that “new city wards will be created”, that “work on building the new city will start in 1997”, and that “[t]he new City of Toronto will reduce the number of municipal politicians.

● (1525)

How is one to interpret such unqualified claims? In my opinion, they convey the impression that the passage of the requisite legislation was not necessary or was a foregone conclusion, or that the assembly and the Legislature had no pro forma tangential, even inferior role in the legislative and lawmaking process, and in doing so, they appear to diminish the respect that is due to this House. I would not have come to this view had these claims or proposals—and that is all they are—been

qualified by a statement that they would only become law if and when the Legislature gave its stamp of approval to them.

In the RCMP documents, we are not talking about standing up a crown corporation, or hiring a government consultant, or even promoting an anti-smoking campaign, nor are we talking about new tax rules or changes to local government. We are talking about a publication that gives advice on how to avoid becoming a criminal. How much more serious can one get than that? This is not hyperbole.

One of the passages I referred to earlier said, “They explain the grandfathering requirements and how to avoid being in illegal possession of a firearm.” Another was, “If your SA firearm was listed in Bill C-71, it will be classified as a prohibited firearm.”

The unlawful possession of a firearm can lead to a jail sentence of up to five years. That is pretty serious stuff.

Conservatives have been clear and on the record about their concerns about the RCMP arbitrarily reclassifying firearms. That is why the previous government gave the Governor in Council an oversight role. Basically, what happens is that law-abiding owners who follow all the rules and regulations with respect to their firearms are suddenly, because of one meeting of some bureaucrats, declared criminals for possession of an illegal weapon, when they have owned and used that weapon for sport shooting or hunting for many years. Suddenly, with one blanket move, what dozens or hundreds of thousands of people already possess is somehow deemed illegal.

We have seen this disrespect for law-abiding Canadians from the RCMP before. The RCMP has acted in contempt of Parliament several times before. There is an institutional history of it, as a matter of fact.

On February 16, 1965, Mr. Speaker Macnaughton found a prima facie case of privilege concerning the RCMP's arrest of an opposition member of Parliament. On September 4, 1973, Mr. Speaker Lamoureux found a prima facie case of privilege concerning the RCMP interrogation of an opposition member. On March 21, 1978, Mr. Speaker Jerome found a prima facie case of privilege concerning the RCMP's electronic surveillance—spying, in other words—of an opposition MP. On December 6, 1978, Mr. Speaker Jerome found a prima facie case of privilege concerning the RCMP misleading a former minister concerning the information he provided to opposition parliamentarians.

On December 1, 2004, Mr. Speaker Milliken found a prima facie case of privilege concerning the RCMP blocking MPs' access to Parliament Hill. On April 10, 2008, Mr. Speaker Milliken found a prima facie case of privilege following the false and misleading evidence given to the public accounts committee by the RCMP's then deputy commissioner.

On March 15, 2012, your immediate predecessor, Mr. Speaker, found a prima facie case of privilege when the RCMP denied MPs access to Centre Block. On September 25, 2014, another prima facie case of privilege was established related to the RCMP's denial of access to Parliament Hill. On May 12, 2015, two incidents of MPs being denied access to Centre Block by the RCMP led to yet another prima facie case of privilege.

Government Orders

Mr. Speaker, you have also needed to deal with these issues. On April 6 and 11, 2017, you found *prima facie* cases of privilege flowing out of MPs' access being denied by the Parliamentary Protective Service, an organization that, of course, has a clear legal relationship with the RCMP.

Even on the Senate side, the RCMP was found to have committed a *prima facie* case of contempt by Mr. Speaker Kinsella, on May 8, 2013, following its efforts to thwart parliamentary task force members from appearing as witnesses before a committee.

• (1530)

It goes without saying that it comes as absolutely no surprise that our national police force would snub its nose at Parliament yet again. Even more distressing is that the minister responsible for the RCMP, the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, is one of the most experienced members of the House and a former House leader. The minister should be urging respect for Parliament by his officials. The RCMP is not above the law and not above the House of Commons.

Mr. Speaker, if you agree there is a *prima facie* case of contempt here, I am prepared to move an appropriate motion.

The Speaker: I thank the hon. member for Medicine Hat—Cardston—Warner for raising his question of privilege, which I take very seriously. I will be coming back to the House in due course with a ruling.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

EXTENSION OF SITTING HOURS

MOTION THAT DEBATE BE NOT FURTHER ADJOURNED

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister of Small Business and Tourism, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in relation to the consideration of Government Business No. 22, I move:

That the debate not be further adjourned.

[*Translation*]

The Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 67.1, there will now be a 30-minute question period. I invite hon. members who wish to ask questions to rise in their places so the Chair has some idea of the number of members who wish to participate in this question period.

The hon. member for Mégantic—L'Érable.

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have a very simple question.

I would like the government House leader to explain the reason for this motion and why it is being moved at this time.

Hon. Bardish Chagger: Mr. Speaker, that is an excellent question. We want to work for Canadians. There are a lot of bills to debate and, since we know that the opposition members want to participate in those debates, we are going to extend the sitting hours so that everyone can participate and work harder for Canadians.

Mr. Matthew Dubé (Beloeil—Chambly, NDP): Mr. Speaker, let us be clear. The NDP is prepared to spend as much time as necessary working in Parliament, and I imagine all the other parties feel the same way. That being said, I would like to ask the government House leader a question.

The government introduced an electoral reform bill at the last minute and a national security bill two years after it took office, and that is not to mention all the other bills that it put on a shelf saying that it needed to hold consultations. What is more, the government did not even listen to the Canadians it consulted. After taking so long to act and imposing its agenda, why is the government now deciding at the very last minute to impose closure on the motion to extend sitting hours?

We are prepared to work hard, but let us be clear. When they talk about work-life balance and respect for Parliament, waiting until the last minute and imposing all this on parliamentarians is not helpful and will get us nowhere.

Can the government House leader justify her actions here today?

Hon. Bardish Chagger: Mr. Speaker, I want to assure all hon. members that I am doing my best to work with them. I have asked many times how many people want to take part in the debate. The opposition members told me on several occasions that they wanted more debates. This is an opportunity for everyone to take part in the debates.

We know that the bill mentioned by the hon. member is very important. The minister talked about it and we want the committee to do its work. However, we see that the hon. members across the way want to play games in the House and in committee. It is their choice, but we want to work very hard for Canadians. That is our way of doing things.

[*English*]

Hon. Erin O'Toole (Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this is truly an unparalleled day in Canadian parliamentary history. On a day that the Government of Canada has paid a Texas company \$4.5 billion to leave Canada and to stop investing in our resource sector, we also have the government House leader bringing to the House for the 34th or 35th time a time allocation motion on a motion that has not yet been debated. This is truly unparalleled.

The member was not here in the last Parliament, but I would like to remind her of the wisdom of her deputy, the member for Winnipeg North, who used to call such tactics “assaults on democracy”. There are so many times he said that. In fact, he went further to talk about the use of time allocation on omnibus bills before the House. He said they are “an affront to democracy and the functionality of Parliament.”

Why do the Liberals fear debate? Why do they fear Canadians knowing what is happening? Why are they using omnibus bills for budget implementation, and for Bill C-75 and Bill C-59? What about the openness and transparency they promised?

Government Orders

●(1535)

Hon. Bardish Chagger: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to respond to the obviously more experienced member's question. That is what he just said. On Thursday of last week I telegraphed that we would be bringing forward a motion, and what did the opposition members choose to do? They chose to ensure that the government could do no business.

The member asked about fear of debate. Members on this side do not fear debate; we welcome debate. That is exactly why we brought forward a motion to say, let us debate more, let us extend the hours so that more members can be part of the debate and represent their constituents in this place.

We committed to Canadians that we would work hard for them. We committed to Canadians that their voices would be heard in this place, and this is just another way to ensure that every member of Parliament who wants to debate the important legislation this government is advancing has an opportunity to do so. I look forward to hearing—

The Deputy Speaker: Questions, the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development.

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to draw upon the earlier comments by the House leader. We come to this place to be able to debate legislation and have an opportunity to bring the voices of our constituents here and to do the good work that Canadians have elected us for.

One of the members talked about family obligations. I do have family obligations as well, and I try to balance these as much as possible while I am here, but we also know that while we are here, there is opportunity for us to engage not only with our own members, but also with members of the opposition who ask good questions, to hear debate and to be able to challenge each other.

I would like the House leader to further explain to Canadians why this motion in particular is so important.

Hon. Bardish Chagger: Mr. Speaker, I would like to start by commending the member and the level of discourse she brings to this place. I have seen her on numerous occasions represent the voices of her constituents. When it comes to the depth of policy knowledge she brings to this place, it has raised the level of debate. I encourage more members to study the bills that we are putting forward so they can ensure that their constituents' voices are heard here. That is exactly why we would like to extend the hours.

We know that at this time of the year most governments have extended hours so that members can do more to represent Canadians and advance good bills. This will provide an opportunity for more members to be part of an important debate to ensure that the voices of their constituents are heard right here, because it is the House of the people.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher (Beauport—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île d'Orléans—Charlevoix, CPC): Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to my colleague, I would like her to elaborate. We have had many opportunities to ask for more debate and have always been turned down. Today, she is asking us to take part in debates, and we will

take part in them because on this side of the House, the opposition side, we like to have our say on behalf of our constituents.

Is this charade the government's way of muzzling us on bills that should have been passed a long time ago?

●(1540)

Hon. Bardish Chagger: Mr. Speaker, on the contrary. This is an opportunity to have more hours of debate in order to allow a greater number of hon. members to participate.

[*English*]

If we want to talk about this place and being cute, let us talk about last week.

We returned to this House on Tuesday after the constituency week. What did the opposition members do? They started by moving concurrence. What did they do all week long? They moved concurrence rather than debate the legislation before the House.

The opposition members talk about the importance of knowing what is taking place. This government committed to openness and transparency. I have been telegraphing what the business of the days will be so that members can be part of meaningful debate. What have the opposition members chosen to do? They have chosen to play games. They have chosen to use tactics rather than be here representing the voices of their constituents. They have chosen to put the voice of their party before the voices of Canadians.

On this side of the House, we will put Canadians first.

The Deputy Speaker: Just as a reminder to all hon. members, and in this case the hon. government House leader, in this 30-minute period for questions, the questions are generally reserved for opposition members. We will have time for the two other members of the government side who are standing. We will get those two in, and probably not much more than that.

Going to questions now, the hon. member for Elmwood—Transcona.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I will start with a brief remark. I have to say that I do take exception to the implication by the government House leader that there is something wrong with the House's debating and voting concurrence on committee reports. That is in fact why committees report back to the House, so that those reports can be considered. If the House decides it wants to concur in a report by a committee, there is absolutely nothing wrong with that. Therefore, for her to somehow suggest that there is something untoward going on, that there is something wrong in principle, or that it is a bad thing for members to be concerned about the good work they do in committee that has come before the House to be discussed at large and then voted on by the House is just ridiculous. It would be nice to have a government House leader who actually understood this place well enough to know that there is nothing wrong with moving concurrence in a committee report.

Government Orders

I will digress from that point and move to my main point. The government moved time allocation on Bill C-76. My colleague from Skeena—Bulkley Valley proposed to the minister a way forward that would include the right amount of debate and consultation with Canadians. The minister said no and moved time allocation. Therefore, the demand for extra sitting time is odd coming from a government that is refusing to respond to proposals by the opposition on how to effectively study bills.

Hon. Bardish Chagger: Mr. Speaker, we do not talk about committee business in this place. However, now that the member opposite has welcomed the opportunity, I do so as well.

I believe that my colleagues on this side, including the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Democratic Institutions, has more than welcomed opportunities. However, rather than debate the important legislation that would allow more Canadians to vote in the next election, what are the opposition members doing? They are currently in committee right now filibustering rather than getting to important government legislation. That legislation is Bill C-76, which brings forward 85% of the recommendations of the Chief Electoral Officer. It is the right thing to do for Canadians after what the previous government did to vandalize the opportunities for Canadians to vote. We are changing that so that many Canadians can vote. The NDP, rather than stand for Canadians, is today standing with the Conservatives to take away the right of Canadians to vote. That is disappointing—

The Deputy Speaker: I would ask all hon. members to keep their interventions to around one minute.

The hon. member for Cypress Hills—Grasslands.

Mr. David Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC): Mr. Speaker, there is certainly a lot of arrogance in the implication that the opposition members are just a problem here.

I want to point out that the Liberals claim they want debate. We are here today and are talking about a pipeline purchase by the government. However, the government will not give us the information on how much it will pay for it and what it will cost in the future. We have asked questions about the carbon tax. The government will not give us any information on those issues as well. Therefore, on many of these issues, we're left without any information at all, yet the government tells us that it wants us to come here to debate these issues. When is the government going to open up and be a lot more transparent with Canadians and us?

The Liberals claim they are representing Canadians. However, they are not doing that, but representing themselves. We need more information and more accountability. When is the government going to open up and give us the information we need to do our job here as well?

Hon. Bardish Chagger: Mr. Speaker, whether in or outside this House, I have stated that every member of Parliament, regardless of the side they sit, serves a very important purpose. For months we have seen this place able to function when we work together. We are able to advance legislation. Members are able to represent their constituents, or their parties, as the Conservatives choose to do, and advance and vote on legislation as they choose. What is important is that the voices of Canadians be heard in this place. For a few months now, we have demonstrated that we can work together to ensure that

we know how much time is needed for debate, and we can continue advancing legislation through the process, including in the other place.

What has transpired all of a sudden is that when we returned from the constituency week, the official opposition definitely chose not to continue with that gesture of good will. I continue to keep my door open and hope that we can return to the days when we were all able to work for and represent our constituents.

● (1545)

Mr. Robert-Falcon Ouellette (Winnipeg Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to come to the House and have the opportunity to debate. I enjoyed hearing that we are going to have extended hours, because I think it is extremely important that people from Winnipeg Centre ensure that their representative does have the opportunity to speak.

I know that sometimes debate does not go long enough, and there are more members than there were. Before, there were only 308 members of Parliament, and now there are 338 in the House of Commons.

I appreciate the opportunity. I believe the opposition should take this opportunity to debate longer into the future, until 2 a.m. or 3 a.m. even. We should run this place 24 hours a day so that every member who wishes to speak has that opportunity.

I am prepared to stay here, and I hope the opposition is, as well.

Hon. Bardish Chagger: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for his commitment to represent Canadians in this place, and I agree.

A point that does not get raised often is that there are more members of Parliament in this place. Many members of Parliament have issues of concern, whether to them personally or to their constituents, ridings, or regions, and they want to be part of a meaningful debate. That is the way to advance good legislation for all Canadians. We need to hear the diversity of views.

When the Prime Minister says that diversity is our strength, he is not talking only about the shells that we occupy; he is talking about the diversity of regions, genders, experiences, and perspectives. We need to hear all of them, and this motion would allow us to debate more, to have more voices heard, and to continue advancing important legislation that will benefit Canadians.

Hon. Ed Fast (Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, please do not accept those soothing words from the government House leader at face value. When we look at the actions of the Liberal government, it is very clear that it has no intention of allowing free and open debate in the House.

Members may recall that when the Prime Minister was first elected, he provided mandate letters to all of his ministers. Every one of them received a letter. In it, the Prime Minister said the following:

I made a personal commitment to bring new leadership and a new tone to Ottawa. We made a commitment to Canadians to pursue our goals with a renewed sense of collaboration.

Government Orders

The letter went on with all these promises about doing things differently, allowing open debate, and collaborating with colleagues in the House. However, nothing of the like has happened. In fact, it has gotten worse and worse: invoking closure on a regular basis, interfering at committees, and cutting off debate at committees. There were 100 amendments in our own committee that went through without debate because the government House leader instructed the Liberal chair of that committee to cut off debate.

This is a shameful performance on the part of the Liberal government, which promised to do things differently but is actually much worse than any government we have seen before.

Hon. Bardish Chagger: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that the member for Abbotsford would stand up in this place, because he was at the committee when it was debating Bill C-57, and he chose to advance an amendment that members on this side of the House worked hard to find a way to support. They actually fought for that amendment. Not only did they fight for that amendment, but they supported it. When that legislation returned to the House, the very same member, the member for Abbotsford, who moved the amendment and got support from the Liberal government at committee, chose to come to this place and exactly undo that amendment.

My parents always told me when I was growing up that one has to look at where it is coming from. When I hear comments from that member, I am reminded of the Harper government and the nonsense the Conservatives played in the House to take away from democracy.

We will not take lessons from the Conservatives.

Ms. Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, as the government House leader just said, we have to look at where the issue is coming from.

It was not so long ago that the Liberals formed a majority government in this place and said they would do things differently. They promised Canadians that they would not bring in closure on the Elections Act. However, this is what they are doing. They are doing exactly the opposite of what they said they would do.

I think every single member in the House deserves the opportunity to have full debate on this, because it matters. Democracy matters to Canadians, and how we do this matters. Following up on one's word and commitment matters. In politics, there is only one thing for all of us that defines who we are, and that is our word.

When the government continues to do what it does, and the House leader gets up to defend the government breaking its promise to Canadians, I would ask whether this is how she wants to be defined.

•(1550)

Hon. Bardish Chagger: Mr. Speaker, as all of us know, on Thursdays the government House leader is able to put forward the business of the House for the rest of that week and the week after. On Thursday, we telegraphed that we would be bringing forward this motion, and that is part of our commitment to openness and transparency.

I listened to the words of the member, and I really feel that she should be supporting this motion, because obviously she would like more time to debate. That is what we are trying to say: Let us extend

the hours and have more time to debate so that more members can have their voices heard and we can advance more legislation. It sounds like a win-win-win situation.

Mr. Mark Warawa (Langley—Aldergrove, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I listened intently to the comments made by my colleague from Abbotsford.

The common theme that we are hearing from all members on the opposition side is that the government is not listening. It is playing games, bringing in closure, and passing motions and bills in committee, ignoring the input from the opposition.

The government promised that this would not happen. It promised to work with the opposition, but that is not happening. The same thing happened in the HUMA committee, where ministers came to answer questions on the main estimates and we were forbidden to ask any questions of any minister. The government brought in closure after the ministers made their speeches.

The government has no trouble bringing forward wonderful statements with lots of confetti, but it does not listen and it does not work. The government talks the talk but does not walk the walk. Why is that a common theme with the Liberal government?

Hon. Bardish Chagger: Mr. Speaker, I believe the member is projecting. He is reminded of a time when a previous government was in this place for 10 years. I would like to give him some good news and remind him that a new government has come. We have been here for two and a half years. Our government has been listening, engaging, and consulting with Canadians, not only with party members, as the Conservatives did. We are engaging with Canadians. Members of our communities, whether they have been engaged with government or not, are being welcomed to the table. We want to hear from them. We want to ensure that legislation works for them.

Under this government, we have seen more witnesses appear at committee. Under this government, we have seen more resources for committees to do the important work they do. Under this government, we have seen more amendments accepted at committee than we surely did under the Harper Conservatives.

The member is mistaken. He needs to come into the 21st century. He needs to see that there is a new government in town, a government that not only talks about the importance of openness and transparency but is acting on it. The member can continue to project, but it is important that he open his eyes and embrace the new ways, because it will benefit all Canadians.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to go back to the comment made by the member for Langley—Aldergrove about the Liberals being open to ideas that come forward in committee. I would like to share an idea with him.

Government Orders

When I was on the environment committee, the member for Abbotsford brought forward a motion. All committee members had the opportunity to review the motion in good faith, and we came to the conclusion that his recommendation, his amendment, was a good idea. We voted unanimously in favour of it and sent it back to the House. Guess what happened when it got to the House. The member for Abbotsford stood up and basically put forward an amendment to delete it.

The whole objective of the opposition is to put roadblocks in front of the government to stop it from getting its work done. Would the government House leader not agree with that?

Hon. Bardish Chagger: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to commend the member for the great work he has been doing. The level of discourse he has been bringing to debate in this place on behalf of his constituents has been overwhelming. He does such a fabulous job.

I would entirely agree with the member that the tactics the Harper Conservatives used on the government benches, and the reason why they were put on the opposition benches, are the same tactics they are using today. Instead of encouraging the government to get work done, they will do anything they can to obstruct democracy. We saw it in their legislation. We see it in their actions. Day after day they continue to do just that.

Today, the Conservatives actually have an opportunity, as does the NDP, to support a motion that would extend the hours, provide more hours for debate, and provide for more legislation to get through that would benefit Canadians. They should continue voting however they think is important, but what we know is that the system works and they should support it.

• (1555)

Mr. David Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my colleague across the way speaks a lot, but I do not think she is speaking with sincerity. She spent half her time attacking my colleague on her government's motion to extend the hours here.

I want to point out one other thing that does not seem to be apparent to Canadians, and that the Liberals are not telling them. The government has set this thing up so that nobody can make any change or do anything that would impact any legislation or activity in the House for most of the evening. The House goes on autopilot, which is just another way for cabinet ministers to go home and watch TV all evening while opposition members are required to be in the House to keep the debate going.

If Canadians watch closely enough, they will see who is here in the evenings, keeping the debate going, and who is not here. They should make note of that when it comes to the next election.

Hon. Bardish Chagger: Mr. Speaker, the member of the opposition talks about somebody being attacked and then does quite the attack himself. We always have to look at where it is coming from. That is advice I received when I was little. It is advice I will continue to move forward with.

In the House, I have seen two committees of the whole in the last week. I saw the number of members on this side of the House, and I am sure there were not many other members. Perhaps they were doing other work. Work for all members continues, whether in this

place, in their offices, or at different meetings and so forth. I think it is important that we note how many members will be here.

We are the government. We know that we need to advance important legislation. What we also recognize is the important work of the opposition. This motion does exactly that. It extends the hours and permits more time for debate for all members, on both sides of the House, which would benefit all Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Matthew Dubé: Mr. Speaker, the House leader knows full well how this place works, so it is important that she not get mixed up. She keeps talking about the motion to extend our sitting hours and the hours of the House of Commons.

However, the motion we are asking questions about right now is a closure motion. The leader says it is fine because the opposition members are going to get more time, yet just one day ago, she gave three time allocation notices, or maybe more. This happens so often that I have lost count.

I would like the leader to explain something to me. We are debating a closure motion one day after the Liberals tabled multiple time allocation notices.

Is there any conclusion we can draw other than that we should just be calling them Stephen Harper's Liberals?

Hon. Bardish Chagger: Mr. Speaker, I want to assure my colleague across the aisle that I understand full well. I saw the games that the opposition decided to play last week. We on this side of the House want to work together better so we can have more debates.

[*English*]

This motion would extend the hours and allow more time for debate. There have been occasions when I have provided notice of time allocation, but I do not need to move time allocation. I would encourage members of the opposition to share with us how much time is needed for debate. In that way, we can move forward.

Something that was clear from Canadians is that they want us to work better together. I hope the member opposite understands that there is a difference between giving notice of time allocation and moving time allocation.

Hon. Ed Fast: Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to stand up in the House again to respond to the government House leader.

Members may recall that when the Liberals were elected, their leader, the Prime Minister, promised that he was going to usher in a new era of openness and transparency. Do members remember that promise? It was one of hundreds of promises he made that he has now broken.

Government Orders

Now we see this playing out at committee. The government House leader tried to suggest that somehow we move motions at committee to improve legislation, to make it better for Canadians, and then, when that legislation comes to the House, we vote it down.

Here is what happens. The Liberals will cherry-pick one of our motions to improve legislation at the committee and vote in favour of it, but there are many others that are required to improve the legislation to a point where the opposition in the House can actually approve it.

What do the Liberals do? They slam the door shut. They cut down debate at committee. With over 100 amendments left to go on Bill C-69, they said, "That is it. We are simply going to vote on them without any debate or any input from government officials." That is the way the government conducts its business.

It is a sham. It is a farce.

•(1600)

Hon. Bardish Chagger: Mr. Speaker, I thought that the opposition member was going to stand up and perhaps realize that he moved an amendment in the House to undo the amendment he had moved at committee. I guess that was not the case.

It is important for the member to know that we do believe in a new approach. It will take everyone wanting to work better together. I will continue keeping my door open.

The member talks about the government's track record, so let us talk about it quickly.

We lowered taxes for middle-class Canadians by increasing them for the wealthiest 1% of Canadians. What did the Conservatives do? They voted against it.

We gave more money to families with children that needed it the most, by asking better-off Canadians to take a little less. What did the Conservatives do? They voted against it.

We reduced taxes on small businesses to 9%. What did the Conservatives do? They voted against it.

Mr. Matthew Dubé: Mr. Speaker, the leader has done me the great favour, after seven years in this place, of trying to explain to me what the difference is between a notice of motion and the actual motion being before us. I appreciate that, and I understand the difference.

In the previous parliament, the member for Winnipeg North would wax on in these types of debates about how it was proof that the government House leader had given up working with opposition parties.

I ask the hon. House leader this, if the member for Winnipeg North could cease heckling me. Does the fact that she feels the need to bring forward notices of motions of time allocation not represent bad faith in the very negotiations she purports to care so much about?

Hon. Bardish Chagger: Mr. Speaker, as the member probably knows, many conversations take place among parties. Every part of government, opposition or whatever the case, has important work to do in this place.

I have said both in the House as well as outside the House that I very much respect the work of the opposition. It is important the government of the day be held to account, that the government be more open and transparent, and that is what we will continue to do. That is why we are saying to let us have more time for debate, let us have more opportunity to do so.

On numerous occasions, there are times when I have asked how much time is needed. When I do not receive any information, I have limited tools. Therefore, I would like to reassure the member that I take this as a last and final step. It has never been the easiest decision. Every time I use those tools, I use them with regret because I wish there was a better way forward. I would need the opposition to help to make that way forward.

The Deputy Speaker: It is my duty to interrupt the proceedings at this time and put forthwith the question on the motion now before the House.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion 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 yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker : Call in the members.

•(1640)

[*Translation*]

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

(*Division No. 676*)

YEAS

Members

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Aldag | Alghabra |
| Amos | Anandasangaree |
| Arseneault | Arya |
| Ayoub | Badawey |
| Bagnell | Bains |
| Baylis | Beech |
| Bennett | Bittle |
| Blair | Boissonnault |
| Bossio | Breton |
| Brison | Caesar-Chavannes |
| Casey (Cumberland—Colchester) | Casey (Charlottetown) |
| Chagger | Chen |
| Cornier | Cuzner |
| Dabrusin | Damoff |
| DeCoursey | Dhalawal |
| Dhillon | Drouin |
| Dubourg | Duclos |
| Duguid | Dzerowicz |
| Easter | Ehsassi |
| El-Khoury | Erskine-Smith |

Government Orders

| | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Eyking | Fergus | Donnelly | Dubé |
| Fillmore | Finnigan | Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona) | Dusseault |
| Fonseca | Fortier | Eglinski | Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster) |
| Fragiskatos | Fraser (Central Nova) | Falk (Provencher) | Fast |
| Fry | Fuhr | Finley | Fortin |
| Garneau | Gerretsen | Garrison | Généreux |
| Gould | Graham | Genius | Gill |
| Grewal | Hajdu | Gladu | Gourde |
| Hardie | Harvey | Hardcastle | Harder |
| Hébert | Hehr | Hoback | Hughes |
| Hogg | Holland | Jeneroux | Jolibois |
| Housefather | Hussen | Kelly | Kent |
| Hutchings | Iacono | Kwan | Lake |
| Joly | Jones | Laverdière | Liepert |
| Jordan | Jowhari | Lobb | Lukiwski |
| Khalid | Khera | MacGregor | MacKenzie |
| Lambropoulos | Lametti | Maguire | Malcolmson |
| Lamoureux | Lapointe | Marcil | Masse (Windsor West) |
| Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation) | Lebouthillier | Mathysen | May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) |
| Lefebvre | Leslie | McCauley (Edmonton West) | McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo) |
| Levitt | Lightbound | Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound) | Moore |
| Long | Longfield | Motz | Nantel |
| Ludwig | MacAulay (Cardigan) | Nater | Nicholson |
| MacKinnon (Gatineau) | Maloney | O'Toole | Paupé |
| Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia) | McDonald | Plamondon | Poilevre |
| May (Cambridge) | McGuinty | Quach | Ramsey |
| McCrimmon | McKay | Rankin | Rayes |
| McGuinty | McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam) | Richards | Saganash |
| McKenna | Mendès | Sansoucy | Saroya |
| McLeod (Northwest Territories) | Mihychuk | Schmale | Shields |
| Mendicino | Murray | ShIPLEY | Sorenson |
| Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs) | Nault | Stanton | Ste-Marie |
| Monsef | O'Connell | Stetski | Stubbs |
| Morrissey | Oliver | Sweet | Trost |
| Nassif | Paradis | Trudel | Van Kesteren |
| Ng | Peterson | Van Loan | Vecchio |
| Oliphant | Philpott | Viersen | Warawa |
| Ouellette | Poissant | Waugh | Webber |
| Peschisolido | Ratansi | Weir | Wong — 110 |
| Petipas Taylor | Robillard | | |
| Picard | Rogers | | |
| Qualtrough | Rota | | |
| Rioux | Ruimy | | |
| Rodriguez | Sahota | | |
| Romanado | Sajjan | | |
| Rudd | Sarai | | |
| Rusnak | Schieffe | | |
| Saini | Serré | | |
| Sangha | Shanahan | | |
| Scarpaleggia | Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon) | | |
| Schulte | Sikand | | |
| Sgro | Sohi | | |
| Sheehan | Spengemann | | |
| Sidhu (Brampton South) | Tan | | |
| Simms | Tootoo | | |
| Sorbara | Vandenbeld | | |
| Tabbara | Virani | | |
| Tassi | Wilkinson | | |
| Vandal | Yip | | |
| Vaughan | | | |
| Whalen | | | |
| Wilson-Raybould | | | |
| Young — 161 | | | |

PAIRED

Members

LeBlanc

Thériault — 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

[English]

EXTENSION OF SITTING HOURS

The House resumed from May 25 consideration of the motion.

Mr. Garnett Genius (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I always appreciate the opportunity to rise in this House, although it is on a sombre note today, given the motion that we are debating. With Motion No. 22 again we see the government trying to do everything it can to restructure the rules of the game to compensate for its own significant failures. The opposition is frustrated and Canadians are frustrated at the many abuses we see of the parliamentary process and in the dissonance between the commitments that were made around transparency and respect for this institution and the reality we see, which is a total and unprecedented lack of respect for this place, for this institution, and for democracy itself.

NAYS

Members

| | |
|----------------|-----------|
| Abouttaif | Albas |
| Albrecht | Allison |
| Anderson | Arnold |
| Aubin | Barlow |
| Barsalou-Duval | Beaulieu |
| Benson | Benzen |
| Bernier | Berthold |
| Blaikie | Boucher |
| Boudrias | Boulerice |
| Boutin-Sweet | Brosseau |
| Calkins | Cannings |
| Caron | Carrie |
| Chong | Choquette |
| Christopherson | Clement |
| Cullen | Davies |
| Deltell | Diotte |

Government Orders

I just have a few notes about where we are on this particular motion, Motion No. 22, which proposes to dramatically extend the hours of debate every day. It is an attempt by the government to try to ram through more of its legislative agenda. The Liberals brought in closure on this motion before it had even been debated. There was no debate on this motion, and the government wanted to immediately propose to bring about an end to that debate. I am actually the first person speaking to the motion. The government put forward the motion, but the government House leader cannot even be bothered to defend the approach the Liberals are taking, so debate then falls to the opposition. This shows how much respect the government has for the important debate that happens in this sacred place, the people's House. Even in the process by which the Liberals bring forward this motion, we see a lack of respect for this institution and for democracy that underlines the opposition's frustration.

I want to highlight a number of the principal grievances we have with the way the government is operating in this respect. I would appreciate it, Mr. Speaker, if you would give me a signal when I have one minute left, because at that time I will be moving an amendment as well.

We have this whole issue of the government shutting down debate before it has even begun. There are important issues to be debated with respect to the structure of the motion. We do not oppose in principle any extension of the hours, but we are going to be moving an amendment, adding the idea that if the government extends hours for government orders, then a fair corollary is that we have a similar extension of hours with respect to opposition motions. What is good for the goose is good for the gander.

However, the government has put forward a motion that says opposition days will remain with the limited hours that they have, while government orders will have the extended period that has been proposed with the motion. We see again a pattern from the current government, which is always setting up the rules to its advantage. We saw this pattern with the Liberals' approach to electoral reform. They wanted to change the electoral system to their advantage, and when it became clear that it was not going to work, they said, "Let's scrap the whole exercise."

We saw it with respect to changes they wanted to make to the Standing Orders. They wanted to change the Standing Orders to weaken the role of the opposition, to make time allocation automatic and take away various important powers that the opposition has. We resisted that. We engaged public concern on that and eventually forced the government to back down.

We see Bill C-76, government legislation that is trying to make changes to the rules governing elections to the Liberals' own advantage, and we see changes with respect to the way in which the extension of hours is happening. Again, the Liberal Party is trying to change the rules to its own political advantage. We have the government shutting down debate before it started.

In this session of Parliament as well, we have expected of the government some basic level of transparency. The Liberals promised in the last election that they would go above and beyond with respect to transparency and sharing vital information with Canadians, yet we see a complete lack of transparency from the government. The most

egregious case of the lack of transparency we see from the current government certainly is the carbon tax cover-up.

● (1645)

As the opposition, we have asked the government to give basic information about the impact its policies will have on Canadians. Here is how it works. The government has said that it wants every Canadian to have to pay a carbon tax. Wherever someone lives, it thinks that person should have to pay higher taxes, and it will not let any provincial government get away with not charging those higher taxes.

The government has said that if a province does not set up its own carbon tax, the federal government will impose a carbon tax. It has defended that as consistent with the philosophy it has, which is the government taking more money. From its perspective, a bigger government is the solution to every problem. We have said that this is not the solution to the environmental challenges we face, that there are many different ways, such as the binding sector-by-sector regulatory approach and other kinds of incentives we can use and have used in the past, to bring about environmental improvement.

The government does not think that is the right way to go. Instead, it thinks that imposing higher taxes on Canadians is the way to go. We disagree with that and we have tried to have debate about it. We have challenged the government to defend its position. It has not really defended its position, except to suggest that perhaps its plan is the only possible plan, even though its carbon tax is not even connected with specific targets. It knows it should understand that the very nature of the carbon tax as an instrument is to impose a tax but is not to set a particular total cap on emissions.

We see this policy from the government and we disagree with it. We can have some discussion about it, but at the end of the day the government will not even release the information that would allow Canadians to understand what the impact of that carbon tax will be. The information it has released about the impact the carbon tax would have on ordinary Canadians has all the critical information blacked out. This is an issue of the taxes Canadians pay and is an issue of the impact this policy would have on hard-working families in terms of the affordability of basic needs like home heating and transportation. Absolutely, on behalf of Canadian taxpayers and families in my riding and other parts of the country who are looking for real affordability, we raise these concerns about the affordability of the carbon tax.

However, this is also an issue of respect for this institution. We have a government that does not respect this institution and is covering up key information about how much the carbon tax would cost Canadians. We have repeatedly asked the government to show the numbers and defend its policy. If it thinks a carbon tax is the right way to go, then it should release the numbers, tell Canadians how much the carbon tax is going to cost them, and make the case to Canadians about whether they think that is a good idea. Then we can have that debate.

Government Orders

By the way, when these questions are asked, it is very interesting. The finance minister will talk about the specific structures in place in some provinces, but then when asked about the federal carbon tax that would be imposed in jurisdictions where a province is unwilling to give in to the bullying of the government, we are not told how much individual Canadians would pay.

By the way, we know how much it would cost the Canadian economy. It is a massive cost to the Canadian economy, but the government is covering up the information about how much it would cost individuals.

In shutting down debate before it has even begun, in trying to constantly change the rules to its advantage, and in covering up key information about the policy decisions it is making, the Liberal government displays the profound disrespect it has for our democracy and for our institutions in general.

Now, in the same vein, I would like to speak as well to what is happening right now with the government's attempt to ram forward the bill dealing with changes to the Canada Elections Act, Bill C-76. We are very concerned about how this legislation would not protect Canada from foreign interference in our elections and how this legislation would create certain advantages for the government over the opposition. We have repeatedly raised these concerns, but the government has shut down debate.

Not only that: we have a situation in which the Chief Electoral Officer, on the instruction of the government, is actually already in the process of creating the mechanisms for the operation of an election on the basis of legislation that has not even passed Parliament.

● (1650)

The Prime Minister tells us that the government is open to amendment, but how plausible is it that the government is really open to substantial amendments when it has already asked the Chief Electoral Officer to begin the process of preparing for the implementation of the original unamended bill?

We know that when the government proposed this legislation, we were getting close to the time of the next federal election, but rather than proposing legislation earlier so that there could have been opportunities for discussion and building consensus among parties, the Liberals waited until this later stage and then pushed the Chief Electoral Officer to begin the process of quasi-implementation before the proposed legislation has even passed, which makes it very clear that they are not serious when it comes to the issue of receiving feedback from experts and receiving amendments.

I sat in on the environment committee when over 100 amendments were proposed, many of them by government members. It clearly shows that the committee process can reveal problems, even from the viewpoint of government members with government legislation. However, what happened at the environment committee is again an interesting example in terms of the way the government operates when it comes to democracy. There was a motion in place that meant that there was absolutely no discussion on many of the amendments that came forward. There were many amendments from all corners of the House, and the movers of the amendments in each case did not even have an opportunity to make their case with respect to their

amendment. It was simply a matter of "Here is the amendment and here is the vote."

This is how the government wants to operate. It wants to ram through legislation. Already we see with these electoral changes the government forcing the process of implementation through before the legislation has passed the House.

What is so concerning about Bill C-76? Well, Canadians I have talked to are very concerned about the possibility of foreign interference in our elections. Yes, the way the legislation is structured would prevent foreign entities from directly and explicitly campaigning under their own name during a Canadian election; however, there are absolutely no rules to prevent the transfer of funds from a foreign entity to a Canadian entity prior to that election period, and that money could then be used during the election for the advantage of that group and no doubt for the advantage of the foreign entity.

Let us take a purely hypothetical example. Let us suppose there was an organization called Vladimir Putin Incorporated and that it was interested in influencing the Canadian election. It transferred \$5 million to a Canadian organization called Canadians Against NATO Membership, and that was mingled with \$50 million raised locally. The \$5 million and the \$50 million were mingled, so it was totally indistinguishable as to which money came externally and which was raised by Canadian donors. That money could then be used in a Canadian election. There would be caps on the advertising that this third party could do, but it could still be doing a significant amount of activism and mobilization work under the radar.

Canadians should be very concerned about that. This is an example that could happen, and it could in fact fully conform with the law as it is written.

We think, as Conservatives, that strong measures are needed to prevent foreign interference in Canadian elections, but for whatever reason, the Liberals, although they spend some time talking about this situation in certain cases, have not brought forward legislation that would actually address it. However, again, they have now asked the Chief Electoral Officer to begin implementing proposed legislation that has not even passed the House.

There are many other issues in Bill C-76 that we could talk about in terms of ID requirements and so forth, and there is an important discussion to be had there. However, I will specifically address the artificial advantage created by the government.

● (1655)

The government has done this. Right now we have a writ period. It has said that it does not want the writ period to be too long. On the other hand, it has created this formalized pre-writ period, which some might argue effectively increases the writ period. We have the pre-writ period and the defined writ period, which together we might see as really forming something like what the writ period used to be.

Government Orders

In any event, that pre-writ period has restrictions on political party advertising, which will hit opposition parties very hard. They do not have the same resources the government has when it chooses to engage in advertising itself. The government has all the resources of being in office, of continuing to be in office, and it can continue to proceed with government advertising, as it would be able to outside of a writ period.

Therefore, we have this problem where the pre-writ period is kind of a quasi half writ period and half not. It is like the writ period insofar as there are restrictions on political parties. In particular, the impact is hardest on what opposition parties can do, but we do not have the same restrictions that would normally exist during the actual writ period with respect to the activities of government.

Therefore, we have the tilting of the scales through this bill in a way that works to the advantage of the government and foreign entities that would want to potentially influence Canadian elections and, at the same time, works to the disadvantage of the opposition. This is the consistent pattern we see from the government with respect to this issue. It is a consistent disrespect for Parliament and democracy, a consistent effort to tip the scales in the government's favour.

At the same time, I am conscious that, as we resist these efforts in Parliament, in committees, and elsewhere, Canadians will also see the importance of what we are doing and will not succumb to these attempts by the Liberals to tip the scales. They will observe the way in which the actions in Parliament do not match the high-minded rhetoric of the last election.

I think Canadians believe, when they see the way the current government acts, that "better is possible", to coin a phrase. Better is always possible, and it is particularly possible now, when we have measures like Motion No. 22, which is again shutting down debate before it has even started.

I was going to make some comments on the pipeline issue, but I am running relatively short on time. However, briefly, it is a source of great frustration to me and my constituents that we had a government before that did not actually build four pipelines but created the conditions for the private sector to build four pipelines, which is an important difference. Now we have a government that on the one hand has created conditions that make it very difficult for private sector investors to want to proceed with pipelines. On the other hand, it has said that it will pour a whole bunch of public money into buying an existing pipeline and hopes to build onto that pipeline, undertaking the expansion.

It is perverse that before the government took office we had the private sector eager to build a pipeline. The approval of the northern gateway pipeline, energy east, and the Trans Mountain pipeline were there in process. The Conservatives approved every pipeline that was proposed, which included the construction of four pipelines. We now have a government that has made it so difficult for the private sector to build pipelines that it requires this massive multi-billion dollar bailout. Again, I think Canadians will see through the government. Something that could have been done by the private sector is being done by the public sector.

With that in mind, I move:

That the motion be amended by:

(a) adding to paragraph (b) the following: "and if a recorded division is demanded in respect of a motion moved pursuant to Standing Orders 78 or 57 in relation to any bill dealing with the Canada Elections Act or the Parliament of Canada Act, it shall stand deferred to December 5, 2018, at the expiry of the time provided for oral questions; and

(b) deleting all the words in paragraph (j).

● (1705)

Mr. Rodger Cuzner (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in this debate.

As much as partisan posturing goes on, every now and then something is said in the chamber that triggers a reaction to some MPs. Certainly the member's comment about how Canadians can see through it is the one that has triggered the comments I want to share with the House now.

Canadians can see through that last 10 minutes of agony, listening to that speech. I was here in the chamber when Stephen Harper and his gang prorogued the House twice, once after six weeks of government.

I was in the House when one of the Conservative members, speaking on electoral reform, said he had witnessed first-hand voter fraud, people picking voter cards out of the garbage and using them. That member had to come back and purposefully apologize to the House, telling the House he had misled it. When we tried to send that issue to the PROC committee, the Conservatives shut down debate. They called closure. They put the run on it.

We will take no lessons from the member on how to operate the House.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Speaker, my friend from Cape Breton—Canso has a long but selective memory.

To start with, the member described my speech as 10 minutes of agony. My speech was actually 20 minutes, so at least he liked the first 10 minutes. At least he was half-right, which is more often not the case with my friend from Cape Breton—Canso.

By the way, while we are talking about a fundamental disrespect for democracy, I am sure the member would like me to highlight the work he has done on the Canada summer jobs program, which now says that organizations, be they faith-based or not, can no longer access the Canada summer jobs program unless they check a box. I wonder if the member is prepared to apologize for that, which is clearly a violation of the Charter of Rights and Freedom in respect for conscience and religion.

In response to what the member said, the Liberals had never heard of prorogation, it seems, until the last 10 years. It has never been used in our history, at all, it seems. It is a normal part of the parliamentary procedure, which was used quite frequently. If the member would rather have seen the coalition under Michael Ignatieff take power, we could talk about that too.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Matthew Dubé (Beloeil—Chambly, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his speech.

Government Orders

One thing we agree on is that the people across the aisle have a very short memory. It is funny to see how fast they fell into the old habits they used to condemn so loudly in the last Parliament.

What I want to focus on is the claim that the government is trying to give opposition members more time. Yesterday, the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons gave notice of time allocation three times. Today, she says she also wants us to sit until midnight to give the opposition members time to debate.

I would like to hear what my colleague thinks. Does he agree with me that there is a contradiction in the government's approach? Does he not think the government is trying to convince the public that the blame lies with the opposition tactics, when the government is really the one at fault for mismanaging its own agenda?

• (1710)

[*English*]

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Speaker, let us be clear about what brings us here. The government is now trying to impose repeatedly time allocation and changing the rules to its advantage. It is reflective of a reality that it has not been very successful at getting its bills passed.

There are many reasons for this that are not within our control. For example, we regularly have the Senate raising problems with bills, more than has historically been the case. The Senate effectively has a Liberal majority. It is raising concerns with bills and sending them back to the House. That involves time of course and it is an important part of the process.

The government has been far less efficient with respect to proposing and passing bills. I think we have seen 30 government bills, other than routine appropriations, that have received royal assent. By this time, under the previous government, we had 50 government bills. Therefore, we were able to actually show more respect for the House. People may disagree with particular decisions here and there, but by ending debate before it starts, we are seeing the Liberals go further than has ever been done in the past.

Also, the Liberals are totally unable to manage their own legislative agenda, and that is what has gotten them to this point. If they are going to pass this motion, at least support the opposition amendment that treats the opposition fairly in that context as well.

Mrs. Bernadette Jordan (South Shore—St. Margarets, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague kept talking about the disrespect being shown to the House. I was here on Friday, on House duty. The disrespect shown in the House when for one hour solid the members opposite slammed their desks and would not listen to the Speaker when he called for order was total disrespect.

Second, today, during question period, when the minister got up to answer questions, I could not hear the answer in my earpiece because of the screaming from the other side of the House. I really would like to know what my hon. colleague's definition of disrespect is.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Speaker, I think Canadians believe the opposition has an important role, and that role involves challenging the government. Therefore, when we have a situation in question period, when we ask repeated serious questions of the government about providing basic information, as a Canadian, about ending the carbon tax cover-up and the minister simply ignores the question and

makes a statement that has no relationship to the question, that situation, as the Speaker has said, perhaps provokes a legitimate frustration and response from members.

We should have good, substantive debate in the House. Ministers who refuse to answer questions should then be called out by opposition members. This is part of the dialogue that needs to take place. If the government showed more respect for the substantive debate that happens in this place, then the opposition would have less need for using tactics that we are now required to use in defence of our democracy.

Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member is an eloquent speaker, and he spoke to a number of different things. I would like to ask the member a simple question. To me, the biggest issue the government has is its failure to be accountable for its own actions. The Liberals continually try to spin the blame on previous Parliaments and previous governments, and they will not take responsibility for their own decisions. Does he agree that is the biggest issue with this Liberal government?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his comments and for his excellent and always eloquent interventions in the House. He is absolutely right. We see the government taking actions that are really beyond the pale. Any time there are legitimate questions about it, they ignore the questions and sometimes say that it is all about the previous government.

I remember a great intervention by former president Barack Obama during his press gallery dinner speech. He said that people accused him of always blaming the previous administration, but that was a practice that began under George W. Bush. This is precisely the approach the government takes and it is worth underlining.

• (1715)

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we heard in response to a question by a Liberal colleague of mine a few minutes ago that if opposition members do not get the answers they want, they are going to resort to banging on their desks. Those members have essentially reduced themselves to that.

The reality of the situation is that the opposition tries to use tactics all the time, and that is the only reason closure is required. Opposition members do not want the government to get its legislation through, so they are using every tactic at their disposal.

We are now saying that we will extend the hours of debate so they will have more time to debate these issues, and for some reason they are against that too.

Government Orders

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Speaker, part of respecting this institution is listening to what a speaker is saying before posing a question, and maybe to think about what that speaker has already said before ascribing a view to him or her, even on something as fundamental as our position on this motion.

We said that we are willing to support the principle of extending the hours if the amendment we proposed passed, which would ensure that the opposition is treated fairly. The member missed that. He missed the fundamental rhetorical thrust of the speech. He has suggested that it is disrespectful to be calling across the way, yet he is calling across the way to me during my response to his question.

The Liberals have absolutely no sense of irony or shame.

The Deputy Speaker: Before I ask the member for Elmwood—Transcona to start his speech, I will remind him, and I should have done this earlier, that there are only about 12 minutes remaining in the time for government orders until we have to interrupt him. The hon. member will have the remaining time of his 20 minutes allowed when the House next gets back to debate on the question. After around 12 or so minutes, I will interrupt in the usual fashion.

The hon. member for Elmwood—Transcona.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to rise to speak to the motion before the House. Of course, the essence of this motion has to do with the government's treatment of its own business and its capacity to move legislation through the House of Commons. It has certainly been the case in the past that various governments have decided to extend sittings to try to accomplish some of the business they were not able to accomplish throughout the year.

However, I think that my hon. colleague who just spoke and moved an amendment raises an excellent and fair point. His amendment is a good one in addressing one of the issues of equity in the House. We know that it is the job of the Speaker and the House to balance the needs of the minority against the majority. The amendment recognizes the fact that some people in this place have more power by virtue of the number of MPs within the governing party, and that others do not. I think that point is very well taken in the Conservative amendment. It really is just about making sure that in the government's attempt to create more time to pass more bills in the lead-up to summer that the business and the issues that matter to the opposition are given their equal due.

Of course, some members of this House will know, and certainly you, Mr. Speaker, will know, that supply days originated for the airing of grievances before the crown, before Parliament approves funding. That is why they are kind of archaically called "supply days". We most often refer to them as "opposition days", but they are an acknowledgement of the importance of non-government members being able to bring forward important issues for consideration by the House as part of the process of the government's hearing those concerns before Parliament grants it the authority to spend money. Supply days are not just some sort of trivial part of the process. They are not just some sort of tangent. They are certainly not a favour that the government grants the opposition and they are not something the government gets to do what it wants with willy-nilly, as it were.

The proposed amendment simply tries to give that equal weight and value to the issues being brought forward by the opposition, as

well as to the government. I think that is perfectly reasonable and it is something we will be supporting.

In the absence of having that fair treatment and the right balancing between the needs of the government and the legitimate needs and purposes of opposition members of the House, it does make it really hard to support the main motion, because in that case we would fail to find that right balance, as it would somehow be implied that simply by virtue of the fact that the government is bringing certain issues forward, those issues are more important and more deserving of time in the House when I think the Standing Orders are very clear that the opposition is entitled to a certain proportion of the time in the House to bring forward the issues that matter, not just to it as the opposition but also to many Canadians whose view the opposition brings to this House and who are not represented within the government.

It is a good amendment. It is one that we will support, and I think in the absence of that amendment's going through, it would be very hard to say this is a fair and balanced motion. It is therefore hard to support.

One of the reasons we are in this predicament, of course, is that there is a lot of government legislation that has yet to be passed. One only has to look at the Order Paper and the number of bills on it, with a little bit of an understanding of where some of those bills come from, to know that the government, remarkably, has not been very ambitious with its legislative agenda. There are bills like Bill C-76, for instance, that have just rolled in other bills. While one could point to the bill number and look at all the bills that have been before Parliament, the fact is that a number of them are simply routine appropriation bills having to do with the business of supply. There are also a number of bills on public service labour issues to repeal some of the nefarious legislation of the Harper government with respect to public servants that, for all the announcements and talk about those bills for years now, have not actually gone anywhere.

● (1720)

One bill gets presented, it gets talked about for awhile, and then a new bill gets that does something a little differently gets presented, and that one gets rolled under, and then there is some talk by government at various events about how there is a new bill before the House and so on. For a government that has not brought a considerable amount of legislation before the House, it is somewhat surprising that the Liberals are having to resort to extraordinary measures to try to get more legislation passed before summer.

It is particularly surprising, notwithstanding some of the comments by the government House leader during the closure debate, because the fact is that our party on an important bill with a deadline, Bill C-76, which makes a large number of modifications to the elections regime in Canada, did make a proposal to government via my colleague, the hon. member for Skeena—Bulkley Valley, to move forward with that bill in an expeditious way. By that, I mean not just in a way that allows more members to speak to it, but one that would allow a whole bunch of Canadians in their home communities to speak to the bill and the changes it proposes.

Private Members' Business

My hon. colleague presented the Minister of Democratic Institutions with a proposal for how to go out across the country, and central to that proposal was ensuring that the bill gets passed by the end of the summer. For the government to say that it sure would be nice if the opposition worked with it, I note that we have been quite willing to work with the government to get legislation passed. When my hon. colleague sent that proposal to the minister, she did not even dignify it with a response. It is hard to hear from the government that it wants to work with opposition members when it does not even bother to respond to proposals by the opposition on how to work together to get a bill passed. It is a bill that has to be passed on a timeline because the government did not act and bring that legislation forward.

Apropos to my point about bills being rolled into each other, Bill C-33 was an act to make a bunch of substantive changes to the Elections Canada Act and other acts that go together in order to, according to the government, improve our elections process. That bill sat on the Order Paper for 18 months and went nowhere. Now we are being told there is a big rush and that we have to get this bill through.

The NDP would like to see that bill passed, but it is a little cheeky of the government to wait so long to bring a bill forward to make those important changes when it knew all along, as did everyone else, that Elections Canada had been very clear about when those changes needed to be introduced and passed by Parliament to be implemented in time for the next election. The Liberals did not meet that deadline and now they are crying foul, saying that opposition parties are being obstructionist despite the fact we sent them a proposal on how to do it more quickly. We wish to goodness that they had just bothered to move it forward 18 months ago when they had a bill on the Order Paper.

None of this is rocket science. There is no black magic here. There is no opposition making unreasonable demands. It is just an opposition disappointed that the Liberals had 18 months to move forward with changes to the elections act after they tabled their own proposals. We wish they had moved forward with them. However, we did not get that opportunity, as we do not say which bills get debated during government orders.

While that was going on and we were not debating Bill C-33, we were debating some bills like Bill C-24, which was a complete and utter waste of time. I will refer members to my comments on Bill C-24. All that bill did was affirm what the government was already doing and what was clearly within its legal mandate to do. If it were not, then the government should tell us, because then it would be an issue of its acting outside its legal mandate and illegally paying ministers of state more. However, it did not seem to be doing that, so presumably we did not need a change in the law.

All the while we debated that bill, the other bill, Bill C-33, was sitting on the table. It could have been taken up and we could have been working on that and meeting the Elections Canada deadline. The government did not need to be in a panic as it is now to get that legislation passed. We could have spent time scrutinizing that legislation and trying to make it better, not just here in Parliament but also by travelling across the country to make sure that Canadians had an opportunity to weigh in on it in their home communities.

● (1725)

However, that was an opportunity they squandered for reasons that remain unclear. I will say that part of it has to do generally with what has become a theme of the government in terms of a serious lack of respect for Parliament. I know the Liberals will say otherwise. We hear a lot about the great respect they have for the work that is done in committees, but let us consider the fact that many committee recommendations are never taken up. We have certainly had instances where committees have amended legislation, only to see the government come in with a heavy hand at report stage and wipe out the amendments that were passed by its own members at committee. That does not make one feel that the Liberals are talking in good faith when they talk about the so-called good work of committees.

Who could forget the Special Committee on Electoral Reform, where the government did not have a majority and a number of parties came together in order to propose a way forward for the government to meet its own election commitment? Who could forget how the Liberals took that work and threw it in the garbage? The day the report was tabled, I remember the minister, with great fanfare, disrespected the work of the committee, because apparently the government thought it would fail and it did not.

Earlier today, we heard the government's own House leader get up and insinuate that concurrence debates were just a waste of time and there was no way an opposition party could move concurrence in a committee report seriously because it actually cared about what the committee said and wanted the House to pronounce on the recommendations of the committee. Of course, that is the whole reason committees do reports and report them back to the House. The current government really does not understand Parliament's place in the system and does not have a lot of respect for it.

I will come back to this theme after private members' business.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The hon. member for Elmwood—Transcona will have seven minutes and 50 seconds coming his way when this bill comes back to the House.

It being 5:30, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

● (1730)

[*Translation*]

UNITED NATIONS DECLARATION ON THE RIGHTS OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES ACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-262, An Act to ensure that the laws of Canada are in harmony with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, as reported (without amendment) from the committee.

Private Members' Business

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The hon. member for Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou has indicated to the Chair that he does not wish to proceed with his motion. Accordingly, the House will now proceed without debate to the putting of the question on the motion to concur in the bill at report stage.

[English]

Mr. Romeo Saganash (Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou, NDP) moved that the bill be concurred in.

(Motion agreed to)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): When shall the bill be read the third time? By leave, now?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Translation]

Mr. Romeo Saganash moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

He said: Mr. Speaker, thank you.

[Member spoke in Cree]

[English]

I remember very clearly when, in September 2007, the United Nations General Assembly adopted the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. It was such an important moment in the history of the United Nations, and also in the history of 400 million indigenous people throughout more than 70 countries. Today, I would suggest, is an equally important moment for this Parliament, for indigenous peoples, and indeed for all Canadians in this country.

I say all Canadians, because Canadians stand for justice when it comes to the rights of indigenous peoples in this country. I say indeed for all Canadians, because Canadians believe in the human rights of the first peoples of this land. Canadians believe in and want reconciliation with indigenous peoples in this country. I am certain that no one in this place is against justice. No MP is opposed to reconciliation, and all want the human rights of indigenous peoples to be upheld at all times. That is part of our duty as parliamentarians in this place. There cannot be reconciliation in the absence of justice. Let us be clear about that as well.

I am honoured once again to rise in the House to speak about these issues and questions that I hold dear to my heart. I would like to start by briefly talking about the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and the human rights that this international human rights document enshrines.

Although it has been more than a decade since the UN General Assembly adopted the declaration, this human rights instrument is still not well known. It is the most comprehensive international human rights document that deals specifically with the rights of indigenous peoples: their political rights, their economic rights, their cultural rights, their environmental rights, and I would even add their spiritual rights. Bill C-262 proposes all of that.

The UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples is the most comprehensive, as I said, but I think it is also worthwhile reminding this place that it has been reaffirmed by consensus at the

UN General Assembly eight times since its adoption. In December 2010, the United States, which was one of the last remaining countries that had initially opposed the declaration, confirmed its endorsement for the declaration. Therefore, since December 2010, no state in the world formally objects to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

I would remind members that the UN declaration is the longest-discussed and longest-negotiated human rights instrument in the history of the United Nations. Two decades is a long time for countries to have discussed, negotiated, expressed their concerns, and proposed drafting for the contents of this declaration.

I also want to remind members that Canada finally endorsed the UN declaration in November 2010. I will read what Stephen Harper said when he confirmed the government's endorsement. Mr. Harper said:

We are now confident that Canada can interpret the principles expressed in the Declaration in a manner that is consistent with our Constitution and legal framework.

• (1735)

[Translation]

I know my speaking time is running out, and I want to give other members a chance to speak on this matter. However, I want to remind the House that Bill C-262 actually fulfills two major calls to action issued by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission in its report, namely calls to action 43 and 44.

Call to action 43 calls upon federal, provincial, territorial, and municipal governments to fully adopt and implement the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples as the framework for reconciliation. If we truly believe in reconciliation, we must use that declaration as the framework.

I also want to remind the House that the rights enshrined in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples are inherent, meaning they supersede all other documents. They exist because we exist today as indigenous peoples.

Bill C-262 is probably the most important bill Parliament has considered in a long time. We will get to vote on this bill as of tomorrow. "If you believe in reconciliation, what are you doing about it?" That is the question I asked all summer when I was speaking to Canadians across the country, from east to west and all the way up north.

[English]

"What are you doing about it?" That is the question I asked Canadians throughout the country, both indigenous and non-indigenous. They all want justice for indigenous peoples. Every Canadian wants reconciliation. Every Canadian believes in the human rights of the first peoples of this country.

Private Members' Business

[Translation]

When I was travelling across Canada, many Canadians asked me questions about this declaration. Once they understood it, Canadians wanted the framework for reconciliation to be based on this document, which took two decades to negotiate and to be drafted. That is why I am saying that Canadians want reconciliation. They believe in the importance of justice for Canada's indigenous peoples. It is 2018 and they believe that it is finally time to recognize that indigenous rights are also human rights. A country such as Canada must support the rights enshrined in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

Bill C-262 is a bill of reconciliation. All parties in the House have expressed their support for the report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission and its 94 calls to action. This bill proposes to implement two of the most important calls to action of the report. That is what Bill C-262 attempts to do, and that is what all parties also wanted to accomplish with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

● (1740)

[English]

Mr. Gary Anandasangaree (Scarborough—Rouge Park, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to once again speak to Bill C-262.

My friend elaborated on the reasons we need Bill C-262 passed here today. It is probably the most important human rights document we will debate in this Parliament.

We almost have a consensus among Canadians that this is an important issue and something we need to embrace, but one party has not fully embraced it, and it would appear that it is not going to support this legislation.

I would like to ask my friend what he feels this moment presents to all of us in this Parliament as part of the process of reconciliation. What would he ask the Conservative Party to do in this important moment as we try to reset our history in a positive way and in the right direction?

Mr. Romeo Saganash: Mr. Speaker, it is important to mention again, as I did during my presentation, that the previous Conservative government finally endorsed the declaration in November 2010. I read the quote into the record. It is important to remind ourselves that this is where we are.

The second point I want to make is that I wrote to the leader of the Conservative Party last week pleading with him personally for his party to support Bill C-262.

It is important to do it, because documents like the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples forge proper relationships and partnerships among governments and indigenous peoples. We can look at the history of northern Quebec, for instance, since we signed the first modern treaty in this country in 1975. Some 80 additional agreements have been signed since then. This is what happens when we recognize the fundamental rights of indigenous peoples. That leads to reconciliation, and that leads to proper partnerships with indigenous peoples.

● (1745)

Mrs. Cathy McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it was over a year ago that the current Liberal government proclaimed at the UN that it would implement the UN declaration. I have a two-part question for my colleague from Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou.

The fact that Bill C-262 has not passed has not constrained the government from acting. Would my colleague say that Bill C-69, the decision on excluding first nations from being part of the Columbia River Treaty negotiations, and the decision today on Kinder Morgan are consistent with what the Liberals committed to on the UN declaration a year and a half ago, or are these actions inconsistent with what they stated they would be doing?

Mr. Romeo Saganash: Mr. Speaker, on my colleague's first point, Bill C-262 would confirm that the UN declaration is a human rights instrument that has application in Canadian law. It would confirm that the declaration already applies in Canadian law. It is important to remind members of that fact. Bill C-262 only confirms its application in Canadian law already.

That being said, a lot of what we do in this place in terms of legislation must be consistent with a lot of things. It must be consistent with the Constitution, and section 35 in particular. It must be consistent with the rulings of the Supreme Court that have been handed down since 1982. Every piece of legislation needs to be consistent with the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

One of the pieces of legislation, I believe it was Bill C-69 my colleague mentioned, references the UN declaration, but only in the preamble. It belongs in the text of the legislation as well. It is important to do that.

If we claim that we have adopted and implemented the UN declaration, we need to be consistent in that claim, absolutely.

Mr. Gary Anandasangaree (Scarborough—Rouge Park, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise once again to speak to Bill C-262 on the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. I want to acknowledge that we are gathered here on traditional Algonquin land.

I would like to begin by thanking my good friend, and the sponsor of the bill, the hon. member for Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou, for his lifelong commitment to ensuring that indigenous rights are upheld as human rights.

For the last several months, the indigenous affairs committee has been studying the bill. We have heard from a number of different organizations. In fact, we had 11 meetings to discuss the bill, and we heard from over 70 witnesses. All of them outlined the different aspects of UNDRIP, the 46 different articles, that make up the declaration. In those hearings, we were able to hear from experts, who called on us, as Parliament, to enact this legislation. UNDRIP has become a very important call to action for many governments where there are indigenous peoples.

Private Members' Business

This year is the 70th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Over the last 70 years, while we professed as countries to enact human rights legislation, it is fairly clear that we failed with respect to indigenous peoples. In 1982 we had the advent of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms that allowed for a number of court cases to advance the rights of indigenous peoples. In the last 20 years, as my good friend opposite has outlined, we were able to engage in a multilateral forum and come together with the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Regrettably, our government at that time did not sign on to the UN declaration. Notwithstanding that, much work was done in Canada by many members of civil society, many parliamentarians, and many academics to ensure that UNDRIP would be part of Canadian law.

My friend talked about going across the country and consulting. Last fall, our committee, the Standing Committee on Indigenous Affairs, travelled across the country. Witnesses all spoke of the need for UNDRIP to be part of Canadian law. I am glad that late last year, we agreed to support Bill C-262. I am very proud to say that we are able to speak to this today to ensure that it becomes law.

This is not a one-off. It is part of a broader conversation and a broader set of commitments our government has undertaken. There is a committee of ministers reviewing legislation with respect to its effect on indigenous peoples. We also have a broader framework on the recognition of rights, which was announced earlier. That will become legislation, as indicated by our Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations today, and part of Canadian law. This broader framework includes, as a central piece, the work of our friend opposite and Bill C-262 becoming Canadian law.

I want to outline a couple of very important issues with respect to this particular legislation. It has 46 articles, and it essentially defines the minimum standards for the survival, dignity, and well-being of indigenous peoples in the world.

• (1750)

It is part of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's calls to action numbers 43 and 44. I am glad to say that we are here today and that a historic vote will take place tomorrow to once and for all enshrine this in law.

Before I finish, I want to call the attention of the House to one matter, and that is having a national consensus. I believe that this is the moment in our history, the moment in our world today, when we can actually come together on something fundamentally important to Canadians and to indigenous peoples, which is reconciliation. Bill C-262 is an essential component of that. I would implore our friends in the Conservative Party, who have done the right thing on a number of fronts in the past several months, most notably with their vote on the opposition day motion brought by the NDP with respect to an apology from the church, to repeat that this time around to make sure that we continue on this path toward reconciliation so that indigenous people know that we are together on this. This is not a Liberal issue or an NDP issue. It is a Canadian issue. For us to do that, it is very important that the Conservative Party support this. I implore the members opposite to reflect on that and support the vote tomorrow.

Once again, I would like to thank my good friend from James Bay.

Mrs. Cathy McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to rise today to speak to Bill C-262 at third reading. Again, I want to acknowledge the tremendous effort of the member for Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou in bringing forward the bill and the important discussion it has generated around the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

During second reading debate, we presented a number of very specific and practical concerns. Unfortunately, in spite of further analysis at committee and detailed testimony, I continue to have reservations about the implications of enacting Bill C-262. It needs to be said first and foremost that our not supporting the bill does not mean we do not recognize the UN declaration as an incredibly important document for Canada. We recognize that it is going to require an effort from whoever is in government to live up to the standards it has set for all of us. However, we do also need to ensure that our support or non-support for any individual piece of legislation is based on a reasonable examination of the potential implications of the bill

Lawyers from Cassels Brock noted:

UNDRIP is a blunt instrument, developed in an international setting, that is not reflective of Canada's world-leading legal protections for Indigenous rights; Canada is the only nation with an established system for limiting unilateral state action against Indigenous peoples. By simply adopting UNDRIP in its entirety into the Canadian context, Bill C-262 misconstrues Canada's existing and sophisticated Indigenous rights regime and, by adding new uncertainties, risks hindering the pursuit of reconciliation.

They went on to say:

While UNDRIP reflects critical elements of Indigenous rights through a lens of human rights, it was designed as a global benchmark and guide, rather than a specific legal instrument to be directly implemented as law. The fact that UNDRIP is a declaration and not a convention makes this clear. Conventions are binding agreements intended to be a reflection of international law and to be incorporated into national laws. Declarations, in contrast, are statements of generally agreed-upon standards which are not themselves legally binding.

Their concerns are not inconsistent with the comments by the justice minister in 2016, when she said:

Simplistic approaches such as adopting the United Nations declaration as being Canadian law are unworkable and, respectfully, a political distraction to undertaking the hard work actually required to implement it back home in communities.

Clearly, she has changed her mind, but has given no explanation how something that was previously unworkable and a distraction is suddenly workable. To be frank, when the Justice officials came before us at committee, they really did not offer any further clarity as to how those comments align with the current government position.

The following areas are some of the concerns that are unresolved and, unfortunately, time is only going to allow me to highlight a few.

Private Members' Business

As noted by one witness, there seem to be three main interpretations of what free, prior, and informed consent means. To be frank, this was consistent with other testimony at committee, because when we asked people what it means, we were given a number of different definitions. One of the ways they described it was that it is not enough to seek free, prior, and informed consent, but enough that you try without actually obtaining it. I might suggest that the Kinder Morgan is a good example of where the government tried to get free, prior, and informed consent, but did not obtain it and moved ahead anyway.

A second interpretation states that it is “really about the type of process required and that it’s possible to move away from talking about consent as long as one has the right type of consensus-oriented process.” I guess that is the free, prior, and informed, but no consent, model.

Finally there are many, especially among the first nation communities, who feel it is grounding rights in something analogous to vetoes, or the right to say yes and the right to say no. That has been heard time and time again by many communities. Certainly, Pam Palmater expressed very clearly in what alternate universe does consent not mean the right to say yes, the right to say no, or potentially veto.

● (1755)

I would suggest that prior to moving forward with a piece of legislation like this, the government needs to make sure that it has an agreed upon interpretation of FPIC with indigenous people so that we do not have the confusion that is out there right now. Again, I can use the Kinder Morgan example, where there are many communities saying that they have not given free, prior, and informed consent, and that the government is going forward anyway and not being consistent with the declaration. Not having that understanding will lead to certain problems down the road.

It was indicated by the proponent of the bill that FPIC, and again we are looking at a multi-jurisdictional project going over much traditional territory, means free, prior, and informed consent from every community that would be impacted. That is absolutely going to be a challenge down the road.

Article 19 of UNDRIP speaks of the need for FPIC for all laws of general application. In a country such as Canada, how would it be feasible to consult and try to obtain consent from Métis, Inuit, and all first nations for essentially every bill tabled in Parliament? Clearly, almost every bill tabled in Parliament has an impact under article 19. I am concerned that this would lead to paralysis and an inability by government to move forward on its agenda and commitment.

Marie-Claude Landry, chief commissioner of the Canadian Human Rights Commission, identified the very important question of who would have access to these rights if this legislation is passed. With the recent Daniels and Descheneaux decisions and the ongoing Bill S-3 consultations, the issue of indigenous identity is increasingly complex and must be resolved.

In addition, Dwight Newman, professor of law and Canada research chair in indigenous rights, identified a number of drafting concerns and internal inconsistencies that would create significant challenges if Bill C-262 were adopted. This leads me back to second

reading debate and one of my original suggestions based on the point made by witnesses that this is a quasi-constitutional piece of legislation. Certainly, I think everyone in this House should agree that a quasi-constitutional piece of legislation deserves the scrutiny a government bill would generate, a government bill that we would get to question the minister about its nuances, and that we would have a much more robust opportunity to have debate and back-and-forth on, as opposed to a very constrained debate.

Accordingly, we not only have important unanswered questions, but also legitimate drafting concerns that were expressed during committee hearings. That said, I want to acknowledge that this bill is incredibly important. It is also symbolic, as we have heard tonight, and some have identified it as an absolutely essential component of reconciliation.

For others who have expressed concerns, they have attempted to engage in a nuanced and serious discussion, but have certainly been met with condemnation. The following are just a few examples. One witness suggested that any objections to voting for this bill were simply based on a colonialist attitude of the people who would not vote for it. A Liberal member said privately that if someone did not support this bill, they were just racist. I found that incredibly insulting.

A number of witnesses were unwilling to testify, feeling that any concerns expressed would simply be construed as being unresponsive of reconciliation. When debate is constrained, so is democracy. The debate among citizens and with political leaders is crucial to building consensus. I do not think we want this place to always be an echo chamber if we really have significant concerns about what a bill would do.

I want to note that in May 2016, the Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations stated at the UN that the government fully intended to adopt and work to implement the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People. However, as my question indicated earlier, I would suggest there are many examples of where the government has not actually stood up to that standard.

● (1800)

In conclusion, international declarations are important to guide legislation and policy, but must be interpreted in the context of a country’s existing legal framework, as opposed to adapting laws to the blunt instrument of a generic declaration. The real work of reconciliation is going to happen, of course, in our communities where we live, work, and play. We do, I believe, have the will and the momentum.

Thus, in spite of the fact that we will not support Bill C-262, we do support and are committed to moving forward with reconciliation.

● (1805)

Ms. Sheri Benson (Saskatoon West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am incredibly honoured to rise in support of Bill C-262 and the hon. member for Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou.

Private Members' Business

Much has already been said about this bill, but as we embark on the third and final reading, I would like to pay tribute to the sponsor of this bill. At the age of seven, he was among 27 Cree children taken from their homes and their families to attend residential school in La Tuque. He remained there for 10 years. After leaving residential school and returning to his home community, he attended a meeting on the negotiations between the Cree and government officials on constitutional and resource rights, which sparked his interest in pursuing a law degree. He attended law school at L'Université du Québec à Montréal, and in 1989 became the first Cree to receive a law degree in Quebec. This was the beginning of a life's work representing and advancing the human rights and well-being of the Cree people.

Most notably, given the bill and debate today, 30 years ago the member for Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou was invited to the United Nations to negotiate the declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples. It is humbling to sit alongside such a distinguished member of this House and an honour to call him a colleague.

The rights of indigenous peoples is what this bill is about. It provides a legislative framework to ensure that no government going forward can deny basic human rights to the first peoples of Canada. Article 1 of the UN Declaration states:

Indigenous peoples have the right to the full enjoyment, as a collective or as individuals, of all human rights and fundamental freedoms as recognized in the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and international human rights law.

Indigenous peoples in Canada live in a world where their basic human rights have to be affirmed distinctly in international treaties and declarations. These basic rights and freedoms are taken for granted and afforded and enjoyed by non-indigenous Canadians, with few exceptions.

Just last week, we celebrated the 100th anniversary of the right to vote being conferred on women—some women anyway, namely, white, middle-class, propertied women. The right to vote was not granted to indigenous people by the Canadian government until 1960. The laws of Canada are not in harmony with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, and despite section 35 of our Constitution that recognizes and affirms indigenous rights, the government has not recognized those rights. Instead, government after government have forced indigenous peoples into lengthy, expensive court battles to have their constitutional rights respected and acted upon. The legacy of colonization and the denial of rights to indigenous peoples is alive and well.

Canada was an active participant in drafting the Universal Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples over a period of two decades, and as I mentioned earlier, the member for Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou played an important role in the drafting. Despite that work, Canada opted to oppose the adoption of the declaration in 2007.

On May 10, 2016, at the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, the Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs stated:

Today we are addressing Canada's position on the U.N. Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. I am here to announce on behalf of Canada that we are now a full supporter of the declaration, without qualification.

In November of last year, the Minister of Justice announced that the government would support Bill C-262, and noted that the bill acknowledges the application of the UN declaration in Canada and calls for the alignment of the laws of Canada with the UN declaration. This, indeed, was welcome news because we cannot move forward and take our place among honourable nations if we do not acknowledge our past and work to make the future a complete repudiation of our past treatment of indigenous peoples.

The Truth and Reconciliation Committee has called upon the federal government, among others, to “fully adopt and implement the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples as the framework for reconciliation.” The TRC has included the UN declaration in its 16 calls to action. Indigenous peoples have been waiting for a long time for the collective rights of aboriginal peoples living in Canada, including inherent rights to traditional lands and territories, self-determination, and recognition of culture and language. They are still waiting for equal treatment under the law. They continue to wait for clean water; equitable funding for education, social services, and health care; decent housing; and communities free of mercury, PCBs, and pesticides, and of tuberculosis and dysentery.

• (1810)

The indigenous peoples of Canada must not be an afterthought, treated as second-class citizens in law and policy or in practice.

I would like to close with a quote from Douglas White, councillor and chief negotiator for the Snuneymuxw First Nation:

UNDRIP is important because it is a comprehensive framework of recognition and reconciliation—a paradigm we have no domestic tradition of in Canada. Our future must be built on putting in place new foundations—including in legislation and policy. Bill C-262 starts that process and builds that new path, and we all should support it.

Meegwetch.

Hon. Hunter Tootoo (Nunavut, Ind.):

[Member spoke in Inuktitut]

[English]

Mr. Speaker, to preface, I do not plan to take up too much time. I want to speak briefly to the great importance of this bill for Canada and for its indigenous people.

I would like to start by thanking the member for Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou for bringing the bill forward, and I am truly honoured to have the opportunity to speak to it.

As an indigenous member of the House and this Parliament, the bill is truly special to me.

Private Members' Business

I think we all know that indigenous people of the country have historically suffered far too many traumas and injustices as a direct result of colonization. Over the past 150 years, Canada's indigenous people have lost much of their identity and culture, a loss that has left many struggling to find their place within the country. As a result, we see a huge disparity between indigenous and non-indigenous people, in particular, poverty, incarceration, health care, housing, access to clean water, and in their overall quality of life. Sadly, this is just the start of a long list of others.

I believe that the adoption of the bill would be a strong first step in helping to right these wrongs, to close this gap going forward.

The bill would fulfill one of the very important calls to action of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. It calls on the federal government to use the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples as a framework for reconciliation. In doing so, the federal government is required to exercise a more contemporary approach when engaging with indigenous people, an approach that is rooted in respect for indigenous rights and equality. This is exactly what indigenous people of the country need.

I have stated many times in the House that Nunavummiut experience third world living conditions in a first world country. Sadly, this is a fact, and the statistics to support this statement are there. Nunavut has the highest rate of food insecurity in the country, with nearly 70% of homes being food insecure. There is currently a housing crisis where nearly 40% of Nunavummiut are in need of suitable safe housing. This is not to mention the highest rate of suicide and the lowest graduation rates in the country. Something needs to change.

Therefore, yes, I agree that we do need a new approach on how the Government of Canada engages with indigenous people and this bill represents a good step toward reconciliation in addressing the current disparity.

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I had the great honour of meeting modern-day pilgrims coming from the faith communities across Canada, young people, people well into their eighties who had been walking for days. Members of the Mennonite Church and young activists were expressing themselves through their church in a way that I had never seen before.

The cause they had taken up, in the spirit of the calls to action of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, was to urge the government and Parliament to adopt Bill C-262, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. It was such a beautiful marrying of faith, activism, and commitment to improving the country, to indigenous reconciliation, and to our parliamentary process. To see protest signs with a bill number on them is not something we see every day. It was the bill that was advanced by my New Democrat colleague, the member of Parliament for Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou.

I am so honoured to have been greeted by that final pilgrimage coming into Ottawa. I am also grateful to be at the service of the people of Nanaimo—Ladysmith in Coast Salish territory, representing that riding at this time in Parliament, because this is a historic day.

My colleague said so powerfully in his opening statement this afternoon that there was no reconciliation in the absence of justice. He reminded us that UNDRIP had been reaffirmed eight times by the United Nations, by consensus. He reminded us that no state in the world opposed UNDRIP, and that even the Harper Conservatives in 2010 acceded to UNDRIP. Therefore, it is well past the time.

The framework for UNDRIP is the framework for reconciliation for Canada. It was used by Justice Sinclair in the Truth and Reconciliation Commission as the framework for the report. In turn, Bill C-262 responds directly to the calls to action in the TRC report, specifically calls to action 43 and 44.

I am reminded of the words of my friend and colleague from Snuneymuxw, a former Snuneymuxw chief, Doug White III. Kwul'a'sul'tun is his Coast Salish name, his Hul'q'umin'um' name. He said:

...to those of us personally and intimately engaged in the struggle for justice for Indigenous peoples, one can sense that while the work remains fierce and intense, there is momentum building toward potential breakthroughs.

He further stated:

Canadians are far more aware of our history of colonialism, and the required work of reconciliation. I am hopeful that in 2018, Canadians will not succumb to voices that are intent on looking backward and maintaining what has been. The reality of what has been for Indigenous peoples is nothing to be preserved.

He urges specifically the endorsement of UNDRIP, and my colleague's bill, Bill C-262.

I asked this Parliament if we need this bill, given the government has acceded to the UN treaty. I say we do.

UNDRIP article 18 calls on governments to recognize that indigenous people have the right to participate in decision-making in matters that would affect their rights, through representatives chosen by themselves in accordance with their own procedures, yet the government has approved the Kinder Morgan pipeline and its attendant oil tanker traffic running through the waters of the Salish Sea, through the riding I represent.

The hypocrisy of the government in saying that it believes that communities should control their own destiny, that it believes in the nation-to-nation relationship and then run roughshod over democracy and those promises tells us that we need the bill and we need to legislate a commitment to UNDRIP. Despite articles 21 and 22, which specifically point to the ending of violence against women and children and the particular role of indigenous women in our democracy, the government passed Bill S-3. It specifically chose to enshrine the continuation of discrimination against the rights of some indigenous women in the Indian Act over the urging and the voices of the six women, known as the Famous Six, who had fought for 40 years in the Supreme Court. We fully expected the government, given its feminist agenda and its commitment to a nation-to-nation relationship, to do better.

Private Members' Business

•(1815)

We do need this legislation. I am so honoured to serve with the member. The spirit he is offering to our country, especially given his own family's personal history with residential schools, is an extremely generous gift.

I urge the House in its entirety to vote together in consensus to move our country forward.

Mr. Lloyd Longfield (Guelph, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would first like to thank the hon. member for Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou for bringing the bill forward and also for helping the students at John McCrae Public School in Guelph to get some textbooks into his riding. We did a switch between our trucks and it was greatly appreciated.

The Truth and Reconciliation Commission, which completed its work in 2015, included UNDRIP in its 94 calls to action. As has been mentioned, the 43rd call to action challenges federal, provincial, territorial, and municipal governments to fully implement the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples as a framework for reconciliation. The hon. member has done extensive work on that.

Thankfully, this government has already taken action to fulfill the call to action in the Truth and Reconciliation Commission and the principles in the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

Article 13 states that indigenous peoples have the right to revitalize and transmit their culture to future generations, including language. This is why the government set aside \$69 million to significantly enhance the aboriginal languages initiative. This funding will help develop learning materials, fund language classes, culture camps, and archiving.

Article 14 of the declaration states that indigenous peoples have the right to establish and control their educational systems. To accomplish this goal our government has set aside \$2.6 billion over five years for primary and secondary education on reserve.

According to article 24 of the declaration, indigenous peoples have the right to access, without any discrimination, all social and health services. Canada has shown tremendous leadership and recognized a right to housing, allotting \$40 billion to provide housing for all Canadians.

Stable living conditions must also include access to clean water. Since November 2015, 62 long-term drinking water advisories on public systems on reserve have been lifted. We still have 76 in effect. Our government has committed to ending boil water advisories by March 2021, and progress can be seen online at Canada.ca/water-on-reserve.

We welcome the bill coming forward. I fully support the work of the hon. member and the goals to which this private member's bill aspires.

•(1820)

Mr. Robert-Falcon Ouellette (Winnipeg Centre, Lib.):

[Member spoke in Cree]

[English]

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased of the work the people of Winnipeg Centre did in getting the bill here today. People from across Canada had a profound impact on the bill and seeing it get to third reading.

Last summer, Steve Heinrichs met me on the streets of my riding and asked what I thought about UNDRIP, especially Bill C-262. I told him that I supported it, naturally of course. His next question was whether the government supported it. I told him that I had no idea what the government's position was or would be, but that I was willing to work to see the bill passed. I wanted it passed.

Steve Heinrichs set up one of the most interesting meetings of my short political career. It was a meeting full of passion and debate with the MP for Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou. It was not a conclusive meeting. The principal question that we looked at was how to move forward and see this passed into Canadian law.

After this meeting, Steve set up additional meetings. Later he said that the most important words he had ever heard in a very long time, and it is to the true Christian and Mennonite tradition, where, "It's about relationships. It's about relationships."

As a result of the encouragement of citizens of Winnipeg Centre, I support UNDRIP and Bill C-262. I would support the bill no matter if it were from the opposition or from the government.

Citizens from Winnipeg Centre met me at Thom Bargaen's coffee house. They met me at my meet and greet. They also met me at the Feast Cafe Bistro on Ellice, at my riding office, and finally at a press conference announcing public support of the citizens of Winnipeg Centre. What great work they did.

I would like to thank the CPT, Indigenous Peoples Solidarity, Leah Gazan, Steve Heinrichs, Chuck Wright, Erin Froese, Kathy Moorhead Thiessen, and all the participants of the indigenous rights walk from Kitchener to Ottawa.

The main thrust of the bill is extremely important. It has many clauses. It affirms the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples as a universal international human rights instrument with application in Canadian law. It states that it must work in consultation with indigenous peoples and take all measures necessary to ensure Canadian laws are consistent with UNDRIP, that the Government of Canada must, in consultation and co-operation with indigenous peoples, develop and implement a national action plan to achieve the objectives of UNDRIP, and that the Minister of Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada must report annually to the House for 20 years on the implementation of these measures and on the national action plan.

There are many more things that could be said, but we really want to see the legislation put into law. I am looking forward to hearing the final words from my colleague the member for Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou.

God bless Canada for getting this done.

Government Orders

• (1825)

Mr. Romeo Saganash (Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I can pick up where my colleague from Winnipeg Centre left off.

First, I believe that human rights should not be a partisan issue in this place, because human rights are human rights. It is unfortunate that one party has expressed its opposition to this bill, but I respect its right to do so.

Second, I want to raise a point that I wanted to mention in my presentation but I ran out of time. I want to express my thanks to the many indigenous and non-indigenous organizations and communities across this country that have supported and endorsed Bill C-262 through resolution.

[*Translation*]

I would particularly like to thank the mayor of Val-d'Or, Pierre Corbeil, and his council. Val-d'Or was the first non-indigenous city in the country to adopt a resolution in support of Bill C-262 and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. I also want to thank the people of Val-d'Or.

The member for Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo rightly pointed out that declarations are not the same as international conventions or treaties, which are binding.

[*English*]

She is right in raising that point, but she forgets to mention that international declarations, such as the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, do have legal effect, and our courts can refer to declarations when interpreting domestic law in our country. That is an important point we cannot forget.

I remember the days when the Constitution of 1982 was discussed and finally patriated in our country. No one knew at that time what aboriginal rights were, and we did not ask the government at that time to clarify what aboriginal rights were in this country. We adopted the Constitution of 1982, and it was up to the courts to interpret the concept of aboriginal rights.

In those years, when aboriginal rights and treaty rights were enshrined in the Constitution, there were fears expressed by many opponents. However, the good news is that the sky did not fall, and it is going to be the same with the human rights of indigenous peoples. It is important to recognize that.

It has been said that it took 150 years to get into this mess. This is the 151st year of this country. Why not take this major fundamental step in the right direction? This is what Bill C-262 is proposing to do.

Finally, I want to mention one thing that I have said in this place before. My colleague from Saskatchewan referred to the fact that I was sent to residential school. I spent 10 years in residential school. I should have been mad the rest of my life because of that, because it was not my choice to go to residential school. I was forced to do so. However, when I came out of residential school, I set out to reconcile with the people who put me away. Bill C-262 is all about that reconciliation.

Mr. Speaker, this is my extended hand to you and, through you, to all members of this place and to all Canadians across the country. The 151st year of this country is a momentous occasion for us in this place, and for all Canadians, to do the right thing when it comes to the fundamental rights of indigenous peoples.

• (1830)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The question is on the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And five or more members having risen:

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): Pursuant to Standing Order 98, the recorded division stands deferred until Wednesday, May 30, 2018, immediately before the time provided for private members' business.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

EXTENSION OF SITTING HOURS

The House resumed consideration of the motion, and of the amendment.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The hon. member for Elmwood—Transcona has seven minutes and 50 seconds coming his way from what was left from the previous start.

The hon. member for Elmwood—Transcona.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Daniel Blaikie (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to resume my speech on Motion No. 22.

Part of my speech was deferred until later in the day so that we could debate a very important private member's bill, Bill C-262. The theme of my speech was the government's lack of respect for Parliament. I said that was evidenced by its approach to the committees' recommendations and the government House leader's attitude to debates on committee reports and recommendations.

Government Orders

Take, for example, Motion No. 6, which allowed the government to avoid addressing Parliament if it did not want to. The government was looking for ways around the Standing Orders of the House of Commons instead of learning how things work here and doing things in accordance with the procedures of the House.

I also spoke about the Special Committee on Electoral Reform and all of the work it accomplished. In the end, the government did not respect this committee's work either. I think that this year, vote 40 under Treasury Board in budgetary expenditures is another example of the schemes this government comes up with to avoid scrutiny.

Given all of this, I also said that we understand that the government's agenda is moving at a snail's pace and that it wants to make some progress by the end of June. We were and are prepared to consider a notice to extend the sitting hours, provided that opposition days and opposition motions get treated the same as government business. That is not the case in the motion as drafted.

A Conservative colleague moved an amendment. I think it is a good amendment, but it contains a clause that may not be acceptable to the government, because it has nothing to do with opposition days.

Consequently, in the spirit of co-operation, and in the hope of making an offer that will be acceptable to the government, we suggest that this other aspect, which is not related to opposition days, be deleted from the amendment so that the government can support it. We could all support the main motion then, once it becomes a fair motion that gives equal treatment to government business and opposition business.

It is in that spirit that I move, seconded by the member for Berthier—Maskinongé:

That the amendment be amended by deleting paragraph (a).

● (1835)

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat disappointed in my New Democratic friends. I would have figured that they would see the benefits of having active debate in the legislature on important pieces of legislation. Rather, what I have witnessed, which I will have the opportunity to expand upon, is a variation of different games being played.

I have spent over 20 years in opposition and I am aware of many different types of games. Having said that, I would argue that the types of legislation we are talking about are in democracy's best interest. When we talk about Bill C-76 and when we talk about other pieces of legislation, we are talking about really good stuff for Canada's middle class in many different ways, yet time and time again New Democrats and Conservatives have one objective: to not let anything pass. They work together. It is that unholy alliance. Nothing is good; prevent everything from passing.

Does the member not realize that being a constructive opposition means that at times he might have to work a few extra hours? That is really what this motion is all about. All governments of all political stripes have moved this motion in the past. Why does the NDP not

want to put in those extra hours in order to pass some good legislation that Canadians will benefit from?

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, the member for Winnipeg North very often makes it difficult to dignify his comments with a response, but I am going to make an exception in this case and respond to what he said, because I just think it is factually way off base.

First of all, I do not think he even realized that I moved an amendment initially, but if he did and had he been listening to what I was saying, he would know that the amendment is actually trying to establish an offer to the government to make the amendment by the Conservatives more palatable to the government.

That is a negotiation. I am not saying that there are not good ideas coming from various places in this debate, but the idea of moving the amendment was to actually try to make an offer so that we could all come to an agreement on the later sittings.

The principle of that offer is simple. It is just to say the business that comes from the opposition should not be accorded any less importance or value than the business coming from the government. That is not unreasonable.

The member will recall that many times throughout this session the NDP has proposed unanimous consent motions to move bills through many stages at once in an effort to help expedite the passage of legislation by the government. If the member, who apparently spends a lot of time in the House but not necessarily paying attention, would go back and consult the *Debates*, he would see that the NDP has been making many attempts on various pieces of legislation to try to expedite the passage of the government's legislation. In fact, in some cases we are more responsible for the success of the government's legislation than the government itself.

I would repeat again in this House the fact that the member for Skeena—Bulkley Valley made an offer to the Minister of Democratic Institutions on how to move forward with Bill C-76 in a fair and timely way and allow Canadians to contribute to that conversation, but the offer was not even dignified with a response from the minister.

The Liberals say they want to work with us, but when we write to them with a proposal on how to work together, they do not even get back to us.

● (1840)

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary secretary for the government has complaints about the content of the speech by my friend in the NDP. He did not even notice when he moved an amendment. I gather it is unparliamentary to refer to the physical presence or absence of members in this House, but we can still draw attention to their mental absence from the House in spite of their physical presence.

I want to ask the member to share his thoughts on our amendment and on the whole issue of an equality between the government and opposition in terms of how the extension of hours works.

Government Orders

By the way, we have seen today that the government seems to want to use that time not to have more debate on bills but to move more time allocation motions and to fit more of those into one day. However, that aside, we take the view—and I think the member would agree—that if there is going to be an extension of time spent debating government legislation and if we are going to have that extra time for discussion of government initiatives, surely the same courtesy should be afforded to the opposition. As well, surely we should not trust the government to be some kind of neutral arbiter of the rules of the House when clearly it is instead always trying to tilt the playing field to its advantage.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, really, that is the main substance of what the NDP agrees with.

On the Conservative amendment, it is not just about whether we support midnight sittings or whether we are willing to stay later or not. I think we are all willing to put in that work, and the work needs to be done. However, there is an important principle in this place, and it is out of that principle that we get opposition days—or supply days, as they are referred to. The principle is that for Parliament to approve funding for the crown, the government has to hear about issues from not just ridings that are represented by members of the governing party but from people all over the country and the various views that exist within Canada. That is part of the function of an opposition day. Extending the sitting hours does not diminish the importance of those other issues being heard in the right proportion, but if we extend the sitting hours as the original motion proposes to do, which is to treat only government business during those extended hours, then we have a situation in which the government is getting not just more House time, but proportionally more House time, and that is part of what is at issue in these amendments.

I do not think this is partisan or unreasonable. It is just asking the government to observe, in the extension of the hours, the same principles that govern the normal sitting hours.

Nor is this debate unreasonable or partisan. Sometimes there has been some kind of allusion that maybe this debate is somehow a filibuster in and of itself, but this is business that the government brought before the House, and members are debating it. They are moving amendments and they are even trying to find compromises. This, to me, looks like an appropriate parliamentary debate about how we are going to get business accomplished with some give and take.

I wish the government would acknowledge that this is what is happening on the floor of the House instead of pretending that members are being obstructionist.

• (1845)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Karine Trudel (Jonquière, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I want to start by commending my colleague from Elmwood—Transcona for his courage and his impeccable French. I really enjoyed hearing him speak in French.

I would like to hear him say a little more. I would like him to explain the importance of the amendment he just moved. We feel like the government wants to move all its bills forward right now. We have no problem with that. Someone in the House mentioned democracy earlier. Is there anything democratic about cutting

opposition days and limiting opposition members' time to speak and to represent the people of our ridings?

I would like the member to tell us more about his amendment.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, I thank my esteemed colleague for complimenting my French. I will try to live up to her compliment in my response.

I think that the very important principle at the heart of opposition days is that many members of Parliament who are not part of the government have important business in their ridings that they want to be able to discuss in the House of Commons. Opposition days exist for this reason, and there is a certain proportion of days allocated to government business and to opposition business. The government is not respecting this ratio when it extends the sitting hours of the House of Commons but limits those additional hours to just government business. The point of the amendment is to ensure that this proportion is maintained even when we are sitting extended hours.

[*English*]

Hon. Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have been listening with interest to the discussion and debate in the House on this particular motion, Motion No. 22, and I am rising to support the motion.

I have been in this place for a very long time and I have watched political gamesmanship come and go. I have watched, when we were in opposition, all these little games being played occasionally. However, I think what we are talking about right now is that there are still some important government bills that need to be finished. Let us just pick one.

Let us look at Bill C-74, the Budget Implementation Act, 2018, No. 1. I understand and I heard very clearly the debate from the hon. member that this is not going to be fair, that the government had a long time, and that it could have done a lot of things. This may or may not be true; that is not the issue. The point is that there are some things in our budget implementation bill that must come to pass in a certain period of time.

Let us look, for instance, at the Canada child benefit, which is being indexed starting in July this summer, and what will happen if we do not finish the debate on it or if we do not get it passed. If we do not get that done, middle-class families will not get the benefit of the indexation.

There is the workers benefit plan. If we do not get this debate done, workers will not be able to take advantage of that extra \$500 that they may get, especially if they are making \$15,000 a year. That could help them out over the rest of the time.

One could argue about how many angels dance on the head of a pin, who said what, when they said it, and what this is all going to mean if it is or is not fair. At the end of the day, who is it supposed to be fair to? It is supposed to be fair to our constituents. It is supposed to be fair to Canadians. Canadians need to get the benefit of some of the things that are happening in these bills.

Government Orders

Let us look at the issue of pollution. In this House today, we are talking a lot about the environment and pollution, etc. The indexing of carbon needs to start. It needs to move forward. There are 67 nations in the world that have a carbon price, so let us get moving on this. Let us start getting money in and money out, and getting that money back into provinces so that they can start moving. Then we could get the greenhouse gas emissions down, and some other things could come about from the indexing of carbon.

Let us look at Norway. For me, this is the finest example of what a carbon tax could do. Norway started a carbon tax way back, with their former prime minister Gro Harlem Brundtland. All of the oil companies decided that they hated it, but they paid it, and that moved them forward to start doing technology and changing to clean technology in terms of oil and bringing down their greenhouse gases. I think they are the fifth-largest oil producer in the world, but they are number one in terms of environmental sustainability and they are no longer paying a tax.

I hear sometimes from across the way, especially from the hon. members of the official opposition, that this measure is going to kill the economy. Norway has the highest per capita income in the world. All of the Norwegians are enjoying the benefits. The money is going into social programs. It is going into making sure that Norway is a better place for quality of life. When we look at some of these things, we see that we have to get moving.

British Columbia has had a carbon tax, I think for about 10 or 12 or 15 years. Now British Columbia is the number one performing economy in Canada. British Columbia is actually creating more jobs, and we are seeing better employment in British Columbia than in anywhere else across the country. Let us get moving on some of these things.

The point is that we need to move forward with the initiatives that we need to finish before we rise. We all want to go back to our ridings and enjoy the summer, spending time with our families and our constituents. Our constituents need us to roll up our sleeves and get moving here. Let us forget whatever gamesmanship we want to play and who said what and where and when, and who is right or wrong, and let us just get this done for Canadians.

Let us just move forward and do it. I do not understand why this is so difficult to comprehend. When we look at all the people who are waiting for these bills to move forward, we see it is really time to start talking about how to do things to change it.

• (1850)

Let us talk about, for instance, Bill C-65, which addresses harassment and violence in the workplace. Let us get this done, get it moving, so that we can diminish the amount of harassment and violence in the workplace. We know that this is important. If we do not get this done before we rise, and we wait until we come back in the fall, what will happen is that it will continue for an extra three months.

We passed Bill C-66, on which all of us came together. That was a shining example, in my opinion, of how well we can work when we care and when we put Canadians first. Let us look at the expunging of the records of LGBTQ2+ Canadians who were convicted of offences involving consensual sexual activity. The bill was

introduced on the same day the Prime Minister delivered his apology. Everyone in this House came together. We moved forward, and those affected are going to be able to get compensation. We can do things when we want to.

Sometimes I think the politics get in the way of getting the work done. Let us all agree that we need to get this done. Working later hours means that we can get to some of these important pieces of legislation that must be passed for the benefit of Canadians. This is what I am getting to. If we have these extended sittings, one can actually discuss and debate the bills and do what we need to do with these bills. The motion would give us time for that extra debate on those bills.

At least before we rise for the summer, we would be able to say to Canadians that we worked hard; some of us did not like it or think it was fair or the right thing to do, but we were putting them first. I think we sometimes forget to do that in this place. We forget who we are serving and why we should be serving them in a very efficient and effective manner. Tricks and tactics are cute. Everyone gets a “gotcha” and “my strategy is better than yours”, but sometimes we have to put that aside for the benefit of the people who elected us.

Let us think of what we need to get going on and agree on in terms of British Columbia and New Brunswick, which are facing flooding. We know that in British Columbia, there are chances of fires over this very hot summer, which may be another thing we have to deal with. Therefore, let us put in place some kind of process so we can move forward and get help to them.

On Bill C-74, the budget implementation bill, we have seen amendments come from the standing committee. Let us deal with those amendments. Let us look at this and talk about how we get going. We are talking about the Canada child benefit, which is the biggest one I can think of for the middle class. I know that families are waiting for this to give them the extra money they need to help their children. Time is of the essence when we are looking at putting money in people's pockets. Not only that, but once we index it with this bill, it is going to assist indigenous communities. Many do not know that they are eligible or that they need to apply. They need to know how to apply for this money, and it is important for them.

As I said, the new workers benefit, the CWB, will allow Canadians to take home more money while they work, and it will encourage Canadians to enter the labour market. Some of the other pieces in the budget implementation bill will help to create a work-life balance for people in this House and women and men who are working and trying to bring up their children. They are worried that they do not have the time for anything, that they are neither fish nor fowl, they are neither workers nor parents.

Government Orders

Let us move forward and be generous with our time in terms of helping Canadians. We can look at some of the work to do in this House that will not only help middle-class Canadians but also move the economy forward, get people working, and get more jobs going in the summer. I am not being condescending, but we all know that sometimes, for our constituents, a month, two months, or a year is what they need to get moving to live the quality of life they want. Let us get moving on some of these things.

We can look at the Minister of Democratic Reform. I do not necessarily agree or disagree with any of the arguments that have been made, but at the end of the day, we need time to move forward, with the election coming up.

● (1855)

I know that some members have said that we did not do it, and so now what? Who are we punishing when we do not do it and say we could have done it and should have done it, and now we are running late? At the end of the day, getting work done is not about saying “woulda, coulda, shoulda” and that we have a timeline. Let us just put aside some of the scoring of points we try to do in this place. It would really help Canadians in feeling that they can trust their politicians, that politicians sometimes care about them more than about scoring points and creating tactics and “gotcha” moments in the House.

We can look at tax reform in Bill C-74, for instance. We are talking about the fact that small and medium-sized businesses can use the corporate tax savings to help themselves get about \$7,500 a year so they can expand their businesses. In so doing, they can create more jobs. It would help people come summer and moving on into the fall. They can bring new capital investments. Those are some of the things we are talking about.

We also know there are loopholes for large private corporations and that they use the loopholes to avoid paying taxes. Let us fix that. Let us get some of these things moving. It may be the unintended tax advantage they are looking for. Let us fix it. Let us move on and get some of these things done.

I will go back to carbon pricing. Right now, everyone is debating carbon pricing and what is happening with carbon, greenhouse gas emissions, and the Paris agreement. Let us get it moving. Every time we delay things here in the House, we are making Canadians lag behind. We are putting things on hold, when we know that time is of the essence. Again, I am not necessarily disagreeing with people who say that we had an opportunity to do it but we did not and that we are not giving the opposition enough time to get their pieces on the table.

Right now we have legislation on the table that has to be passed for the benefit of Canadians. I will reiterate. Let us put aside all the tactics we are employing in the House, all the gamesmanship, and come together, as we have shown we can. We did it with the LGBTQ2+ issue. Let us show that we can come together for the benefit of Canadians, because that is what we were elected to do.

There will always be enough time for gamesmanship and pointing fingers. However, the environment, the economy, and jobs are very important things. Look at the changes we are proposing in terms of making Parliament more open and transparent. We have promised to

give the Canadian public a bigger say when looking at projects and when planning, and so on. We can get better input from them. Let us get that going. The summer gives Canadians an opportunity to start thinking about these things and having input.

Let us talk about parliamentary committees. I remember being in opposition when the parliamentary committee system was run by the parliamentary secretary, and we had to do what the parliamentary secretary said. They got the agenda going and nobody listened to anyone. We said we were going to change it. We came in, and we did. Parliamentary secretaries sit on committees, because they need to hear what is going on so they can go back to the minister and say what people are debating. However, they have no vote. They cannot run the show anymore. It is now far more democratic in parliamentary committees.

Having chaired a committee myself, I can say that now everyone is busy debating the issues and people are agreeing on so many things. I look to my seatmate here, who is chair of the finance committee. The finance committee is doing yeoman's work. It is changing things and making amendments that are making a difference, and it is all because Parliament is working a whole lot better.

I could go on, but I am not going to. I just want to make a plea. We have made our points in the debate in the House that the government is dragging its feet or not dragging its feet. Members have made their points. Let us now get on with the work. Let us roll up our sleeves and work the extra hours. Let Canadians see that we are committed to them, to the work we need to do, and to the reason we were elected, and let us just get things done.

● (1900)

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to my colleague, I think that was a speech pointedly lacking in self-awareness about what we are debating and what the government has done.

She told the House that we should support this motion, which would give the government an extended ability to pass legislation, without affording the same basic opportunity to the opposition. She is proposing supporting this motion, and opposing the amendment, to give the government advantages the opposition will not have. Why should we do this? The member tells us that it is because they are good bills. She thinks the government legislation is good and should be passed.

With all due respect, the point of a Parliament is that some people think these are good bills, and some people do not think these are good bills. We have sufficient time and mechanisms for debate and discussion about them but should afford opportunities to the opposition to also put forward ideas, in the context of opposition days, and to have the same opportunities the government has.

Government Orders

We have signalled that we would support the motion if the amendment passes. It is simply not good enough for the member to say that the government has legislation it likes, and therefore it should have extra advantages passing its legislation, but it thinks the opposition proposals are bad, and therefore it should be disadvantaged, at a procedural level, in putting them forward. Clearly, that is unreasonable.

I want to ask the member a very specific question about her speech and what she said. She praised the idea of a carbon tax, and she said the carbon tax in B.C. was a great thing. I want to ask the member about the peak price people pay in her riding for gas. Should people in her riding be paying more for gas, less for gas, or the same amount? What would she like to see people in her riding pay for gas? Would she like to see them pay more, less, or the same amount? I would love to hear that from the member.

Hon. Hedy Fry: Mr. Speaker, we are back again to this sort of hedging and arguing about things. The hon. member asked me a question with a yes or no answer. Most things do not have a yes or no answer. Most things have more factors involved in them. I cannot say yes or no. That may not be what happens when we implement a carbon tax.

In British Columbia, the carbon tax has created a strong economy for British Columbians and a large number of jobs. British Columbia has the best performing economy in the country. Tell me we are not. We are. Is there a problem? Does the member have a problem with that?

Is the member saying that he does not like that we want to index the child benefit? Is the member saying that I, alone, like it or that only the government likes it? Does the member not care about that? Does the member not care about the CWB for workers who are making \$15,000 and who could get an extra \$5,000 a year? Is the member opposed to that? Is that a bad thing we are asking to have passed in this House?

I just do not understand the member's argument. We are back again to spurious arguments. They are not about people and helping people to do things. If the member disagrees with the CWB and the middle class getting more money because of the indexing of the child benefit, the member should say so. That is all we are saying. Let us get some of those things done.

● (1905)

Mr. Murray Rankin (Victoria, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking my hon. friend and colleague from British Columbia for her strong endorsement of the NDP's management of that economy, which she correctly states is the strongest economy in the country and for which I am grateful.

However, I thought we were here to talk about Motion No. 22. As a consequence, I feel compelled to bring the member back to the question my hon. colleague from Elmwood—Transcona put on the table. I think he fairly and properly characterized his motion as a compromise in an effort to get from the opposition agreement with the government that we extend the sitting hours of this place.

They would be prepared to do that, I think he said very clearly, if they would treat non-government business the same as government business and let matters involving supply from the opposition,

sometimes called opposition day motions, be treated in the same fashion.

I am sure my colleague would agree that all members are equal in this place. That is a fundamental principle of Parliament. I wonder, therefore, in the spirit of compromise offered by my colleague, if she would be willing to accept that as a way to move forward to do the important work she described.

Hon. Hedy Fry: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the hon. member's comment about his particular government in the province of British Columbia having done so well, but we know that the economy was up and jobs were being created four or five years before the NDP came into power. It has been in power only for a short time.

You are asking whether, when we have only a short period of time and we are looking at extending the hours to fit the work we have to do, it is important to say that work that is not as urgent as some of the things we have to get done before we rise should be ignored and we should just fill the space with other things. That would be a nice thing to think about if we were talking about this in March, but we are talking about this with just a few weeks left in the House, and we still have some of the important things that I talked about, such as the child benefit and bringing back protection to fisheries and marine habitats. As a coastal MP, I know that this is very important. That should be happening now.

We need to get done the work that needs to be done. If there is time left, we could discuss some of these other things, but should we not get done the work that we started? We should finish that, and then we can talk about any other kinds of compromises on other things.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I want to remind hon. members to make their statements and their questions through the Chair, not directly to each other.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what my colleague was talking about really got to the core of what this is about. This is about advancing not just the legislation that has been originally introduced in the House by the government, but also the work the committees have done along the way to shape, mould, and bring forward amendments to that work, and to see it eventually come back to the House so it can be deliberated and voted on prior to the end of the session we are in now.

Would my colleague not agree that this is not about a proportion of time spent for each party? This is about working and bringing forward the legislation and committee work that all parties have been contributing to in order to get to the point where the legislation comes back to the House to be voted on.

● (1910)

Hon. Hedy Fry: Mr. Speaker, I could not have put it better myself. My hon. colleague put it in a nutshell. That is exactly what we are talking about. There is essential work that is already on the table and that has already been done by committees and by the House, which we need to finish. Let us finish that work. That is all I am saying.

Government Orders

Mr. Mark Warawa (Langley—Aldergrove, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it was unfortunate that my colleague did not answer a previous question about how high the carbon tax would have to be and how high she would like the price of gas to go, but perhaps she could answer a simpler question. How much will the carbon tax cost the average Canadian citizen?

Hon. Hedy Fry: Mr. Speaker, that is an interesting question, because we are still dealing with the provinces on how they want to see the price on carbon move forward. We are not saying that every province wants a carbon tax. British Columbia did want it, and it worked well.

I mentioned the fact that Norway now has the highest income per capita in the world. Its people are enjoying an extraordinary quality of life. Looking at the evidence, I would suggest that this is not a negative. It is a positive. I am looking at the evidence here at home with British Columbia, in Norway, and in 67 other countries around the world that have decided to put a price on carbon. It is of benefit. The evidence tells us that. One can, again, start asking those kinds of questions, but, really, they are not simple; they are simplistic.

Hon. Candice Bergen (Portage—Lisgar, CPC): Mr. Speaker, here we go again: another spring, another motion from the Liberal government to sit until midnight. In fact, it is exactly the same motion for midnight sittings that the Liberals used last year. It also has the same flaws that last year's motion contained, and quite frankly, the issues dominating debate in the House are pretty much the same.

Last spring, the Prime Minister was under an ethics investigation. This spring, now that the Ethics Commissioner has found the Prime Minister guilty in four different ways, it is the Prime Minister's friend, the fisheries minister, who is embroiled in what has become known as “clamscam”. Of course, the finance minister is under investigation as well. Boy oh boy, round and round we go.

Last spring, the Liberals were getting ready to ram through the House major changes to the way Parliament works, all to their benefit, of course, because the Liberals never do anything unless it is going to benefit them. Conservatives fought tooth and nail when the Liberals tried to ram through those changes that would erode our democracy. Well, this spring it is the very rules about electing members of Parliament to the House that the Liberals are trying to rig, and to rush those changes through Parliament as we speak.

We see this time and time again. When the Liberals are failing at something, they try to change the rules to benefit themselves. Last spring, the Liberals tabled a budget with a runaway deficit and no balanced budget in sight for decades. This spring, another whopping deficit and still no plan to bring the budget back to balance. Today, they made an announcement of another \$4.5 billion to buy a 60-year-old pipeline, which did not need government money as we already had a private investor who was putting billions into it and creating jobs. However, now the federal government is giving them \$4.5 billion to take down to Houston. Who knows what the costs will be to build this pipeline.

Let us remember that the federal government is not that good at building much of anything. We can look at its records on ships, planes, and the Phoenix system. I do not really trust the government to build anything.

I digress. My point is that more and more billions of taxpayers' dollars are being spent by the Liberal drunken sailor government. We see questionable ethics and self-serving rule rigging, taxing, and spending. The more things change, the more they stay the same.

Now let me turn to the principle of government Motion No. 22. Let me be clear. Conservatives believe in hard work. We believe in doing hard work rather than just talking about it. We do not have a problem at all with working a little extra in the spring. In fact, it is something of an annual ritual around here. We usually work harder in the spring as we gear up for the summer.

The last Conservative government also asked the House of Commons to put in some extra hours in the spring, but one thing we never did in government was to steal time for government business on opposition days. The current government did this last year and is proposing to do it again. It is probably going to ram it through again this year.

Let me just explain once again, for our constituents who are watching, what this means. Paragraph (j) of Motion No. 22 would shortchange the opposition, both the Conservatives and the New Democratic Party, on the only four opposition days remaining this spring. Let me just offer a quick explanation. Over the course of one year, the rules of the House of Commons require the government to set aside 22 sitting days for discussion of topics of the opposition's choosing. That is 22 days in total for the NDP and the Conservatives to talk about issues they believe are important.

We get to discuss the opposition topic all day. Regardless of whether it is a short sitting day, such as a Wednesday, when we have our caucus meeting, or a longer day, such as a Tuesday, we debate the opposition topic all day. That is why we call them “opposition days”. It simply does not matter how long the day is. We get to debate our opposition topic from the beginning of the day to the end of the day.

We have brought forward some very important topics during our opposition days, topics such as support for Kinder Morgan. Interestingly, the government voted against that topic when we brought it forward, but it is now buying the pipeline. That is quite something.

● (1915)

We have brought forward very important topics, such as helping Yazidi girls and women who were victims of ISIS terrorists. We have brought forward motions supporting Israel. There are a number of topics that we have brought forward on opposition days. As I said, it does not matter how long that day it is; it is our day.

Government Orders

If the government is asking the opposition to work longer days, we are fine with that. It only makes sense and it is only fair for the government to also be willing to discuss the opposition topics on those longer days as well, but it is not willing to do that. We have two opposition days left, and I believe the NDP has two as well. Even though we are going to be sitting longer hours, according to Motion No. 22, on opposition days the government is going to stop us earlier from talking about the issue that we have brought forward, probably at 5:30 p.m. or 6:30 p.m. The government will then continue with its business for the rest of the day, but we, the opposition, will not be able to talk about the topic we have brought forward. We do not have a lot of days to do it, and those days are important.

Again, let me remind everyone that when we were in government we did not do that. We might have sat a little longer in the spring, but opposition days also went longer in the spring. It is unbelievable that the Prime Minister, who was elected promising to respect parliamentarians, disrespects the job that we do here so much that he will not even let opposition topics be debated on these longer sitting days.

Wait, did the Prime Minister not recently fly down to New York and encourage people to listen to those who disagree with them? I think I remember that news coverage. There was our Prime Minister, standing at second base in Yankee Stadium with hand on heart, which we have come to learn is the Prime Minister's telltale sign that sanctimony and hypocrisy will soon be following. Nonetheless, there he was, telling university graduates about the importance of tolerating and listening to other people's views. However, our "do as I say, not as I do" Prime Minister has a different attitude when he comes back to his own country and our House of Commons.

Let us not forget that the Liberal Prime Minister, who claims to believe in tolerating other people's views, has imposed a values test on Canadians and organizations looking for help to hire summer students. Those views he does not want to listen to. Their views he is not going to tolerate. Their views have to be shut down because the Prime Minister does not think they are worthy of listening to. He will go to the U.S. and lecture people in the United States about listening to other people's views, but when he comes back to Canada he does the exact opposite. It is unbelievable.

The same Liberal Prime Minister surely did not seem to have tolerance for opposing views when he fired the former chair of the fisheries committee, the hon. member for Coast of Bays—Central—Notre Dame, because he disagreed with the Prime Minister over the summer jobs values test.

The same Prime Minister kicked the hon. member for Saint John—Rothesay off the committee as punishment for disagreeing with the Prime Minister about his dangerous and reckless plan for small business tax changes. Do members remember all that?

Do they remember the feminist Prime Minister? This one was particularly galling for me. He ordered his MPs to veto the election of the hon. member for Lethbridge, who was duly elected to the House of Commons, as chair of the status of women committee, a role which was filled by nomination of the official opposition, because he did not agree with her views on an issue of personal conscience. He was telling an elected member of Parliament what

she can think, what she can believe, and what she can hold dear to her heart. It is utter hypocrisy.

Sadly, this sort of behaviour is not limited to just the Prime Minister. Let me be very clear. I do not think that all Liberal MPs are like this, but, sadly, a lot of them are seeing their leader do it, and they think it gives them permission to do the same thing.

Leadership starts at the top. This is not just a cliché; it is true. An organization's culture is often shaped and moulded, and the signal is sent by the boss. That fact of life is no different with the government. The Minister of Environment and Climate Change was on national television a few weekends ago, saying she has no time for politicians who disagree with her.

• (1920)

Earlier this spring, the Minister of Finance called our deputy leader, the hon. member for Milton, a neanderthal because she did not agree with him. There was no apology, no outrage. They will say one thing and do something completely different.

Now we have the government House leader bringing forward a motion that cuts off debate on opposition motions. No longer will they be opposition days, but opposition half days. The Prime Minister apparently cannot stomach having to listen to opposition ideas for a few extra hours. Maybe the Prime Minister should not have flown off to New York City to give a sermon on tolerance of different opinions. Maybe he should be reflecting on his own words, and at next week's cabinet meeting, maybe he should lay his hand on his heart and give the same speech to all of his colleagues. Certainly the disrespect the Liberals have been showing for ideas is matched by the disrespect they have for Parliament.

However, it is not just weeks of legislation that the Liberals have decided to hinder Parliament with, but also that we have not talked about recently that is incredibly important. Parliament has not been consulted on ordering Canadian troops into harms way as part of a United Nations mission in the west African nation of Mali. In a breach of tradition and practice, the Prime Minister is refusing to consult Parliament on this deployment. The seriousness of this deployment of our soldiers into an active war zone, which is widely considered to be the most dangerous UN mission in the world today, warrants a debate and a vote here in the House of Commons.

Again, the Prime Minister does not want to hear any voices that might disagree with him, that might challenge him, or that might ask him questions that he has no answer for. The Prime Minister, instead of doing what a leader does and taking the heat that comes with leadership, refuses to show the respect that this House, but mostly that our soldiers and their families, deserve.

Government Orders

On the security front, indeed, all Canadians have a vivid memory of the fiasco that was the Prime Minister's journey to India in February. The fumbling and flailing around that we saw from the government and the Prime Minister in the days that followed led to a full-blown diplomatic incident with our ally India, the largest democracy in the world. Conservatives wanted the national security advisor, Daniel Jean, to appear before a parliamentary committee to explain how those conspiracy theories came to be and his comments to the media. Members will recall that for weeks and weeks, because we had seen media reports about Daniel Jean telling the media that India had been part of this so-called conspiracy, we had wanted to talk to him. We wanted him to explain what was going on when a man convicted of attempted murder of a former Indian minister was invited to pal with and hang around with the Liberals at swanky parties in India.

By the way, we have a question on the Order Paper on that. The government will not tell us how much it cost. It is saying that there are just so many departments that it has to look into to find out. How much did all of those parties cost? I am pretty sure they cost a whole lot of money. We are not going to give up on getting those answers, because taxpayers deserve to know. However, the Prime Minister was going to have nothing to do with that kind of exercise and accountability.

Members will remember the Liberal convention in Halifax last month, where the party's outgoing president, the same Anna Gainey who joined the Prime Minister on his illegal vacation on the billionaire's private Caribbean island, told delegates that "now more than ever, we need to have his back", referring to the Prime Minister. Well, just a few weeks before that, the Liberal caucus got a taste of having the Prime Minister's back. The Liberal whip told those on the Liberal backbench that they needed to have the Prime Minister's back and would have to be voting for close to 40 hours. They would have to have his back by voting down the opposition day motion to have the national security advisor appear at committee. They would have to have his back by voting for potentially up to 40 hours. That was quite something. They were not going to give in. At the end of all of that, "Oh captain our captain", they were cheering on the Prime Minister.

● (1925)

Then a week later they realized they had better make sure the national security advisor appeared. He appeared, lo and behold, miraculously. I just want to know how good it felt for the Liberal back bench to have the Prime Minister's back. After all that was said and done, after the extreme pressure laid on by our amazing Conservative team, the government relented. The national security advisor appeared at the public safety committee. It must be so fulfilling, so rewarding to be part of the Liberal caucus, when things like that happen. It must make them proud to go home and tell their constituents what they were doing.

The Liberals wanted to change the way the government asks for spending permission and the way the House of Commons studies these spending proposals. That is what has brought us to where the main estimates have changed. This year the main estimates include a single \$7 billion lump sum under the buzz phrase "budget implementation". The government claimed it would be focused on

initiatives announced in this year's budget. The wording provides no assurance.

Again, the Liberals are ramming this through. The Parliamentary Budget Officer, a dedicated public servant who has had a long career here on Parliament Hill, told the Senate committee he had never seen anything like it. His office stated:

While the Government has included a new Budget Implementation Vote for \$7.0 billion, the initiatives to be funded through this vote are not reflected in the Departmental Plans. Hence, there remains a lack of alignment between the Budget initiatives and planned results.

Let me summarize that: Liberal slush fund. That is what the \$7 billion amounts to.

There are so many more things I could go on talking about. Last year the government tried to ram through changes to the Standing Orders. It wanted to eliminate Friday sittings. The Prime Minister did not want to be here to answer questions. Of course, the list goes on.

Is there a pattern here? Yes, there is. When the chips are down for the Liberal government, its go-to move is to change the game, to rig the rules, to tilt the scales in its favour, always to regain and have its own advantage. We have seen a pattern.

I will close with this, in Bill C-76, the so-called elections modernization act, here is what is happening. The Prime Minister is having a hard time raising money, even with his cash for access. His policies are so bad, people who have supported the Liberal Party for generations cannot support it anymore. Today, I think Kinder Morgan is going to be another example for these lifelong Liberals. Liberal policy is so bad, so destructive of our competitiveness, and so destructive of our foreign relations that longtime Liberals are done writing cheques to the party. The Prime Minister cannot raise money anymore.

What is he going to do? He is changing the election rules in Bill C-76 so that third party funding can flow before the election and help him, but he is limiting the ability of parties that have raised money, who have had people donate willingly to their party. Those parties, like the Conservatives, actually have had a lot of people, hundreds of thousands of people, support them through financial donations.

The Prime Minister says that he does not like that, because he cannot raise money, because he is doing such a terrible job and is such a failure that nobody wants to donate to his party. However, the Leader of the Opposition, our leader, is doing well and the Conservatives are doing well. We have good ideas, stable, strong ideas that are getting donations from supporters right across the country.

The Prime Minister says he is going to change the rules so that the party cannot spend it. The Prime Minister has not learned that he cannot get away with it. I know he does not respect Parliament, but we do respect Parliament. I believe that members of Parliament who have been duly elected, in the end, will also respect Parliament and will follow through and do the right thing.

Government Orders

I hope that the government accepts our amendment. All we are asking for is that on opposition, days we have the same ability to bring our issues forward, even if it is uncomfortable for the government. It is called democracy. Even if the Prime Minister will not respect democracy, I sincerely ask my colleagues on the other side of the House to respect democracy, support our amendment, and then we can finish the work that we are doing here in the House of Commons.

• (1930)

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is a classic case where the Conservatives say one thing and do another.

I will speak to this because the member brought it up, namely the 40-hour voting spree we had and her talk about our supporting the Prime Minister's back. I certainly do have his back. In our government we support each other here.

She spoke about the motions she brought forward on the women survivors of Daesh. When it came to voting for funding to support those survivors of Daesh, the Conservatives voted against it. What else did they vote against? They voted against ensuring that we reimburse first nations for emergency management. They voted against funding for youth employment. She talked about our defence and our military. They voted against funding to support Canada's defence policy.

When we talk about saying one thing and doing another, of actions probably speaking louder than words, the Conservatives have the market cornered on actions and how very void they are when it comes to actually supporting the things they talk about.

Hon. Candice Bergen: Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague addressed a couple of issues there. I will begin with the first one, and that is on the marathon voting that went on here. What happened, just so I can remind her and everyone else, is that we were simply asking for Daniel Jean to come to the public safety committee to testify. It was not unreasonable. It was not a brand new request. It was something we asked for. We said we were going to show the government that we were serious and that there would be a whole lot of votes. There are very few tools we have in opposition. One of the tools we have is that we can have extended votes. We think that is something we have to be able to do to show the government we are serious.

The Prime Minister slept wonderfully that night on his feather bed. He did come in at about 8 in the morning after we had all been here and were exhausted. He came in eight hours later. He looked refreshed. He was energized. Apparently he brought donuts, someone said. My point on that marathon voting was that in the end, Daniel Jean came to committee.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I just want to remind hon. members of two things. One, we are not to speak of someone's presence in the House, whether they are here or not.

Two, another hon. member, I do not want to name him, should know that if he is sitting next to a microphone and it is on and the person who is speaking is trying to get a message across, it makes it hard for the rest of us to understand what she is saying, and I am very interested in hearing what the hon. member has to say.

The hon. member for Portage—Lisgar.

• (1935)

Hon. Candice Bergen: Mr. Speaker, it is like being a singer. Sometimes a backup singer does help. I do not mind if the hon. member wants to be my backup singer.

My point to the hon. member is that most of the Liberal members sat here. I saw them toiling away hour after hour, and in the end the government gave in. This is something that the Liberals will have to make decisions on in the future. If their Prime Minister and the government is going to be giving into what Canadians are asking for, they need to rethink how much they have his back.

On the issue about voting on different measures, we can recall how sanctimonious the Liberals were during the 2015 election when they said they would never, ever use omnibus bills. Then, of course, they immediately started using omnibus bills, not only on public safety and justice legislation, but also on the budget. They threw everything but the kitchen sink into the budget so that they could say that we, the opposition, did not vote for this measure or that measure. It is an old trick. It is an old party; the old party with the old tricks.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Karine Trudel (Jonquière, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would refer to the NDP's proposed amendment concerning a compromise on extended sitting hours for opposition days. There has been a lot of talk about democracy, and democracy means allowing opposition members to express themselves and represent their ridings.

What does my colleague think of the amendment the NDP proposed to the House?

[*English*]

Hon. Candice Bergen: Mr. Speaker, I fully agree with my hon. colleague. Part of what makes our democracy so vibrant is the opposition. I talk a lot with my constituents about the role we play. For example, on the small business tax changes, the government was going to ram those through, penalizing so many of our hard-working men and women across the country, professionals as well as small business owners and farmers.

People will recall that those individuals and their voices were loud, but it was the voice of the opposition in this place that was able to amplify that day in and day out. In fact, we used things like opposition days. We used every tool we had to ensure the government knew it could not ram those small business changes through.

The problem is this. When the government starts to erode the fundamentals of our democracy, it become a slippery slope. We have seen the Liberals try to do it with people's fundamental right to beliefs and conscience. We see it in the House when they try to erode our ability as opposition to do our job. It is about the government recognizing that the role we play, although it might be difficult for the government and for the Prime Minister, is a vital role. It is what makes our democracy vibrant.

Government Orders

Many times, there are opposition motions that the New Democrats bring forward on which the Conservatives might not agree. Then when the vote comes, that is when we have the chance to express that. We have the time to express that during questions and answers during debates. That is when the Liberals can express their displeasure with our opposition day motions. In fact, they can defeat them every time, but we should have the ability to bring them forward and ensure they are talked about. If these days are cut short, it is disrespectful to opposition, whether Conservative, NDP, or other opposition members.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher (Beauport—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île d'Orléans—Charlevoix, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for that magnificent speech. Here is an excerpt from the Liberals' 2015 platform on prorogation and omnibus bills:

We will not resort to legislative tricks to avoid scrutiny.

That is funnier now than ever. I have reread that sentence several times since the Liberals were elected because I am interested and to see how that has played out, seeing as today's Prime Minister of Canada promised us he would be more transparent and cooler. Sure, everyone knows he is cooler. He takes so many photos that everyone knows that.

Anyway, does my colleague think today's Parliament is as transparent as the Prime Minister of Canada promised it would be?

● (1940)

[*English*]

Hon. Candice Bergen: Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague has been doing such an amazing job, working for her constituents and doing a great job in the House.

She is bang on. She sees something I think so many Canadians see. People who voted for the Liberal government, thinking they could trust what the Prime Minister said, wanting to give him a chance, are realizing that he has failed to keep his word on so many issues, not just the issue around respecting parliament, not just the issue around using his majority to ram things through the House and not allow for debate. On issues of balancing the budget, Canadians are seized with the impact of his reckless spending.

On issues around ethics and transparency, as I mentioned earlier in my speech, we have a Prime Minister who, for the first time in history, has been found guilty of breaking four parts of the Conflict of Interest Act. On fiscal responsibility, we see the government taxing Canadians. Canadians are paying more for everything because of the government.

There is electoral reform. The Prime Minister has betrayed veterans. On every front, everything the Prime Minister touches seems to fail. Everything the Prime Minister says he is going to do fails. He may have thought he was going to try hard. He may have thought that if he put his hand on his heart and was very sincere, it would work, but it has failed. This is a failure as well.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise today to contribute to the debate on government Motion No. 22, which is an important motion. It addresses the manner in which the House will continue to work between now and when we eventually reach the summer break. It is

important because it will allow us to make additional progress in advancing the agenda that Canadians have elected us to do in this place.

Motion No. 22 will also position the House to build on the good work that has already been accomplished by the committees and the work that the committees have put forward. I want to highlight that this is not just work that government members on the committees are doing; this is work that all parties and individuals on committees have been contributing to in order to get the legislation back to this place so it can be voted on before the summer break. That is really important.

A lot of the debate today has focused around government legislation, that it is only about what the government wants. Through my participation at committees and the work I have been able to do, I have seen that quite often committees have the ability to work really well together, to collaborate together, to work on a less hyper-partisan level than we seem to experience in this place, and quite often do come to compromises. I know that happens for me and my colleagues at the defence committee. We should all take great pride in that.

The problem is that if we do not have this motion, if we do not extend the sitting hours, we will be put into a situation where all the work we have done basically gets put on the table until the fall. That is why it is so important to do this.

I would like to highlight some of that important work the committees have done. Before I get to that, it is important to stress the fact that during the 2015 election, the governing party now, the Liberal Party at the time, of which I am a part of, made a commitment to strengthen parliamentary committees. In doing so, we were committing a new government's respect for the fundamental roles that parliamentarians played on committees in order to hold government to account.

This commitment included in the mandate letter of the government House leader that under the government, the parliamentary committees would be freer and better equipped with legislation. One of the things out of a whole host of things that committees do differently now is the chairs are elected freely by the members. They are not appointed by the government. It is done with a secret ballot that allows members to freely express who they are putting forward as their selection for chair.

One of the other changes to committee recently was with respect to the addition of putting parliamentary secretaries on committees, but not in a voting capacity, in a capacity that they could be there to contribute when necessary. On the defence committee, parliamentary secretaries do not play a very active role, but they are there so they can stay informed about what the committee is doing. By not having a vote, it removes any potential interference that one might see coming from the minister's office into the committee.

The Standing Orders that enabled all this were passed in June 2017. In my opinion, and I think in the opinion of the majority of the people in the House, they have given committees the ability to genuinely act in a more open, transparent, and free manner.

Government Orders

I would like to quickly highlight some of the important legislation that is currently before Parliament that runs the risk of not being voted on and to be completed and enacted before the end of this session.

The first one I would like to speak to is Bill C-59, which was before the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security. The bill, the national security act, 2017, began in November 2017 and extended to clause-by-clause review in April 2018. This committee literally spent five or six months working on this legislation.

● (1945)

For anybody to suggest that the government somehow does not want committees to have full participation and input is absolutely ridiculous, when we consider the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security spent up to six months on the legislation.

Bill C-59 fulfill's the government's commitment to keep Canadians safe, while safeguarding the rights and freedoms of Canadians.

Members might remember the bill that was introduced by the previous government, Bill C-51, which ended up with massive public outcry and complaints about its infringement upon the rights and freedoms of individuals. During the election, a commitment was made to ensure new legislation would come forward. Now we have seen upward of five to six months of committee deliberation on that work. It is important to note that the committee adopted over 40 amendments to bring greater clarity, transparency, and accountability to the bill.

Another bill before the same committee is Bill C-71, an act to amend certain acts and regulations in relation to firearms. We know this is another thing about which Canadians are extremely concerned. Bill C-71 would enhance background checks on those seeking to obtain firearms. It would make background checks in the existing licensing system more effective. It would also standardize best practices among retailers to maintain adequate inventory and sales records that would be accessible to police officers.

Bill C-71 would also ensure that a classification of firearms would be done in an impartial, professional, and accurate manner, consisting of resorting to a system in which Parliament would define the classes of authorities, but leave would it to experts within the RCMP to determine firearms classification specifically. The most important part of that would be leaving the political influence out of it.

As we can see, Bill C-71 is an important bill that would contribute to public safety. That is why it is so critical to ensure it has an opportunity to come back to the House to be voted on before we break for the summer.

The biggest bill, and in my opinion the most important bill that would do the most for Canadians, is Bill C-74, the budget implementation act. This bill would affect every Canadian from coast to coast. It would increase the opportunities for people to have a fair chance at success, in particular those who are struggling.

The budget implementation act would specifically introduce things like a Canada workers benefit to assist low-income workers. It would index the Canada child benefit to help nine out of 10 Canadian families. It would lower the taxes on small business. It would put in better supports for veterans. It is absolutely critical to have the bill work its way through the finance committee and the deliberations it has with Canadians throughout the country, so it can come back to the House and we can vote on it in a timely fashion.

I have so many more examples of other legislation before committee right now. However, for all of these reasons, it is so important we pass the motion now to allow us to sit later into the evenings so we can ensure we complete the work Canadians have put us here to do.

I want to take two more minutes to speak specifically to the amendments that have come forward today. I know there has been a lot of discussion about the proportion of time being spent on government business versus the proportion of time being spent on opposition motions and opposition days. This is not about proportioning of government versus opposition. This is about ensuring we can put more items on the agenda. That is why it is important to ensure we sit later into the evenings so we can do exactly that. The items I am speaking about are ones that have been collaborated on in committees by all members of all parties of the House.

● (1950)

That is why I personally cannot support the amendments. I do not think that they are particularly good amendments, because they are not going after what we need to do, which is to examine more pieces of legislation, as opposed to proportionally growing the amount of time that each political party gets, which is unfortunately the partisan nature that this debate has been put into.

With that, I see that we are approaching the end of the debate on this matter. I would like to leave an opportunity for people to ask questions. I am happy to entertain those at this time.

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for a very engaging speech, and one that really outlined, I think quite eloquently, the need to have this extra time to debate pretty important legislation that we are trying to advance. Of course, we are here to do the work that Canadians have brought us here to do, and advancing legislation is particularly important.

The member spoke in particular about the budget implementation act and the various initiatives in that legislation that would allow Canadians, such as people in my riding of Whitby, to do a lot better in their lives. I wonder if he can speak a little more about how that particular piece of legislation will impact people in his riding.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most progressive budgets that has ever been before the House, in my opinion. The items within this budget, whether changes to the Canada child benefit or the workers compensation benefit or a whole host of other things that are within the budget, are going to have real impacts on the lives of Canadians and, to her question, to many members in my community.

Government Orders

One of the most basic fundamental functions of government, in my opinion, is to make sure that people have the opportunities to succeed, that they have the opportunities before them so that if they choose to chase after their passions and their dreams, they can fulfill them. That is what a budget like this does, whether it is about child care or about giving equal opportunities to women or changing the way in which we look at policies. That is exactly what this budget does. I am extremely proud to be standing in support of it. I look forward to having the opportunity to do that when we vote on the budget.

• (1955)

Hon. Ed Fast (Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I was out in the lobby listening carefully to the speech by my friend, the member for Kingston and the Islands. He used to be a member of the environment committee and he did good work there. I enjoyed having him there. We miss him. However, he did suggest in his speech that there are remarkable reforms in the committee system and that the committees are independent. In fact, nothing could be further from the truth.

The reality is that the Prime Minister's Office controls every single committee. There are officials from the PMO at those meetings, directing the members on how they should vote. How do I know that? At the environment committee, we were just recently considering Bill C-65, and as we were going through these different

An hon. member: It was Bill C-69.

Hon. Ed Fast: Yes, Bill C-69. Thank you.

As we were going through all of these amendments, with each one it was funny to see the rep from the Prime Minister's Office running up behind the Liberals and telling them how they should be voting, telling them how they should be dealing with the issue. They had been told that with 100 amendments yet to be considered and debated at committee, they were going to cut off debate and vote on those amendments without any further debate. It was to be just up-and-down votes on each one, without our being able to share our views on them.

I would throw that back to the member, whom I do respect and who has had a taste of the environment committee. How can he say that there has been this tremendous reform of our committee system when nothing could be further from the truth?

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Let me get this straight, Mr. Speaker. If I understand this correctly, the rep from the PMO needed to run up behind the Liberal members to tell them how to vote on every vote when they were voting in favour of every single one.

That is the problem with the discussion and the discourse that is going on in here. The member for Abbotsford is making an assertion, and the very least he could do is at least say "in my opinion", but he does not even do that.

It was no different from when the House leader spoke before I did and said that the Prime Minister himself directed the members of the status of women committee to not vote in a particular chair. How on earth does she know for a fact that is what happened? At the very least, why would she not at least say "in my opinion"?

To that end, I was on committee with that member. We had the opportunity to collaborate. The member should know that I, of all people on that committee, was willing to say at certain times, "I disagree with my members. I agree with what the member for Abbotsford said." The member knows that I did that.

For him to ask me that question is extremely rich.

Mr. Chris Bittle (St. Catharines, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member for Kingston and the Islands does a good job.

This comes down to hard work. Constituents send us here to do hard work to get the job done. Opposition members must be heard. That is their right. Disagreement is welcome and vigorous debate is encouraged, but at the end of the day we are legislators and we have to arrive at decisions.

I would like to ask the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands what his thoughts are. What would our constituents think about the opposition to putting in a few extra hours to get the job done?

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, I should point out that the member for St. Catharines does incredibly hard work for his constituents too.

In all seriousness, I have absolutely no problem explaining to my constituents what is going on here. The irony is that until one gets to this place, there is this preconceived notion that things actually happen in the appropriate way, but when one actually gets here and witnesses the antics, it is something else. Opposition members did not get what they wanted on Friday, so they spent 30 minutes banging on their desks. I would not even expect that from my two-year-old.

I will digress from that. I really appreciate the opportunity provided by the member for St. Catharines to express that.

• (2000)

The Deputy Speaker: It being 8:01 p.m., it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of Government Business No. 22 now before the House.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment to the amendment 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.

• (2040)

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

*Government Orders**(Division No. 677)***YEAS**

Members

| | |
|------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Barsalou-Duval | Beaulieu |
| Benson | Blaikie |
| Boulerice | Boutin-Sweet |
| Brosseau | Cannings |
| Caron | Choquette |
| Donnelly | Dubé |
| Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona) | Dusseault |
| Fortin | Garrison |
| Gill | Hardcastle |
| Hughes | Jolibois |
| Kwan | MacGregor |
| Malcolmson | Masse (Windsor West) |
| Mathysen | May (Saainch—Gulf Islands) |
| Moore | Nantel |
| Pauzé | Quach |
| Ramsey | Rankin |
| Saganash | Sansoucy |
| Ste-Marie | Stetski |
| Trudel | Weir — 38 |

NAYS

Members

| | |
|--|-------------------------------|
| Abouttaif | Albas |
| Albrecht | Aldag |
| Alghabra | Allison |
| Amos | Anandasangaree |
| Arnold | Arseneault |
| Arya | Ayoub |
| Badawey | Bagnell |
| Bains | Barlow |
| Baylis | Beech |
| Bennett | Benzen |
| Bergen | Bernier |
| Berthold | Bezan |
| Bittle | Blair |
| Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis) | Block |
| Boissonnault | Bossio |
| Boucher | Brassard |
| Breton | Brisson |
| Caesar-Chavannes | Calkins |
| Carré | Casey (Cumberland—Colchester) |
| Casey (Charlottetown) | Chagger |
| Chen | Chong |
| Clarke | Clement |
| Cooper | Cormier |
| Cuzner | Dabrusin |
| Damoff | DeCoursey |
| Deltell | Dhaliwal |
| Dhillon | Diotte |
| Dreeshen | Drouin |
| Dubourg | Duclos |
| Duguid | Dzerowicz |
| Easter | Eglinski |
| Ehsassi | El-Khoury |
| Erskine-Smith | Eyking |
| Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster) | Falk (Provencher) |
| Fast | Fergus |
| Fillmore | Finley |
| Finnigan | Fisher |
| Fonseca | Fortier |
| Fragiskatos | Fraser (Central Nova) |
| Fry | Fuhr |
| Garneau | Généreux |
| Genuis | Gerretsen |
| Gladu | Godin |
| Gould | Gourde |
| Graham | Grewal |
| Hajdu | Hardie |
| Harvey | Hébert |
| Hehr | Hoback |
| Hogg | Holland |
| Housefather | Hussen |
| Hutchings | Iacono |
| Jeneroux | Joly |
| Jones | Jordan |
| Jowhari | Kelly |

| | |
|---|---|
| Kent | Khalid |
| Khera | Kmiec |
| Kusie | Lake |
| Lambropoulos | Lametti |
| Lamoureux | Lapointe |
| Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation) | Lebouthillier |
| Lefebvre | Leslie |
| Levitt | Liepert |
| Lightbound | Lloyd |
| Lobb | Long |
| Longfield | Ludwig |
| Lukivski | MacAulay (Cardigan) |
| MacKenzie | MacKinnon (Gatineau) |
| Maguire | Maloney |
| Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia) | |
| May (Cambridge) | |
| McCaughey (Edmonton West) | McCrimmon |
| McDonald | McGuinty |
| McKay | McKenna |
| McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam) | McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo) |
| McLeod (Northwest Territories) | Mendès |
| Mendicino | Mihychuk |
| Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound) | Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs) |
| Monsef | Morrissey |
| Motz | Murray |
| Nassif | Nater |
| Nault | Ng |
| Nicholson | O'Connell |
| Oliphant | Oliver |
| O'Toole | Ouellette |
| Paradis | Peschisolido |
| Peterson | Petipas Taylor |
| Philpott | Picard |
| Poilievre | Poissant |
| Qualtrough | Ratansi |
| Rayes | Reid |
| Rempel | Richards |
| Rioux | Robillard |
| Rodriguez | Rogers |
| Romanado | Rota |
| Rudd | Ruimy |
| Rusnak | Sahota |
| Saini | Sajjan |
| Sangha | Sarai |
| Scarpaleggia | Schiefke |
| Schmale | Schulte |
| Serré | Sgro |
| Shanahan | Sheehan |
| Shields | Shipley |
| Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon) | Sidhu (Brampton South) |
| Sikand | Simms |
| Sopuck | Sorbara |
| Sorenson | Spengemann |
| Stanton | Strahl |
| Stubbs | Sweet |
| Tabbara | Tan |
| Tassi | Tilson |
| Trost | Van Kesteren |
| Van Loan | Vandal |
| Vandenbeld | Vaughan |
| Vecchio | Viersen |
| Virani | Warawa |
| Warkentin | Waugh |
| Webber | Whalen |
| Wilkinson | Wilson-Raybould |
| Wong | Wrzesnewskyj |
| Yip | Young |
| Yurdiga | Zimmer — 242 |

PAIRED

Members

LeBlanc Thériault — 2

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

[*Translation*]

The next question is on the amendment.

● (2050)

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

(Division No. 678)

YEAS

Members

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Aboultaif | Albas |
| Albrecht | Allison |
| Arnold | Barlow |
| Barsalou-Duval | Beaulieu |
| Benson | Benzen |
| Bergen | Bernier |
| Berthold | Bezan |
| Blaikie | Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis) |
| Block | Boucher |
| Boulerice | Boutin-Sweet |
| Brassard | Brousseau |
| Calkins | Cannings |
| Caron | Carrie |
| Chong | Choquette |
| Clarke | Clement |
| Cooper | Deltell |
| Diotte | Donnelly |
| Dreeshen | Dubé |
| Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona) | Dusseault |
| Eglinski | Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster) |
| Falk (Provencher) | Fast |
| Finley | Fortin |
| Garrison | Généreux |
| Genuis | Gill |
| Gladu | Godin |
| Gourde | Harcastle |
| Hoback | Hughes |
| Jeneroux | Jolibois |
| Kelly | Kent |
| Kmiec | Kusie |
| Kwan | Lake |
| Liepert | Lloyd |
| Lobb | Lukiwski |
| MacGregor | MacKenzie |
| Maguire | Malcolmson |
| Masse (Windsor West) | Mathysen |
| May (Saanch—Gulf Islands) | McCauley (Edmonton West) |
| McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo) | Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound) |
| Moore | Motz |
| Nantel | Nater |
| Nicholson | O'Toole |
| Pauzé | Poilievre |
| Quach | Ramsey |
| Rankin | Rayes |
| Reid | Rempel |
| Richards | Saganash |
| Sansoucy | Schmale |
| Shields | Shiple |
| Sopuck | Sorenson |
| Stanton | Ste-Marie |
| Stetski | Strahl |
| Stubbs | Sweet |
| Tilson | Trost |
| Trudel | Van Kesteren |
| Van Loan | Vecchio |
| Viersen | Warawa |
| Warkentin | Waugh |
| Webber | Weir |
| Wong | Yurdiga |

NAYS

Members

| | |
|------------|----------------|
| Aldag | Alghabra |
| Amos | Anandasangaree |
| Arseneault | Arya |
| Ayoub | Badawey |
| Bagnell | Bains |
| Baylis | Beech |
| Bennett | Bittle |

Blair
Bossio
Brison
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Cormier
Dabrusin
DeCoursey
Dhillon
Dubourg
Duguid
Easter
El-Khoury
Eyking
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Gerretsen
Graham
Hajdu
Harvey
Hehr
Holland
Hussen
Iacono
Jones
Jowhari
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Lightbound
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
Maloney
May (Cambridge)
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Soeurs
Monsef
Murray
Nault
O'Connell
Oliver
Paradis
Peterson
Philpott
Poissant
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Rota
Ruimy
Sahota
Sajjan
Sarai
Schieffe
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Tabbara
Tassi
Vandenbeld
Virani
Wilkinson
Wrzesnewskyj
Young— 161

Government Orders

Boissonnault
Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Duclos
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fergus
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fry
Garneau
Gould
Grewal
Hardie
Hébert
Hogg
Housefather
Hutchings
Joly
Jordan
Khalid
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lefebvre
Levitt
Long
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Morrissey)
Nassif
Ng
Oliphant
Ouellette
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Qualtrough
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rudd
Rusnak
Saini
Sangha
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tan
Vandal
Vaughan
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

PAIRED

Members

LeBlanc Thériault— 2

The Speaker: I declare the amendment defeated.

Government Orders

[English]

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

• (2055)

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

(Division No. 679)

YEAS

Members

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Aldag | Alghabra |
| Amos | Anandasangaree |
| Arseneault | Arya |
| Ayoub | Badawey |
| Bagnell | Bains |
| Baylis | Beech |
| Bennett | Bittle |
| Blair | Boissonnault |
| Bossio | Breton |
| Brison | Caesar-Chavannes |
| Casey (Cumberland—Colchester) | Casey (Charlottetown) |
| Chagger | Chen |
| Cormier | Cuzner |
| Dabrusin | Damoff |
| DeCoursey | Dhaliwal |
| Dhillon | Drouin |
| Dubourg | Duclos |
| Duguid | Dzerowicz |
| Easter | Ehsassi |
| El-Khoury | Erskine-Smith |
| Eyking | Fergus |
| Fillmore | Finnigan |
| Fisher | Fonseca |
| Fortier | Fragiskatos |
| Fraser (Central Nova) | Fry |
| Fuhr | Garneau |
| Gerretsen | Gould |
| Graham | Grewal |
| Hajdu | Hardie |
| Harvey | Hébert |
| Hehr | Hogg |
| Holland | Housefather |
| Hussen | Hutchings |
| Iacono | Joly |
| Jones | Jordan |
| Jowhari | Khalid |
| Khera | Lambropoulos |
| Lametti | Lamoureux |
| Lapointe | Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation) |
| Lebouthillier | Lefebvre |
| Leslie | Levitt |
| Lighbound | Long |
| Longfield | Ludwig |
| MacAulay (Cardigan) | MacKinnon (Gatineau) |
| Maloney | Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia) |

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| May (Cambridge) | McCrimmon |
| McDonald | McGuinty |
| McKay | McKenna |
| McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam) | McLeod (Northwest Territories) |
| Mendès | Mendicino |
| Mihychuk | Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Soeurs) |
| Monsef | Morrissey |
| Murray | Nassif |
| Nault | Ng |
| O'Connell | Oliphant |
| Oliver | Ouellette |
| Paradis | Peschisolido |
| Peterson | Petitpas Taylor |
| Philpott | Picard |
| Poissant | Qualtrough |
| Ratansi | Rioux |
| Robillard | Rodriguez |
| Rogers | Romanado |
| Rota | Rudd |
| Ruimy | Rusnak |
| Sahota | Saini |
| Sajjan | Sangha |
| Sarai | Scarpaleggia |
| Schieffe | Schulte |
| Serré | Sgro |
| Shanahan | Sheehan |
| Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon) | Sidhu (Brampton South) |
| Sikand | Simms |
| Sorbara | Spengemann |
| Tabbara | Tan |
| Tassi | Vandal |
| Vandenbeld | Vaughan |
| Virani | Whalen |
| Wilkinson | Wilson-Raybould |
| Wrzesnewskyj | Yip |
| Young— 161 | |

NAYS

Members

| |
|--|
| Albas |
| Allison |
| Barlow |
| Beaulieu |
| Benzen |
| Bernier |
| Bezan |
| Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis) |
| Boucher |
| Boutin-Sweet |
| Brousseau |
| Cannings |
| Carrie |
| Choquette |
| Clement |
| DelTelle |
| Donnelly |
| Dubé |
| Dusseau |
| Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster) |
| Fast |
| Fortin |
| Généreux |
| Gill |
| Godin |
| Hardeastle |
| Hughes |
| Jolibois |
| Kent |
| Kusie |
| Lake |
| Lloyd |
| Lukiwski |
| MacKenzie |
| Malcolmson |
| Mathysen |
| McCauley (Edmonton West) |
| Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound) |
| Motz |
| Nater |
| O'Toole |
| Poilievre |

Government Orders

Quach
Rankin
Reid
Richards
Sansoucy
Shields
Sopuck
Stanton
Stetski
Stubbs
Tilson
Trudel
Van Loan
Viersen
Warkentin
Webber
Wong
Zimmer — 119

Ramsey
Rayes
Rempel
Saganash
Schmale
Shipley
Sorenson
Ste-Marie
Strahl
Sweet
Trost
Van Kesteren
Vecchio
Warawa
Waugh
Weir
Yurdiga

PAIRED

Members

LeBlanc

Thériault — 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

CRIMINAL CODE

BILL C-75—TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister of Small Business and Tourism, Lib.) moved:

That, in relation to Bill C-75, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Youth Criminal Justice Act and other Acts and to make consequential amendments to other Acts, not more than 5 further hours shall be allotted for the consideration at second reading stage of the Bill; and

That, at the expiry of the five hours provided for the consideration at the second reading stage, any proceedings before the House shall be interrupted, if required for the purpose of this Order, and, in turn, every question necessary for the disposal of the said stage of the Bill shall be put forthwith and successively, without further debate or amendment.

• (2100)

The Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 67.1, there will now be a 30-minute question period. I invite hon. members who wish to ask questions to rise in their places so the Chair has some idea of the number of members who wish to participate in this question period.

The hon. member for Niagara Falls.

Hon. Rob Nicholson (Niagara Falls, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the justice minister. The obvious one is why are they doing this? There were no delays when this bill was called up a couple of days ago. We in the official opposition put up three speakers because there is a considerable amount of interest in this legislation. There was no attempt to disrupt or hold this up. I am very interested to hear what the minister has to say.

This bill was introduced the day before Good Friday, just as Parliament was rising. It has over 300 pages of changes to the Criminal Code. I agree with the Minister of Justice that there are some good things in it, but that being said, there are huge changes being made to the Criminal Code, particularly with respect to the question of sentencing. The minister says she is not reducing sentencing, but if they give the option to the courts to turn these into summary conviction offences, they will in effect be doing exactly that.

I would like to know this as well. Is the minister already starting to hear from groups who are worried about impaired driving and the possibility of it being a summary conviction offence? They make that possible for somebody convicted of impaired driving causing bodily harm. Then there are the changes relating to the kidnapping of children under the age of 14 and participation in criminal organizations. This is huge. Therefore, I am hoping that the minister will answer what the rationale is behind that. I will suggest to the minister that she separate some of those elements from the bill, and then get on with some of the other things that all of us could agree on?

Hon. Jody Wilson-Raybould (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague raised a number of issues.

It is clear that there is a challenge with delays in the criminal justice system. The Supreme Court of Canada has challenged all of the actors in the criminal justice system to make substantive changes, to effect a culture shift. That is what we are doing with Bill C-75. Members on this side of the House have spoken. Members of the NDP have spoken. It is clear that members of the official opposition are trying to delay if not prevent second reading debate on this most important piece of legislation. It is my suggestion that we get this piece of legislation to committee, and that is what we are doing, so we can ensure that we have continued debate on this important piece of legislation to answer the Supreme Court of Canada's call.

With respect to my hon. colleague's discussions, I would be very cautious of the hon. member across the way raising impaired driving when the Conservatives have proposed removing mandatory alcohol screening from this most important piece of legislation and that would actually gut Bill C-46. We are trying to ensure there is safety on the roads. I am more than happy to talk about why we are reclassifying offences.

Mr. Randall Garrison (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke, NDP): Mr. Speaker, in just a moment I will be seeking unanimous consent for a motion dealing with Bill C-32. Bill C-32 would repeal an archaic section of section 159 of the Criminal Code. Adopting Bill C-32 would remove a longstanding point of discrimination against gay men by eliminating the unequal age of consent for anal sex.

Bill C-32 was tabled on November 25, 2016, and it has been sitting on the Order Paper since then. With the imminent passage of Bill C-66 in the other place, I am asking that Bill C-32 be adopted at all stages by the House today so that criminal records based on section 159 of the Criminal Code would immediately and clearly qualify for expungement as provided in Bill C-66.

That is why I am seeking unanimous consent for the following motion, that notwithstanding any Standing Order or usual practice of the House, Bill C-32, an act related to the repeal of Section 159 of the Criminal Code, shall be deemed to have been read a second time and referred to committee of the whole, deemed considered in committee of the whole, deemed reported without amendment, deemed concurred in at report stage, and deemed read a third time and passed.

Government Orders

• (2105)

The Deputy Speaker: Does the hon. member for Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke have the unanimous consent of the House to propose this motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: We are going to take two minutes more for questions on this. The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today we are debating a number of different issues in the House. Clearly, the government is moving ahead with this legislation.

The Prime Minister and his cabinet, which includes the justice minister, voted against the bill dealing with single sports betting, which is an important issue for communities across Canada. About \$8 billion goes to organized crime and offshore betting. In a six to two decision, the United States Supreme Court agreed to allow this in the United States. Why is the minister not showing the same support for getting rid of organized crime around single event sports betting?

Why is the minister not dealing with offshore tax havens and nefarious operations related to the use of this money, and giving revenue back to deal with gaming addiction? Why is the minister allowing communities to compete with the United States, which now has an advantage for single event sports betting that we do not have?

Hon. Jody Wilson-Raybould: Mr. Speaker, when private members' bills are put forward, we consider them closely. I recognize the challenges posed by gambling and the need to address this issue. We considered that private member's bill closely.

We are now talking about Bill C-75, which would address significant delays in the criminal justice system. I am hopeful that we will have the support of all members of the House to move forward with this most important piece of legislation.

Mr. Mark Strahl (Chilliwack—Hope, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this is the third time today that we have been dealing with a motion before the House to cut off debate. The Liberal Party spent the entire last Parliament crying every single time the government of the day moved forward with time allocation. Now the Liberals have done the same thing three times in the same day, cutting off debate of the opposition after only three speakers were heard on this particular legislation.

The minister is a new member of Parliament. I wonder if she is proud of the fact that her government has implemented closure, cutting off debate three times in a single day.

Hon. Jody Wilson-Raybould: Mr. Speaker, new member or not, I am incredibly proud of the work our government has done. I am incredibly proud to introduce Bill C-75, which answers the Supreme Court of Canada's call to address delays in the criminal justice system. We are making every effort.

Members across the way continue to ask me questions about delays and why we have not done anything about delays. I would assume that they will not cut off second reading debate and actually support this legislation and get it to committee so we can have the necessary discussions and debate and proposed amendments.

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to pick up on a comment the minister just made.

We have heard during question period and during debate about the delays in court proceedings, about how people are getting off from being convicted and all of the injustices that are happening as a result. Now we have an opportunity to vote for the bill to go to committee.

Members across the aisle should be happy about the work that the Minister of Justice has been doing, including the fact that she has appointed a record number of judges and is now introducing a piece of legislation that would allow even more of her great work to take place.

• (2110)

Hon. Jody Wilson-Raybould: Mr. Speaker, I would hope that all members of the House take delays in the criminal justice system seriously.

We have put forward Bill C-75 with a huge amount of consideration and consultation to ensure that we have the provinces and territories on board with the bold reforms we have proposed. We have had consultation across the country via round tables. The Senate committee on legal and constitutional affairs has submitted a substantive report, and many of their recommendations are contained in Bill C-75. These bold reforms are necessary.

I look to the members across the way to ensure that we do everything we can to answer the Supreme Courts of Canada's call and to make these necessary changes. If we get this bill to committee, we can have the necessary conversations and debate to ensure that we put the best piece of legislation forward.

Hon. Erin O'Toole (Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I echo my whip's concern about the government's excessive use of time allocation and omnibus bills. I hear groans from many of the Liberal MPs who were not here in the last Parliament when their deputy House leader used to say repeatedly that these were assaults on democracy. They are assaulting the House today in particular.

What troubles me about this omnibus legislation is that our Minister of Justice is also the attorney general, the chief prosecutor in Canada. The defence bar in Canada does not want Bill C-75 rushed. In fact, it has said repeatedly that it denounces both the elimination of preliminary hearings and the stipulation that police evidence can only be introduced in written form and not as *viva voce* evidence. Speaking on behalf of the defence bar, Michael Spratt, who is someone I do not generally agree with politically, said that these changes "will erode fundamental safeguards of trial fairness." Now they are not allowing any debate. How can our chief prosecutor do this?

Hon. Jody Wilson-Raybould: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to stand up to speak to the measures we propose putting into place via Bill C-75. This is a very comprehensive piece of legislation that deserves the necessary discussion and debate, including from defence counsel, when it arrives in committee. I look forward to that dialogue and discussion.

Government Orders

I certainly recognize that this is a very large bill, but it deals with measures to amend the Criminal Code. Amending the Criminal Code is its theme. I would reference my hon. colleague across the way when he was talking about section 159 in what was then Bill C-32. This has been amalgamated into Bill C-75, and it is a necessary provision that needs to be repealed.

We are entirely supportive of all the provisions in Bill C-75 and we look forward—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Cowichan—Malahat—Langford.

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Mr. Speaker, one gets the sense that someone in the government House leader's office looked at the parliamentary calendar and suddenly started panicking when they saw how much time they had left.

That aside, Bill C-75 is like a giant amoeba: it has swallowed three previous justice bills, one of which had swallowed another bill. We now have four previous justice bills in Bill C-75.

The Minister of Justice came to power with a very strong mandate to reform our criminal justice system. If that is the case, why did she let those four previous justice bills languish at first reading for so long, and only now, in the third year of her mandate, move ahead with Bill C-75 and cutting off Parliament's ability to properly debate this bill?

Hon. Jody Wilson-Raybould: Mr. Speaker, members on this side of the House have had the opportunity to speak to Bill C-75. It is my understanding that the members from the New Democratic Party have had the opportunity to speak to this legislation. The members of the official opposition have refused to speak to the bill, and they want to cut off second reading debate.

The member opposite is correct in that we amalgamated a number of justice bills, which represent very important pieces of potential legislation around the victim fine surcharge, around human trafficking, and around phase one of the charter cleanup, which includes section 159. These are incredibly important pieces of legislation that would amend the Criminal Code. We have put them into Bill C-75, which speaks to efficiencies and effectiveness.

This is an important piece of legislation that deserves a debate in committee.

• (2115)

Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, so far I have been completely unimpressed with this minister's justification for pushing this bill forward so quickly.

I have a great respect for the legal community. When New Zealand had a major reform of its criminal justice system, it took five years for it to go through a process in which the legal community was able to sort out what things should go forward. It was actually a very good process for that country.

On the contrary, this minister has not given the legal community that kind of consultation. Worse than that, the Parliament of Canada deserves to have input and a say in these kinds of matters before the bill goes to committee. Why is she shutting out members of Parliament? Does she not think that members on this side or on that

side have something to say about justice reforms that she is carrying out without proper consultation with this place?

Hon. Jody Wilson-Raybould: Mr. Speaker, the member opposite talks about being impressed or not impressed. I am not impressed with the misrepresentations and the hyperbole that is coming from the other side of the House from the official opposition.

This is an incredibly important bill. The member opposite is alluding to consultation or engagement with the legal community. I have engaged, my parliamentary secretaries have engaged, and my officials have engaged for two and a half years, and then some, with respect to getting feedback from the legal community, from all actors in the justice system, including having two federal, provincial, and territorial meetings with my counterparts in the provinces and territories, the justice ministers, all of whom are supportive of the bold reforms that we are putting forward.

This is a necessary measure to answer the call to action of the Supreme Court of Canada.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I have to say it is nearly unbelievable that we have had three time allocations in one day today.

In this debate period, we do not usually speak to the merits of the legislation. In Bill C-75 there is much that is important with respect to reforms. For instance, I am pleased to see it is getting rid of peremptory challenges to jurors. That was clearly a big issue in the Colten Boushie case.

However, we stand here today to ask the government why time allocation is being used time and time again. It is anti-democratic. There is no way around it. The minister can say that this bill is so important that it deserves full debate in committee—it deserves full debate in the House.

I ask the hon. minister if she can please explain why this bill is now an emergency that requires that we shorten the opportunities for those of us particularly in smaller parties to have a chance to debate this bill.

Hon. Jody Wilson-Raybould: Mr. Speaker, we are moving forward with Bill C-75. We want to get it to committee to have this discussion.

There have been conversations among the parties with respect to Bill C-75. From those discussions, members on this side have spoken to this bill, the New Democratic Party has exhausted its speakers, and members from the official opposition see fit to not speak to this bill at all, and in fact to cut off second reading debate.

We want to get this bill to committee so that the legal community and others can have further dialogue and debate, make suggestions, and put forward potential amendments to improve this legislation. This is an important piece of legislation, and we would like to get it to committee.

Government Orders

Mr. Michael Cooper (St. Albert—Edmonton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice, in response to the question posed by the hon. member for Niagara Falls, stated that she is committed to getting tough on impaired drivers. It was this Minister of Justice who opposed tougher sentences in Bill C-46 for the most serious of impaired driving offences, including impaired driving causing death, and it is now this minister who has introduced legislation in Bill C-75 that will make the offence of impaired driving causing bodily harm prosecutable by way of summary conviction. In other words, instead of facing up to 10 years behind bars, individuals who commit the offence of impaired driving causing bodily harm may be able to get away with a slap on the wrist and a mere fine. How is that taking impaired driving seriously?

Hon. Jody Wilson-Raybould: Mr. Speaker, I think there are two questions there. The member opposite references Bill C-46, which is the impaired driving legislation. When passed, this measure will create among the toughest impaired driving regimes in the world. I find it remarkable that the opposition members are talking about impaired driving when members of the Conservative Party in the other House voted to gut Bill C-46 to remove mandatory alcohol screening, which has proven to save lives, which is supported by MADD Canada, and which is supported by the chiefs of police. This is remarkable.

In terms of sentencing, which is what the member opposite is talking about with respect to impaired driving, we are looking at reclassifying offences. This is not to change the fundamental principles of sentencing, which require proportionality, but to ensure that we provide prosecutors with the necessary tools to utilize their discretion to proceed by way of summary conviction or by indictment to ensure that they can use their discretion and assist with respect to court delays.

● (2120)

Mr. Daniel Blaikie (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, a big part of Bill C-75—the stated purpose of it, anyway—is to try to address delay within the court system. However, we know from debate in the House and from reports in the media that an important cause of delay in the court system is that a lot of judicial vacancies have not been filled.

I am wondering if it is possible to move a time allocation motion on the period of time that the minister takes to appoint judges when there are vacancies, because if it is possible, I think she would find that there is support on the opposition benches for that time allocation motion. If it is possible, would she move it?

Hon. Jody Wilson-Raybould: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to talk about the judicial appointments process, which we dramatically reformed. I have to say that I am incredibly proud of the 179 Superior Court judges that I have appointed. Last year, 100 appointments were made, which is more than any other minister of justice has made in more than two decades.

In terms of judicial appointments, of course this is something that I take seriously. I am going to continue to fill the necessary vacancies. This is one aspect that could potentially contribute toward the delays. However, 99% of criminal cases are heard in provincial courts. We are continuing to work with our provincial and territorial counterparts to ensure that we are moving forward with Bill C-75, which is an incredibly collaborative bill.

I am going to continue to address the appointments of judges, but the member opposite should know that this is only one aspect. There are more complicated issues that need to be addressed as well.

Mrs. Karen Vecchio (Elgin—Middlesex—London, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am going to change the channel and look at some facts on victims. One thing that I have been studying as I have been writing my speech for Bill C-75 is about human trafficking and sexual exploitation.

We know that the average age is from 11 to 14. We know that this is a growing epidemic. We also know that there were a number of cases in 2012 and 2014, and we put in hard legislation, but these perpetrators, these pimps that allow this to happen to our children, are going to be provided a summary conviction. I am wondering why we are taking the side of criminals and not the side of victims who are like our children.

Hon. Jody Wilson-Raybould: Mr. Speaker, every member in this House, I am certain, takes the issue of human trafficking extremely seriously. These are among the most vulnerable people in our society, and we need to protect them.

The reforms that we are making in the criminal justice system are broad-based. They ensure that we are protecting public safety, that we are showing compassion and respect for victims, and that people are held to account for their offences.

Contained within Bill C-75 is the bill that we had introduced to deal with human trafficking. However, because this is a difficult offence to prove, the bill proposes to provide additional tools to prosecutors and law enforcement in order to prove the offence of human trafficking. That is one measure.

In terms of assisting victims, we are doing many different things, including in the areas of domestic violence and sexual assault. We are bolstering the intimate partner violence provisions within this bill, among many other things. Recognizing that this is Victims and Survivors of Crime Week, we have engaged in a number of ways to assist with respect to victims and to ensure that we are showing our compassion and respect to them.

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes: Mr. Speaker, I am hearing from across the way that this piece of legislation would reduce sentencing and make it easier for those who perpetrate crimes to get away with them. Could the minister please speak to that and correct the record so that constituents in my riding and in fact all Canadians can understand that there are some things being said across the way that are just factually incorrect? I would like her to set the record straight.

● (2125)

Hon. Jody Wilson-Raybould: Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for the opportunity to correct the mischaracterization that members opposite are projecting on the reclassification of offences.

Reclassification of offences is not about sentencing ranges. Instead, these amendments would give crown prosecutors, as I said, the necessary discretion to elect the most efficient form of prosecution, whether that be by way of summary conviction or by indictment. This measure does not speak to or change the fundamental principles of sentencing; what it does speak to is the amount of court time.

Government Orders

All offences are serious, but if the offence merits moving by way of summary conviction, it can be dealt with in the provincial court, where matters are less complicated, thereby expediting and leaving room and time in the superior courts for the more complex cases. This measure would contribute, as do the other measures in this bill, to a comprehensive approach that will tackle delays in a fundamental way.

Mr. Michael Cooper: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice says the government is not watering down sentences. The fact is that the government has taken a whole series of indictable offences that are punishable by up to 10 years in prison and is now making them hybrid offences that could be prosecuted by way of summary conviction. The maximum penalty for a summary conviction is two years less a day.

Individuals who are convicted of offences ranging from promoting terrorism to kidnapping a minor to arson for fraudulent purposes to impaired driving causing bodily harm could get away with, literally, a fine, thanks to the minister.

What part about sentencing does the minister not understand when she is watering down sentences from up to 10 years behind bars to two years less a day?

Hon. Jody Wilson-Raybould: Mr. Speaker, I have to comment on the absolute mischaracterization by the member opposite with respect to what we are doing in terms of the reclassification of offences.

We are not touching the sentencing ranges. We are providing the necessary discretion in terms of additional offences for a prosecutor to proceed by way of summary conviction or by way of indictment. This does not change the facts of a specific offence. This does not change the fact that the prosecutor, given the gravity of the offence, will proceed in the necessary and appropriate manner.

We are not changing the fundamental principles of sentencing at all. I want to be very clear about this. The members opposite can try to work really hard to incite fear, but what we are doing is working with the provinces and territories that have agreed to these bold reforms, including the reclassification of offences, to tackle in a fundamental way something their government was not able to do to ensure that we address delays in the criminal justice system.

Mr. Brian Masse: Mr. Speaker, we are here tonight debating Bill C-75, which has been crammed with a lot of different changes taking place from other legislation. It is now receiving less time in the House here before going to committee.

Could the minister explain to the House, or at least go on the record to say if she believes that her process and her government's process right now to fast-track this bill and limit debate and cram it together like this is going to lead to better legislation, or to potential problems later on?

In the minister's opinion, is this the best professional way to deal with the criminal justice system in Canada?

Hon. Jody Wilson-Raybould: Mr. Speaker, with Bill C-75, we have introduced a very comprehensive piece of legislation.

In my view and in the view of the government, the best way to deal with the criminal justice system is to ensure that we have done

our homework, ensure that we work with officials not just within my department but across the country, ensure that we are working with the provinces and territories to bring forward and understand a shared responsibility on the administration of justice, and ensure that there is agreement around the bold reforms that are necessary.

We have had extensive consultations and discussions with the provinces and territories. We are taking heed of the report of the Senate committee on legal and constitutional affairs, which did a detailed study on justice delays, and we are taking heed of online surveys as well as round tables right across the country in every jurisdiction.

We are taking this incredibly seriously. We have the evidence to support the reforms that we are making. I would invite the members opposite to support alleviating the delays in the criminal justice system.

• (2130)

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher (Beauport—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île d'Orléans—Charlevoix, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the minister says she spoke to the provincial representatives. That is good, but did she listen to them? We know there are delays everywhere, especially in Quebec. If she wants us to debate this bill, then let's debate it.

Will she accept amendments from other parties in the House?

She says she worked with officials, but did she even talk to the main people involved, the victims of crime? I doubt it. I would like—

The Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. Minister of Justice.

[*English*]

Hon. Jody Wilson-Raybould: Mr. Speaker, I am incredibly proud to answer the member opposite's question.

With respect to listening to the provinces, and I will add the territories, of course we have listened to the provinces and territories. If the member opposite was familiar with the Government of Quebec, the minister of justice was involved in the discussions we had. The provinces and territories and I issued a press release about the bold reforms that are necessary in six fundamental areas.

We have acted on the fundamental areas that have been identified. Of course we are listening to the provinces and territories. We will continue to listen to the provinces and territories.

With respect to amendments, absolutely, I am always open to hearing amendments. I am always open to hearing how we can improve on a piece of legislation, not only from the parties in the opposition but from the actors and the witnesses that come before committee.

Government Orders

In terms of front-line workers, we had a round table on victims and those who advocate for victims. We had a round table that included judges, defence counsel, and prosecutors in every jurisdiction across the country, so we have done our necessary homework. We have the evidence to put forward on Bill C-75.

I would seek all members' abilities in having these debates and discussions, and where this bill can be improved, let us improve it. This is the opportunity we have to address the Supreme Court's—

The Deputy Speaker: Questions. Who has not had a chance?

The hon. member for Langley—Aldergrove.

Mr. Mark Warawa (Langley—Aldergrove, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I think one of the problems in this Parliament is what is happening in committees.

The minister has said that she wants this to go to committee. That is why there is unending debate in this House. The debate that should happen in this House is now going to be sent to the committee. However, the committees are dysfunctional. The Prime Minister's Office has instructed the committees to not permit productive debate within the committees.

The question to the minister is whether this will change. Will she ask the Prime Minister to now let the committees do their democratic work and allow the good discussion to happen in committees, as it should? Will the minister advocate for democracy within the committees?

Hon. Jody Wilson-Raybould: Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the comments from the member across the way, and I would have to, with great respect, disagree. Committees are not dysfunctional. Committees are filled with members of Parliament who work incredibly hard to hear from witnesses, to write reports about very important matters, to consider legislation that has been put forward, and to consider private member's bills. This is an incredibly important part of the parliamentary process. I have taken great heed of the recommendations in terms of amendments that have come forward from committees that have considered legislation I have put forward, as have all members of this government.

Therefore, I think it is a very misplaced characterization of what our committee members do. They are not dysfunctional. They are a fundamental part of the parliamentary process.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: The time for question period having expired, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings at this time and put forthwith the question on the motion now before the House.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion 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 yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Call in the members.

● (2210)

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

(*Division No. 680*)

YEAS

Members

| | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| Aldag | Alghabra |
| Amos | Anandasangaree |
| Arseneault | Arya |
| Ayoub | Badawey |
| Bagnell | Bains |
| Baylis | Beech |
| Bennett | Bittle |
| Blair | Boissonnault |
| Bossio | Breton |
| Caesar-Chavannes | Casey (Charlottetown) |
| Chagger | Chen |
| Cormier | Cuzner |
| Dabrusin | Damoff |
| DeCoursey | Dhaliwal |
| Dhillon | Drouin |
| Dubourg | Duclos |
| Duguid | Dzerowicz |
| Easter | Ehsassi |
| El-Khoury | Erskine-Smith |
| Eyking | Fergus |
| Fillmore | Finnigan |
| Fisher | Fonseca |
| Fortier | Fragiskatos |
| Fraser (Central Nova) | Fry |
| Fuhr | Gameau |
| Gerretsen | Graham |
| Grewal | Hajdu |
| Hardie | Harvey |
| Hébert | Hehr |
| Hogg | Holland |
| Housefather | Hussen |
| Hutchings | Iacono |
| Joly | Jones |
| Jordan | Jowhari |
| Khalid | Khera |
| Lambropoulos | Lametti |
| Lamoureux | Lapointe |
| Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation) | Lebouthillier |
| Lefebvre | Leslie |
| Levitt | Lightbound |
| Long | Longfield |
| Ludwig | MacAulay (Cardigan) |
| MacKinnon (Gatineau) | Maloney |
| Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia) | |
| May (Cambridge) | |
| McCrimmon | McDonald |
| McGuinty | McKay |
| McKenna | McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam) |
| McLeod (Northwest Territories) | Mendès |
| Mendicino | Mihychuk |
| Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs) | |
| Monsef | |
| Morrissey | Murray |
| Nassif | Nault |
| Ng | O'Connell |
| Oliphant | Oliver |
| Ouellette | Paradis |
| Peschisolido | Peterson |
| Petitpas Taylor | Philpott |
| Picard | Poissant |
| Qualtrough | Ratansi |
| Rioux | Robillard |
| Rodriguez | Rogers |
| Romanado | Rota |

Government Orders

PAIRED

Members

LeBlanc

Thériault— 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

● (2215)

FEDERAL SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT ACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-57, An Act to amend the Federal Sustainable Development Act, as reported (with amendment) from the committee, and of the motion in Group No. 1.

The Speaker: The hon. member for Mégantic—L'Érable has nine minutes remaining to finish his speech.

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, since this is my first opportunity to rise in the House since the announcement of a rail bypass in Lac-Mégantic, I think my colleagues will allow me to say a few words about this very important project that was recently announced by the Prime Minister of Canada and the Premier of Quebec. This project was highly anticipated by the people of Lac-Mégantic.

On the Lac-Mégantic bypass file, I saw parliamentarians come together to work for a cause, to help the local population of Lac-Mégantic, which truly needed parliamentarians to send a message to the government and for that message to be heard by the government.

It was a long haul. We had to ensure that every parliamentarian from all the parties agreed because we were creating a precedent in Lac-Mégantic. This is something that had never been seen before anywhere. To all those who ask why we created a precedent in Lac-Mégantic, I say that something unprecedented happened in Lac-Mégantic. There was an absolutely disastrous tragedy that is still being felt today by the local population.

I must say that the people of Lac-Mégantic, who have been waiting for this announcement for quite some time, are obviously very pleased. I want to acknowledge the support of parliamentarians, especially the members of the Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, who travelled to Lac-Mégantic to hear from residents. That is where we began discussing this very important file among us, among parliamentarians from the various political parties. After that, the leaders of all the parties came out in favour of the bypass.

I must say that every time I had an opportunity to speak with a colleague, whether on the government side, from the second opposition party, or one of the independent members, I always sensed a great deal of compassion and openness with respect to this project.

I really want to thank everyone who opened their eyes, their ears, and their hearts to the people of Lac-Mégantic, for now we can finally start to look to the future. Now we can finally make sure that everyone in Lac-Mégantic who was directly or indirectly affected by this tragedy, whether it was themselves, their family, a friend, a parent, or a loved one, they can now start saying that they are finally rebuilding for the future.

Rudd
Rusnak
Saini
Sangha
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tan
Trudeau
Vandenbeld
Virani
Wilkinson
Wrzesniewski
Young— 159

Ruimy
Sahota
Sajjan
Sarai
Schiefke
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Tabbara
Tassi
Vandal
Vaughan
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Arnold
Barsalou-Duval
Benson
Bernier
Bezan
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet
Brosseau
Cannings
Carrie
Choquette
Clement
Cullen
Diotte
Dubé
Dusseau
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Garrison
Genuis
Gladu
Gourde
Hoback
Jeneroux
Kelly
Kmieć
Kwan
Liepert
Lobb
MacGregor
Maguire
Marcil
Mathysen
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Moore
Nantel
Nicholson
Poilievre
Raitt
Rankin
Reid
Schmale
Shiple
Sorenson
Ste-Marie
Strahl
Sweet
Trost
Van Kesteren
Vecchio
Warawa
Waugh
Wong
Zimmer— 113

Albas
Allison
Barlow
Beaulieu
Benzen
Berthold
Blaikie
Boucher
Boulerice
Brassard
Calkins
Caron
Chong
Clarke
Cooper
Deltell
Dreeshen
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Egliniski
Falk (Provencher)
Finley
Généreux
Gill
Godin
Hardcastle
Hughes
Jolibois
Kent
Kusie
Lake
Lloyd
Lukiwski
MacKenzie
Malcolmson
Masse (Windsor West)
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Motz
Nater
O'Toole
Quach
Ramsey
Rayes
Richards
Shields
Sopuck
Stanton
Stetski
Stubbs
Tilson
Trudel
Van Loan
Viersen
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga

Government Orders

The last few years have been spent demolishing and cleaning up the old downtown core. The rebuilding process has begun, but the whistling trains that roll through several times a day were a constant reminder of the tragedy.

Again, I want to thank all the parliamentarians who helped make this announcement possible. I want to thank former mayor Colette Roy Laroche, the mayor who was in office during the first years of my term, Jean-Guy Cloutier, and the current mayor, the very energetic Julie Morin, who knew just how to seize her opportunities and pick the right time to speak to the Minister of Transport and the Prime Minister, for making this announcement possible. There are many residents I also want to thank, like the reeve, Marielle Fecteau, who also worked very hard on this.

Again, this project was only made possible because all parliamentarians came together and co-operated to finally give some meaning to this tragedy and help the people of Lac-Mégantic get closure.

However, the real work is just beginning. This is where Bill C-57 comes in. Now, it is time to work on compensation, the environment, and the best way forward to minimize possible consequences for the people who will be getting this bypass. I am certain that we will again be able to do this work in a fair and prudent manner so that this project goes as smoothly as the other one did. Again, I thank all parliamentarians. This really showed the good side of our Parliament.

Now I want to come back to Bill C-57 and to everything that happened today with this bill. That is the not-so-good side of Parliament. Obviously, I do not just have praise to offer. There are some things that are good and some that are less good.

● (2220)

I was quite surprised today when the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons said one thing and did exactly the opposite not once, not twice, but three times.

Allow me to quote something the government House leader said: “There are a lot of bills to debate and, since we know that the opposition members want to participate in those debates, we are going to extend the sitting hours so that everyone can participate and work harder for Canadians.”

A little later, while answering questions, she said: “...we see that the hon. members across the way want to play games in the House and in committee. It is their choice, but we want to work very hard for Canadians. That is our way of doing things.”

What is their way of doing things? Today, they imposed three time allocation motions. Those three motions will limit parliamentarians' participation in the very important work of the House. How can anyone say something so many times yet do the opposite? Here is another quote from the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons:

[English]

“We know at this of the year most governments have extended hours so that we can do more work to ensure that we are representing Canadians and advancing good bills. This will provide an opportunity for more members to be part of an important debate to ensure that the voices of their constituents are heard right here as it is the House of the people.”

[Translation]

Then, they moved three motions to prevent opposition members from speaking. They did it three times. Here is another quote:

[English]

“This will provide an opportunity for more members to be part of an important debate...”

[Translation]

The government did the complete opposite today. We have been called in here three times to vote on the government's time allocation motions. This goes against the spirit of mutual understanding that the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons repeated as often as she could during the period for questions on Motion No. 22. Bill C-57 is one of the victims of this government's desire to limit speeches by opposition members.

The government is extending the sitting hours, but at the same time it is allocating fewer hours of debate. It says one thing, but ultimately, it will not be giving opposition members more opportunities to speak. I have another fine quote from the Leader of the government in the House of Commons. She said, “This is an opportunity to have more hours of debate in order to allow a greater number of hon. members to participate.” She continued as follows:

[English]

“Let us extend the hour, let us have more time to debate, so more members can have their voices heard. We can advance more legislation. It sounds like a win-win-win situation.”

[Translation]

Limiting the number of speeches and hours of debate, deciding how many members opposite will be allowed to speak, telling those who do not have time to speak that they must remain seated, and then moving on to another bill is not what I would call a win-win situation.

In summary, when parliamentarians are able to work together on a project like the one in Lac-Mégantic, that is good. Canadians want to see a lot more of that. However, when the government says one thing and does the opposite, as it did today, unfortunately, it is judged harshly by Canadians.

● (2225)

Mr. François Choquette (Drummond, NDP): Madam Speaker, I would also like to commend my colleague for the work that he has done on the rail bypass project in Lac-Mégantic. That is extremely important, and the Liberal government should have come up with a plan sooner instead of dragging its feet on this file. However, in the end, it is good news.

This bill talks about sustainable development. Of course, we learned today that the Liberal government is going to spend \$4.5 billion to buy a pipeline because it failed to manage that file properly. I know that my colleague and I do not agree on that pipeline, but investing \$4.5 billion to buy a pipeline is not anyone's idea of sustainable development from either an economic, social, or environmental perspective.

What does my colleague think about that?

Government Orders

Mr. Luc Berthold: Madam Speaker, such a decision is disheartening. We know that this is not the first time that the Liberal government has failed since it was elected. It is not the first time that the Liberal government has failed to keep its promise. In this case, all it had to do was let Kinder Morgan expand its network to export more oil. Unfortunately, the government's failure was such that the pipeline was opposed by just about everyone. The only solution that the Liberal government could come up with to resolve the situation was to take taxpayers' money and buy a pipeline, without knowing how much the expansion will cost. It is disheartening to see that it will be Canadians' hard-earned money that will be used to fix the Prime Minister's mistakes.

Mr. François Choquette: Madam Speaker, I believe that it is important to debate the sustainable development bill. However, it is very disappointing that even though we support this bill, not all the committee's recommendations will be implemented. I am a member of the Standing Committee on Official Languages and when we prepare reports we are disappointed by the response from the government after making our recommendations. It is the same old story with Bill C-57. The committee agreed on several recommendations and the government came up with a bill that does not respect the spirit of all those recommendations.

For example, witnesses mentioned that despite the definition of sustainable development, this bill only refers to the environmental decision-making process and there is no vision for the environmental and social aspects that are the main pillars of sustainable development.

Does my colleague believe, as I do, that the government should pay careful attention to committee reports, including the one on this bill?

Mr. Luc Berthold: Madam Speaker, the government obviously has no intention of looking at the committees' reports, because these reports sometimes contain recommendations from the opposition. Actually, no, there are not often recommendations from the opposition, because these recommendations do not make it into the committee reports. The government does not let the opposition include recommendations in these reports because the Liberal majority on the committees is stopping the opposition's good recommendations from getting here, to the House. This is a problem. For a week now, it has looked as though the Liberal majority plans to use its power more and more to silence any criticism. The Liberals do not like being criticized.

Before I conclude, I want to thank my colleague from Drummond and his entire team for all of their support on the Lac-Mégantic file. I could feel their party's support from the beginning, and it was truly appreciated and noted by the people of Lac-Mégantic.

• (2230)

Mr. François Choquette (Drummond, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to talk about the environment in the House of Commons. That is why I ran for politics, to defend the environment, to promote sustainable development. I remember it well. My wife Liliana and I were watching television and there were reports on the shale gas scandal at the time. My wife said that something needed to be done. I told her that she was right. We got involved and now I am in the House of Commons in the process of defending the environment and promoting sustainable development.

Bill C-57 before us now seeks to improve the sustainable development strategy; it is an act to amend the Federal Sustainable Development Act. We support this bill in principle, but we feel that the committee's recommendations should have been followed more closely. The government did not see the committee's recommendations through.

The Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development studied the legislation currently in effect. Many of the witnesses who spoke at the committee mentioned the gaps in the law. First, contrary to the definition of sustainable development, the legislation talks about the decision-making process with regard to the environment, but not the economic and social dimensions of sustainable development. That was a problem we needed to correct and that was not done. Second, it targets transparency and accountability instead of progress on sustainable development and those are also aspects that were not corrected in the legislation. The committee acknowledged the existence of these major flaws, then recommended amending the legislation accordingly. Unfortunately, Bill C-57 does not correct these flaws and considers only some of the recommendations. It does not consider the entirety of the recommendations made by the members of the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development.

Once again, the Liberal Party unfortunately did not listen to its own members and refused to implement the recommendations received from the standing committee. Clearly, the government is not committed to honouring its commitments regarding the UN's general sustainable development goals, which include making sure that the government as a whole ensures that its laws and policies reflect environmental, social, and economic needs.

In that regard, it is rather ironic, in a negative sense, that we are debating sustainable development today, the same day that the Liberal government announced that it is buying the Kinder Morgan Trans Mountain pipeline. That company purchased the pipeline for \$550 million, and the federal government is going to use \$4.5 billion of taxpayers' money to buy it. That is outrageous. It is going to give that money to a company in Texas, so that money will be leaving Canada, not to mention that the government also gives \$1.3 billion a year in fossil fuel subsidies to oil and gas companies. The Liberal government said that it would respect its commitment to Canada to eliminate those subsidies, but it did not do that. We in the NDP have been saying for quite some time that we will eliminate those subsidies. Those subsidies must be eliminated and that money must be invested instead in a just transition to a low-carbon economy, an economy based on renewable energy sources. That \$4.5 billion would have been incredibly useful for developing renewable energy companies. As we know, the renewable energy sector is creating 10 times as many jobs as the fossil fuel sector.

Government Orders

• (2235)

Had the government done the right thing and invested that \$4.5 billion in renewable energy, we would have created many more long-term jobs for now as well as for our children and grandchildren. That is another reason I am in politics. I want to leave our children and grandchildren a better world. Unfortunately, the Liberal government is making a mistake.

Buying a pipeline is not a step toward sustainable development; it is a step back. This is definitely not the right thing to do. It is a terrible idea, and I am certain Canadians will not accept it. The people will be very vocal in their opposition to buying the pipeline with taxpayer dollars. The Liberals certainly did not talk about this issue during the campaign.

Since we are talking about sustainable development, I would like to say a few words about what is going on in the Drummond region on that front. We have businesses in the renewable energy sector, in heat recovery, and in energy efficiency. Drummondville itself is fortunate to have a diversified economy and future-oriented businesses working in renewable energy and energy conservation. That is an important point to make. There are plenty of great businesses doing that in Drummond.

The City of Drummondville recently announced that it was going to establish a plan for sustainable mobility. I would like to thank John Husk, the municipal councillor for District 5 and chair of the Chantier sur le développement d'un plan de mobilité durable et le transport actif et collectif. That is a very good thing for Drummond because 85% of its citizens do not carpool. We have to fix that. Therefore it is a very good thing to have a plan for sustainable mobility.

What is meant by "sustainable mobility" in the vision that people want to develop for Drummondville? First, there is the economic component. Mobility must be efficient and foster economic vitality in trade corridors. Next, from the social point of view, it must be accessible to be good for the community, equitable, safe, and compatible with health. In terms of the environment, sustainable mobility limits the use of space and resources, is integrated into the environment, and reduces greenhouse gas emissions. What I have just mentioned is the complete opposite of what the Liberal government is currently doing.

I now want to repeat an important point. Today is a sad day for Canada. The Liberal government announced that it will be diverting \$4.5 billion of taxpayers' money to buy a pipeline that is worth just \$550 million. The Liberals blindly spent this money on an obsolete energy source when we could have embraced the future and sustainable development. It just so happens that Bill C-57 is about sustainable development.

The government should have a vision and invest the \$4.5 billion in the companies, like those in Drummond, working to improve energy efficiency, recover heat, and develop renewable energy, such as solar, wind and other energy. That is the Canada that we want to leave our children and grandchildren.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Drummond for his speech.

I too am extremely shocked at the decision to buy the Burnaby pipeline from Kinder Morgan for \$4.5 billion. Even worse, that only includes the existing pipeline, which is now over 60 years old. The government also promised to expand the pipeline, a highly controversial move, since it will infringe indigenous rights and go against British Columbia's interests.

What does my colleague think of the fact that we are debating a bill on sustainable development on the very day the government made a decision that violates every principle of sustainable development?

• (2240)

Mr. François Choquette: Madam Speaker, I want to thank my hon. Green Party colleague for her very relevant question.

My colleague mentioned other broken promises. The failure with Kinder Morgan's Trans Mountain pipeline is just one in a long string of promises broken by the Liberal government. The Liberals said that once they took office, they would review the environmental process that Stephen Harper and the Conservatives trashed. Instead of fulfilling their promise, the Liberals dragged their feet. They did not table the review of the bill on environmental assessment until today, in June, three years into their term. They cannot say they have not been dragging their feet. That is how they ended up approving this terrible pipeline project based on inaccurate environmental assessments from a process that had been completely butchered by the Harper government and the Conservatives. The Liberals are responsible for their own failure on this file.

[*English*]

Hon. Ed Fast (Abbotsford, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to stand in the House to ask my colleague a question. I did appreciate his comments. He and I were both shocked at the decision the federal government made to purchase the Kinder Morgan pipeline. Our reasons are different, but they both go to the root of sustainability. Sustainability is about finding the appropriate balance between our social objectives, our economic objectives, and our environment objectives.

I certainly believe that the Kinder Morgan pipeline purchase is symptomatic of a government that does not understand what sustainability means. It does not understand what that balance means. It has completely neglected the economic component.

My colleague, of course, is more concerned about the environment and has a different approach. He believes that the environment has been neglected. I would ask him to comment more broadly, beyond just the Kinder Morgan pipeline. To what degree does he believe that the Liberal government, which has been in power now for two and a half years, actually understands sustainability and the appropriate balance between the economy and the environment?

[*Translation*]

Mr. François Choquette: Madam Speaker, the bill before us does indeed deal with sustainable development and is based on three pillars: the environment, the economy, and the social aspect. The problem with this government is that it made promises. To approve the pipelines, it had to overturn the environmental assessment bill introduced by the Conservatives that had eliminated a large number of responsibilities.

Government Orders

This government dragged its feet for two and a half years. It approved a project, even though it had said that it would not approve a project based on old environmental assessments. It broke its promise. It was the author of its own misfortune. Now, it wants to push through a pipeline and force it down Canadian taxpayers' throats. On top of that, it wants to make them pay \$4.5 billion of their own money, when this money could be redistributed in a much more sensible and appropriate way.

[*English*]

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to be speaking to this important piece of legislation about the environment and sustainability.

There is a saying in politics that 24 hours is a long time. In the last day, we have had some seminal events with respect to the way the government is operating in terms of the economy and the environment, and also, by the way, in terms of this chamber. We have had closure brought forward three times in one day. That has to be a record. Certainly, if the government continues at this pace, it will far surpass the record of any previous administration with respect to closure. Three times in one day is quite something. It shows that it has no interest in meaningful dialogue on the legislation it has put forward. In many cases, it is doing this on omnibus bills, very long pieces of legislation that include many varied and different elements. For instance, it just brought forward closure on a bill dealing with criminal justice, with many different elements in it. It includes, as my colleagues have pointed out, reducing sentences, yet it tries to justify it by saying that there is something over here in the bill we might like. That is precisely the point when we have this omnibus legislation. That is part of the context. We are at close to 11 o'clock tonight debating Bill C-57, having had three different instances of closure brought forward today.

Speaking of the environment and sustainability, which is the core theme of this legislation, we also had the government announce today that the only way it can get a pipeline built is if it first buys a pipeline that is over 60 years old, and if it is able to work out all the legal wrangling through the courts and with the B.C. government, it will then go ahead and spend billions more of taxpayers' money to build that pipeline. That is not fiscally sustainable. If the government wants to establish a precedent that any time major economic development projects happen they will only happen if it is spending enormous amounts of taxpayers' money, that is not a fiscally sustainable model of economic growth.

Our approach, in the Conservative Party, is to establish the conditions that allow for private sector economic development. Under the previous government, there were four pipelines built. A fifth pipeline was approved. We hear the bizarre criticism from the government that the Conservatives did not build any pipelines to tidewater. Let us be clear. Up until now, at least, it has not been the government that has built pipelines. The government has evaluated and approved pipelines, or had the option of not approving them. However, in our case, we approved pipelines that had been proposed by the private sector. That included approving a pipeline to tidewater as well as approving and overseeing the construction of four pipelines.

From an environmental perspective, I think we should be very supportive of the development of pipelines, because transporting our energy resources through pipelines is a more environmentally sustainable way of proceeding. It is less costly, actually, in terms of greenhouse gas emissions, to be transporting our energy resources by pipeline. Therefore, it is a win-win. It is a win economically and a win for the environment.

We often hear from the government that the economy and the environment go hand in hand. Sometimes they go hand in hand in the wrong direction, and sometimes they move hand in hand in the right direction. Under the current government, they are both moving in the wrong direction, I think. Under the previous government, we got pipelines built by creating conditions for the private sector to get that work done. That allowed for economic advancement for our country and also environmental improvements.

● (2245)

The previous Conservative government was the first government in Canadian history to oversee a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. Our friends across the way are always very skeptical of this. They want to find reasons they cannot really credit it to us, and here are the arguments they use. They will try to say that the Conservatives cannot really take credit for the reduction in greenhouse emissions, because the reductions were the result of policies undertaken by the provinces. The response to that is that if we compare the record of the previous Conservative government to the Liberal government before it, we either had reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, or there was an increase that was lower than the increase in the previous period. In other words, there were improvements in terms of environmental performance in every jurisdiction, which suggests that it was not merely about things happening in individual jurisdictions, although there is obviously a role to be played there, but was a result of federal policy. That was the record of the previous government.

The current government will then say that it was only because of the recession. It is true that the Conservatives governed during a period when there was a global recession, yet at a time when global emissions went up, Canadian emissions went down, even though Canada was relatively less impacted by the global economic recession than many other countries. We were able to achieve environmental improvements at a time when the rest of the world did not, even though the rest of the world was more affected by the recession and therefore saw more constriction in terms of economic activity compared to what was happening in Canada.

If one puts those facts together and recognizes that the Conservatives undertook thoughtful, managed policies on environmental improvements, a regulatory sector-by-sector approach, one can see that we achieved real, substantial, and meaningful progress.

Here is the difference. We do not use the environment as an excuse to impose new taxes on low- and middle-income Canadians. We see the environment as an objective that can be pursued in concert with economic improvement. We can have a sustainable federal budget that does not involve massive deficits at the same time as concerning ourselves with sustainable environmental performance, in environmental terms.

Government Orders

If we look at the record of the previous Conservative government, we can see a strong economy as well as improvements in terms of the environment. I hate to be accused of plagiarism, but if we look at the record of the previous government, it does look like the environment and the economy were going hand in hand.

Under the current government, we see something quite different. We see a government totally unable to establish the conditions that allow for private sector investments in pipelines. In fact, what it is doing is buying out assets, which leads companies to then move that money and make those investments elsewhere. Kinder Morgan is going to spend the money it received from the Canadian government, but it is not going to spend it here in Canada. Very likely, it is going to spend it in other parts of the world.

The energy sector in other countries is doing very well, but we face continuing, significant challenges here in Canada as a result of the government's total inability to get these issues right. It is imposing more taxes on low- and middle-income Canadians through its carbon tax, and by the way, it is not telling people how much it will cost. We are still asking the government to come clean, end the carbon tax cover-up, and share with us the cost to individual Canadians of the carbon tax. It will not come clean with respect to that. It will not reveal the information and has only released severely redacted, blacked-out documents that prevent Canadians from actually seeing what the impact of that carbon tax will be.

The government thinks that imposing these new taxes on Canadians is somehow going to lead to solutions to our environmental challenges. If we want to see what sustainable development really looks like, we should look specifically at what happened in terms of economic performance and greenhouse gas reductions during the period of the previous government.

When we have this kind of big government intervention, the economy model the government has, it is not fiscally sustainable. It means leaving massive debt and deficits to the next generation, and it does not do much good for our environment, either.

• (2250)

Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I found that the hon. member's speech included some contradictions, and it certainly abstracted from certain realities.

The member mentioned at the beginning of his speech that the issue of the Trans Mountain pipeline is wrapped up in legal wrangling. Does the member believe that a Conservative government would eliminate legal wrangling? How would it do that? Would it eliminate the court system?

We have a court system in this country that environmentalists, provincial governments, and all kinds of intervenors and stakeholders can access. That is what has happened with the Trans Mountain pipeline project. It has become caught up in legal wrangling, and the government had to act in that context.

The member seems to think that somehow, with the wave of a magic wand, a Conservative government would eliminate all legal wrangling. I would like the hon. member to respond to that notion.

• (2255)

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Madam Speaker, it is with great sympathy and understanding that I acknowledge that for a Liberal, it would

look like magic to do what I just described, which is establish the conditions that allow for private sector growth. It is not a thought experiment. Look at where we were in October 2015. Four pipelines had been built, the northern gateway project had been approved, and Trans Mountain and energy east were pipelines being proposed by private sector investors.

Where are we today? Energy east has been killed indirectly by the piling on of burdens. By the way, I would like to know what the Maritime Liberal MPs think about the total inaction on energy east in the midst of the government bailing out Trans Mountain, because we want to see energy east, as well. That pipeline is no longer being pursued by the private sector proponent. The northern gateway pipeline was killed directly and intentionally by government policy, and the only way the government thinks it can get Trans Mountain done is by buying it out.

That is not a question of magic. That is a question of the difference elections make. Elections have consequences, and in 2019, that election will have consequences as well.

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): Madam Speaker, I want to understand the Conservative position with regard to purchasing the pipeline and the intervention in market forces. Would they also consider that massive tax subsidization, through tax credits and subsidies, especially given the fact that a number of organizations and companies have paid very few taxes, also represents market intervention, since this reduces taxation amounts? Would they also consider subsidies, grants, and research credits advantages, where the public has subsidized the industry?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Madam Speaker, I know, of course, that the NDP does not take a consistent position in terms of corporate welfare in general. We would have to have a more detailed discussion about how it is defining "subsidy" in this specific context.

My colleague lumped a few things together in a way that seems a little bit imprecise to me. In general, I am not supportive, for instance, of direct government grants to private business and a government buying a pipeline in the way the government has. There is a legitimate place for non-refundable tax credits, like SR&ED credits. There is a legitimate place for an accelerated capital cost writeoff as an incentive for companies to make investments in Canada.

In general, we want to be competitive and encourage investments in Canada. I think the best way to do it is not through the government picking winners and losers through direct subsidies, but rather by establishing conditions and providing incentives to encourage those kinds of capital investments. I would encourage the NDP, when it looks at the oil and gas sector compared to other sectors, to at least take a consistent position, because some of the things it is criticizing in terms of tax credits in the energy sector seem like the same kinds of things it advocates for in sectors like the auto sector. We are very supportive—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Unfortunately the time is up. I tried to let the member know that his time was running very short.

Government Orders

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands.

• (2300)

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, I rise tonight to present my thoughts on Bill C-57. I regret very much that we have time allocation on this bill, and even more so the hour of 11 p.m. that is now approaching. This important legislation deserves to be heard in a normal fashion with full debate.

Let me go back to when this bill originated. The Federal Sustainable Development Act was actually passed in the era of a Conservative government, and was one of those rare pieces of legislation that originated with the opposition. It was brought forward by a former Liberal MP, John Godfrey. It was one of his last contributions as a very diligent and thoughtful member of Parliament. He went on to leave Parliament and go back to his old stomping grounds of education.

Sustainable development and aspects of sustainable development had been in Canadian law before. This bill managed to get through Parliament in 2008, and the successor bill that we have before us tonight does improve some elements of sustainable development as originally put forward with a lot of co-operation in this place back in 2008. I was not yet a member of Parliament in that year, but I followed very closely the development of the Federal Sustainable Development Act because it was really a high-water mark for the minority-government years of former Prime Minister Harper, because opposition parties were willing to work together. The opposition parties had a majority, but very rarely used it. In this case, the Federal Sustainable Development Act was brought in. This act could have been improved and strengthened, but there is very little that I would say is wrong with it. I am disappointed that we will repeat the definition of the precautionary principle, but overall the bill will strengthen the application of sustainable development principles to more parts of the federal government, and I do like the creation of a sustainable development advisory council. The bill has real potential, but I do not think the government plans to do with it what I hope it will do.

Going back to the early 1960s, for decades the Canadian government benefited from well-researched, strong public policy advice from institutions that we no longer have. We used to have, starting in 1963, the Economic Council of Canada. We had as well the Science Council of Canada. In the early 1970s, we had the creation of the Canadian Environmental Advisory Council. In 1993, all three of those agencies were wound up and repealed. That meant we lost the Economic Council of Canada, the Science Council of Canada, and the Canadian Environmental Advisory Council. They were wound up and repealed because in 1993 the federal government brought in the National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy. This was our first substantial sustainable development tool. To quote the late Jim MacNeill, a brilliant Canadian diplomat and former deputy minister who really challenged the ideas of sustainable development, one of the core ideas was that "If we change the way we make decisions, we'll change the kind of decisions we make."

The idea of the national round table was that by bringing together people from different perspectives, including trade unions, large corporate enterprises, academics, environmentalists, indigenous people, as well as government ministers and agencies and so on,

the resulting give and take and shared learning would create decisions that met the challenge of sustainability, because sustainability is not the environment by itself. Sustainability has at least three legs to the stool. They are the environment, and social and economic concerns, but those are within a very clear mandate to ensure that the decisions we take today do not compromise the ability of future generations to make their own decisions and to meet their own needs. In other words, sustainability requires that we think about intergenerational equity.

• (2305)

Here I have to confess that I was a member and vice-chair for quite a while of the National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy. Its work was substantial. I do not want to blow my own horn, but a lot of work was done by a lot of people over many years, and I served for only a relatively brief period.

In 2012, under omnibus budget Bill C-38, the national round table was eliminated. No one at that point said that we had better bring back all those other advisory bodies that we had eliminated in 1993 when we created the national round table. There is no longer the Economic Council, no longer the Science Council, no longer the Canadian Environmental Advisory Council, and there is no national round table.

This is the first time something has been created that could meet that need, namely a sustainable development advisory council. It is pretty thin gruel. It could do a lot. The Treasury Board within the act could establish policies or issue directives and could be adequately funding this new agency, which is quite modestly proposed in the act. That said, I certainly hope that the government will realize that we desperately need sound advice on what is sustainable and what is not.

Speaking of what is not sustainable, it includes today's announcement that the Government of Canada is going to form a crown corporation that will now be the management entity for a pipeline that the federal government proposes to buy with a closing date in August. I can only hope that something goes wrong with this sale because this is monstrous. We are proposing to spend \$4.5 billion to buy the assets of what is called the Trans Mountain pipeline, but owned by Kinder Morgan of Houston, Texas.

The Trans Mountain pipeline was built in 1953 by a Canadian company with the goal of bring crude or synthetic crude to Burnaby, British Columbia, where over time they developed four refineries. The Trans Mountain pipeline was all about bringing Canadian crude from Alberta to Canadian refineries in the Lower Mainland for domestic use.

When Kinder Morgan bought the assets of Trans Mountain, which are now more than 60 years old, in its valuation to the National Energy Board, the company put the value of the Trans Mountain assets at \$550 million. Those are the assets that today the Minister of Finance announced he would buy at a price of \$4.5 billion. That is astonishing. Kinder Morgan has certainly achieved a very rich return on investment without having invested new infrastructure.

Government Orders

Kinder Morgan wanted to build a new pipeline, but I think it has lost interest in it. That is why it kidnapped its own project and said that if we did not have a solution by May 31, it would walk away. Clearly for political reasons, primarily for the impact in Alberta, the federal government decided that anything was preferable to having Kinder Morgan walk away, so it has done something astonishing. It is planning to spend \$4.5 billion to buy the existing assets of the old pipeline and to take on, as yet undescribed by the Minister of Finance, but said by Kinder Morgan to be a \$7.4 billion project to build the expansion. The government is taking on a project that has not yet cleared its conditions with the National Energy Board and is still before the courts in 15 different court cases for violation of indigenous rights, and is doing so with a completely scandalously inadequate environmental review before the National Energy Board within which evidence was put forward by Kinder Morgan and at which no intervenors were allowed to cross-examine.

We now find ourselves asking if the government understands sustainable development, because overarching all of this is the most fundamental and pressing question, what about the climate crisis? How can we possibly claim that Canada understands the pressing imperative of the transition away from fossil fuels, whether in 10, 20, or 30 years? We need to make plans. How can we understand the imperative of avoiding the kind of disaster that deprives not hypothetical future generations but our own children, children alive today that we tuck in at night? How can we possibly think we understand sustainability while building pipelines?

• (2310)

Hon. Ed Fast (Abbotsford, CPC): Madam Speaker, my colleague quite rightly referred to the fact that the original sustainable development act was actually a collaboration within this very House, but in a previous Parliament. It was a minority government and it produced an act that all members in this House could support, one that reflected the appropriate balance between our social objectives, our environmental objectives, and our economic imperatives. Then that went on to result in a study that took place at the environment committee.

We studied the act as it had been implemented over a number of years. We found a number of shortcomings. We suggested improvements. Some of those improvements were actually incorporated into the bill we have before us, Bill C-57.

However, at the end of the day, the proof is in the pudding. If a government does not want to apply the lens of sustainability, it will not, and quite frankly, I have serious reservations about the ability of the Liberal government to understand what sustainability means.

My colleague referenced that. She asked if the government actually understands sustainability. She referred to the Kinder Morgan sale, the purchase by the government of that pipeline, as a clear indicator that the government does not understand sustainability.

I would ask her if she has any other examples of the government failing to understand the true notion of sustainability.

Ms. Elizabeth May: Madam Speaker, certainly there are many. As a matter of fact, every time I hear the minister say that the environment and the economy go hand in hand, increasingly I have that image of Thelma and Louise just at the last frame of the film.

The environment and the economy go hand in hand when one chooses to do things for the economy that benefit the environment, but when one chooses to do things that are in conflict, then one is living in a world of trying to hold opposing notions together at the same time, otherwise known as cognitive dissonance.

A specific example is approving two LNG projects that will drive up greenhouse gases in B.C., Petronas LNG and Woodfibre LNG. Another was the approval of Site C, a project that did not receive an environmental assessment clean bill of health, and if they had gone back and looked at that review, they would not have approved it. There have been numerous occasions on which the decision-making went against what I had expected from a government that claims to understand sustainability.

I do applaud the effort to put in place a carbon price, but the government has not removed fossil fuel subsidies, and, as anyone can see, it is spending billions of dollars. At this point it is committed to at least \$15 billion on this project. It is doing the opposite of ending fossil fuel subsidies. It is inventing new ones.

Hon. Ed Fast: Madam Speaker, the hon. member mentioned intergenerational equity, which is something that now has been incorporated into sustainability. I would ask her to perhaps expand on what that means to her, and how intergenerational equity will benefit future generations of Canadians.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands has just a little over a minute to respond.

Ms. Elizabeth May: Madam Speaker, the essence of sustainability, in many ways, goes back to the concept that comes to us from the Iroquois Confederacy of making decisions on to the seventh generation when we think about what we are doing, and today we are thinking long term. Our economic theories tend to discount the future, and it is hard for us to think about what it means to future generations because they are not right here in front of us.

At a minimum—and this goes back to the Brundtland commission report, “Our Common Future”—the idea was that the decisions we make today should meet our own needs, while at the same time ensuring that we do not compromise the ability of future generations to meet their needs.

The kinds of things that exemplify sustainability, for instance, are projects that ensure we are replanting as many trees as possible, or ensuring that we do everything we can to suck carbon out of the atmosphere by replanting the mangrove forest of the planet. We have removed about a third of the mangrove forest.

We are doing everything we can to get fossil fuels out of our electricity system. Decarbonizing electricity is a key goal. One of the things we could do, if we are throwing around \$4.5 billion, is to use it to build an east-west electricity grid to green up our electricity sector.

● (2315)

Mr. Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to be here at 11:15 at night to talk about Bill C-57, a bill that seeks to make amendments to the Federal Sustainable Development Act.

Someone else was commenting about time allocation today, and there is something about the Gordie Howe hat trick, like a goal, an assist, and a fight. We almost had a government House leader hat trick here today with the closure motion and two time allocation motions.

The Federal Sustainable Development Act has been in place since 2008. It was introduced during the previous Conservative government. I am pleased to see steps are being taken to ensure that it remains relevant in our current landscape.

Jim Prentice, our colleague whom we sadly lost in an aviation accident, said it best: “We must balance environmental issues with economic and social considerations. By doing so, we can make long-term sustainable progress on the environment that is integrated with progress on the economic and social agenda for Canadians.” Most of us in this place, if not all of us, will agree with that.

The bigger point here, though, is making sure we have both environmental protection and economic success. Our previous government did that, which is why the current government kept our environmental plans. The biggest difference, arguably, is that it just slapped a new name on the department.

Suffice it to say that we agree that sustainability is a fiscally responsible decision, especially in a country where natural resources play such a substantial role in our economy. That is why this side of the House has been pushing so hard on Trans Mountain, on ensuring that the government takes action to ensure that this pipeline gets built.

Now we find ourselves in a bind, because apparently the only way the government could make this happen was to throw a bunch of money at Kinder Morgan. Perhaps this could be an indication that the Liberal approach to attracting and maintaining business partnerships is not working.

There was a story yesterday in Bloomberg entitled—and I will adjust the title so as not to name anyone—“[The Prime Minister]’s Hipster Economics Looked Great Until Trump Cut Taxes”. Many may think this judgment is a bit harsh, but I think the criticism is warranted, and here is why.

Canada needs Kinder Morgan and other energy investment. We have been saying this for months and years. Energy investment means thousands of jobs for Albertans and workers across Canada. It means growth for our provinces and increased revenues for the economy.

What has happened with Trans Mountain, a project that has been so ineptly handled by the government that taxpayers are now owners of a pipeline, is not surprising, given the attitude of the government toward business growth, and it will certainly not be the last time it happens.

As the Bloomberg article says:

Government Orders

Around the country, business owners and corporate executives are grumbling. Quebec, Alberta and British Columbia are also boosting minimum wages. The federal government is requiring provinces to put a price on carbon emissions to help fight climate change in a program that could push power bills up further. Railroad bottlenecks threaten Canada’s standing as a major commodities exporter. There’s insufficient pipeline capacity for the oil-sands boom.

On a continent where our neighbour is cutting corporate taxes, pumping the brakes on regulatory policy, and undoing much of the tangles of red tape, Canada has become the regulation-happy, carbon-tax-wielding, under-investment monster that businesses fear, and the ones we had managed to keep at least for a while are now fleeing the country.

What incentive is there for businesses like Kinder Morgan to stay? There is next to none, basically.

In the case of Trans Mountain, the government’s response is not to address the problems stemming from the beast it has created but instead to dip a little more into the public purse and throw out more money borrowed from our kids, our grandkids, and our great-grandkids.

While I and my colleagues understand that the environment is important in considering federal policy, it must be done responsibly, not just to fight climate change but to protect economic prosperity as well, and that is something we have yet to see from the government.

The trend we have been seeing is that the government loves to say it is doing something, with absolutely zero follow-through. It is almost as if we see more apologies in the House than bills passed.

The Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development tabled a report outlining how the government has fallen short in its efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the impacts of climate change, something we have been saying would happen for years.

The Liberal government has pie-in-the-sky ideas with absolutely no ability to get anything done. It aims for the headline and walks back the actual policy when it comes time to get something done. The Liberals cannot even follow their own plan, and the environment commissioner agrees. Here is an example from the report.

Report 2 from the Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development’s 2018 Spring Report states:

Overall, we found that the Government of Canada had not developed a formal approach to implement the 2030 Agenda and the sustainable development goals.

It went on:

[D]espite some specific action at the departmental level, there was still no federal governance structure based on clearly articulated departmental roles and responsibilities by November 2017. We found no communication plan and no engagement strategy on how to include other levels of government and Canadians in a national dialogue on the 2030 Agenda.

● (2320)

Here is the commissioner’s statement on the government’s outstanding record on the environment so far:

First, the federal government does not regularly balance the three pillars of sustainable development [economic, environmental, and social].

Government Orders

Second, there is a lack of leadership for many sustainable development activities.

Third, the federal government has not implemented the tools it already has to assess the impacts of policy decisions on sustainable development.

This, in itself, is why we need the Federal Sustainable Development Act. We need to ensure that we are balancing all aspects of sustainability, not just the things that get a headline in the *Toronto Star*, and that we are doing more than just talk.

I want to look at the environment and climate change departmental plan, the annual departmental plan that gets released when the estimates come out. In the plan's introduction, the minister says that she is pleased to present it. I would be very embarrassed to present the plan that she has.

The former parliamentary budget officer, Kevin Page, said that departmental plans are mere communication devices, and this report is proof. The Treasury Board president, in his failed estimates reform, promised to address this but has not.

This is what the Treasury Board website says about the departmental plans:

The Policy on Results sets out the fundamental requirements for...departmental accountability for performance information...while highlighting the importance of results in management and expenditure decision making, as well as public reporting.

Basically, it is saying, "Here are our plans, and here is what the results are going to be. This is what we are going to spend, and this is what we are going to achieve."

However, I want to look at the environment departmental plan. Yes, I have read them; I do not think many people have. I am going to read the planned results.

For departmental result indicators on GHG emissions from light-duty vehicles, the target is a 21% improvement, which is fair enough, "for manufacturer model year 2017 reporting relative to 2011 model year". One would think that if we were going to reduce it from 2011 to 2017, this already being 2018, which is odd, we would have what the GHG emissions are right now. The target date to achieve it is 2018, but under "actual results" for last year and the years before to compare it against, the comment is "This is a new indicator. Results are not available from previous years." Fair enough, we have nothing to compare it to.

The next is GHG emissions from heavy-duty vehicles: "Percentage improvement in GHG emissions performance for manufacturer model year 2018-2020 reporting relative to the 2010 model year". The target is 13% lower by 2020. Again, if we are comparing it to previous years to see how we are doing, one would think that we would know what it is for 2016-17 and not just compared to eight years ago. What do they have? "This is a new indicator." Results are not available from the previous year, or the year before that, oddly enough.

For HFC emissions, the target is a 10% reduction in consumption levels compared to 2017-18. The date to achieve this target is 2019. What did we do last year? We do not know: "This is a new indicator. Results are not available from previous years." Fair enough.

The next goal is "Reduced methane emissions from the oil end gas sector". The target is a 40% reduction relative to 2012, and we are

going to achieve this by 2025. What is the base right now? "This is a new indicator. Results are not available from previous years."

This goes back to what I have been saying about the current government. The Liberals talk a lot, but they are not getting anything done. In their own departmental plan, where the Treasury Board requires them to state reports and what they are trying to achieve, they have nothing.

The departmental result indicators go on with "Emissions reductions are being achieved under the Clean Fuel Standard building on the Renewable Fuels Regulations". The target is "30 Mf annual GHG emissions reduction in 2030". This is 30 Mf down from what? Well, it is down from previous years. What was it in previous year? "This is a new indicator. Results are not available from previous years." Again, they are setting imaginary goals, almost aspirational goals, with nothing to actually compare them to. The departmental result indicators go on.

I have a lot of other stuff that I would love to go over, but I cannot. I would just say that we need to ensure that foreign investment and international business are attracted to Canada, and that Canadian businesses want to stay; that growth and responsibility happen together; and that innovation is championed across all sectors, not just the ones favourable to the government, but including oil and gas.

● (2325)

Mr. Nick Whalen (St. John's East, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I had a great time working on the operations and estimates committee and reading those departmental reports with the hon. member.

With respect to the energy data and many of the metrics he was referring to, it is true that Canada does not have an energy information agency that has collected the years of data that would be necessary for us to determine some of these outcomes and measures. That is why, at present, the natural resources committee is undertaking a study of energy data so we can both set targets and collect data to determine whether or not we are meeting them.

In this regard, I am wondering if the member could comment on whether or not his party is generally supportive of the direction that committee is taking, and whether or not he is supportive of the idea of Canada collecting, maintaining, distributing, and making available to the public energy data so that we can know whether or not we are meeting our greenhouse gas emission targets.

Mr. Kelly McCauley: Madam Speaker, I used to live in St. John's East, in the member's riding. It is a beautiful part of town. I appreciate his comments and the time we spent together on the operations committee.

Government Orders

Yes, we do need the data, and that data should have been provided in the environment department's plan. We cannot judge how we are actually getting stuff done unless we have reasonable, true targets. It cannot simply be the aspirational targets that the Minister of Environment has provided in this basically useless plan, which violates the rules of what the Treasury Board has said should be in departmental plans.

Mr. Michael Cooper (St. Albert—Edmonton, CPC): Madam Speaker, I found the member's speech to be quite informative. When he talked about some of the targets of the environment minister, he illustrated how the minister and the government are all talk and no action. Indeed, it seems that the only thing the minister is capable of doing and saying is that the economy and the environment go hand in hand, as though that is enough.

The hon. member was cut short. He said he had more to say. I was very interested in what he was saying, so perhaps he could use this time to continue.

Mr. Kelly McCauley: Madam Speaker, there are a lot of other flaws in the departmental plan. My favourite is a table that reads, "Canadian communities economies and ecosystems are more resilient", and that presents departmental results indicators that include the "Number of individuals, businesses, and governments accessing climate services and using that information to inform decision making". It notes that the targets involve an "Increase from [the] baseline".

What is the baseline? There is a little mark that says that the baseline will be established when the Canadian Centre for Climate Services has been functioning for a full year, and that it is expected it will become operational next year. Therefore, the baseline will be set two years from now.

Here are the departmental goals we are trying to achieve this year, and we will not even know what the government is saying is our target, because we will not set a baseline for two more years. We are expected to accept a plan from the government that has been rightly ridiculed by the commissioner. The government is telling us that it will not know what results we are trying to achieve for two years, but that we should accept the plan today for results and give it the money to spend now, with no planned outcomes.

Mr. Nick Whalen: Madam Speaker, the member for Edmonton West is discussing the lack of available energy data, but of course after nine years of inaction the member is assuming that the minister can jump into the world ready with all of the answers. However, she is coming into her role after nine years of a government that did not believe in climate change. The government had not even collected any of the data for the baseline, and now he is attempting to blame the minister for having failed to have the data available for the baselining.

I find it quite an interesting response to my question of whether or not he agrees that we should collect the data for him to blame the minister for not collecting the data for the nine years prior to his being elected.

• (2330)

Mr. Kelly McCauley: Mr. Speaker, I believe we should collect the data. In our environment minister's departmental plans for 2014-15, the last year we were in power, we actually did have the data for

all of our items. It is just for the two years since the Liberals took over that the data is blind.

Mr. Mark Warawa (Langley—Aldergrove, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is an honour to speak to Bill C-57.

I want to begin by addressing some comments made recently by a Liberal colleague about climate change. Statements that the previous government did not consider climate change a serious problem are absolutely false. The fact is that the targets we set to reduce greenhouse gas emissions are the targets that the Liberals are using. The position of the previous government was that every country has to be part of the solution. That is what science tells us. If it is just Canada and a few select countries that are doing their fair share, we cannot address the issue of growing greenhouse gas emissions. The targets that the previous government set are the targets that are being used by the Liberal government.

In speaking to Bill C-57, my concern is not about the bill and the text of the bill. It is whether the government will act on the bill, and whether change is necessary.

Bill C-57 came about exactly 10 years ago. I was parliamentary secretary to the minister of the environment. The minister was John Baird. The Liberal member who was retiring and leaving this place was John Godfrey. As the parliamentary secretary in that structure, I was tasked with meeting with John. We talked. There was work with the David Suzuki Foundation and others. What was proposed was considered, and there was give-and-take. We ended up with a bill, Bill C-474, and the government, under the minister of the environment, John Baird, supported that. We ended up with a good piece of legislation that everyone could support, and we moved it forward as a Parliament in 2008.

That gives us a glimpse into what happened under a previous Conservative government. In the committee structures, how did things work back then? There was work between the government in power and the opposition members. Unfortunately, we do not see that in the current government. It is sad. That is one of the reasons why there is a lack of trust. The government says that it will work with the opposition, but that is not what happens.

In the committee, members are not even permitted to ask questions. It was last week that the ministers came to answer questions about how they were going to spend the \$7 billion of discretionary funds in the main estimates. The ministers came and made their speeches, and then down came the gavel to end the meeting so that the opposition members could not ask any questions. It was so undemocratic and so shocking.

That is how the Liberal government runs the House. In one day, it brought closure three times, and in the committees it does not permit the opposition members to do their work, representing Canadians and keeping the government accountable. The government refuses to let that happen in committees. It is very sad.

That did not happen in 2008, when we worked with a Liberal member, John Godfrey, and permitted him to introduce his bill. There was give-and-take, and we came up with what we could both agree on. The David Suzuki Foundation was part of that consultation.

Government Orders

We ended up with a good bill, the Sustainable Development Act. There are three parts to it. What we said, and what the current government is saying, is that we can have a healthy environment and we can have a healthy economy. We can do it, but there has to be social buy-in. Canadians have to buy in. The key to that is having all three. There has to be trust. Unfortunately, what is missing in Bill C-57 is trust.

There is a third body. There is the Commissioner of the Environment, who will do an assessment of what is happening. Is the government doing what it needs to? The Commissioner of the Environment gives us a report card. How is Parliament doing? How is the government doing?

● (2335)

As was noted previously, the spring 2018 audit by the commissioner stated:

...we found that the federal government is not ready to implement its commitments on sustainable development...

First, the federal government does not regularly balance the three pillars of sustainable development.

That is one of the reasons why it is failing. It then states:

Second, there is a lack of leadership for many sustainable development activities.

With respect to the lack of leadership, where is that source? What is the commissioner talking about? It is the government. It is the Prime Minister. It is the minister. There is no leadership. If the problem with the lack of sustainable development is that lens, why is it not happening? The commissioner is saying it is because of a lack of leadership. The government is not using the tools it has. That is the third reason he cites as follows:

the federal government has not implemented the tools it already has to assess the impacts of policy decisions on sustainable development.

The minister and the Prime Minister need to do their job. The government needs to work with members of the opposition and all parties. There needs to be respect and trust. Then what we already have in place would be working.

Under Liberal governments, we have seen a legacy of disrespect for Parliament and not getting it done. I am looking at reports by the Commissioner of the Environment done year after year. I do not have the time to go through all of them.

The 2002 report stated, "The Liberal government's sustainable development deficiency continues to grow."

The 2003 report noted, "There is a gap between what the Liberal government said it would do and what it is actually doing. Good intentions and great announcements are not enough."

The 2004 report asked, "Why is progress so slow after all the mandates and commitments were there? I am left to conclude that the reason is that there is a lack of leadership, a lack of priority and a lack of will." It sounds like what was announced just weeks ago.

The 2005 report stated, "When it comes to protecting the environment bold announcements are made and then forgotten as soon as the confetti hits the ground."

We have a problem. Because of lack of leadership, we are missing a sustainable development lens that includes a healthy environment;

a strong, growing economy; and social buy-in. That is what the Commissioner of the Environment is saying. Can members imagine for a moment what the economy, the environment, and the social buy-in for a healthy economy and environment would look like if we had a Conservative government or a minister of the environment like the member for Abbotsford? I can only imagine how good it would be.

We became government in 2006. In 2011, we had efficiencies, appliances, and vehicles in place that helped reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The fact is it was in 2008, 2009, and 2010 that emissions were going down because of efficiencies resulting from policies brought in by the previous Conservative government. I can only imagine that emissions would continue to go down when we get a change of government, when we get a Conservative government that respects Canadians, that works with Canadians, and uses common sense to create a growing environment and a growing economy. It is achievable and it will happen from 2019 onwards. I am excited because I know that with a Conservative government, we are going to get it done.

● (2340)

Mr. Michael Cooper (St. Albert—Edmonton, CPC): Madam Speaker, at the end of my friend's speech he talked about GHG emissions and the record of the previous Conservative government, because it was under the leadership of Prime Minister Stephen Harper that we saw a real reduction in GHG in the neighbourhood of around 3%. I was wondering if the hon. member could compare the record of the previous Conservative government, which saw a real reduction by taking a sector-by-sector approach, compared to the record of the current government over the last two and a half years.

Mr. Mark Warawa: Madam Speaker, during the early 2000s, a Jean Chrétien/Paul Martin Liberal government, emissions were growing. The Kyoto targets were set, they were ignored, and emissions continued to grow.

I remember Bob Mills who used to be a member of the environment committee. He warned the government not to set the targets artificially, that they should be based on science. However, Chrétien was involved and he allowed Bob Mills to go on one of those trips. The targets were set artificially and they were never achieved. Again, the commissioner was right: lots of announcements, lots of confetti, but no action.

It took a change of government in 2006 before emissions started to come down. The government started to listen, consult and determine how it could best reduce emissions. We set a world-class example. Sadly that has all ended. In the last three years, there has been a lot of baffle-gab, a lot of announcements, and broken promises. The environment and the economy are too important.

Government Orders

The Prime Minister is saying in one part of the country that we have to shut down the oil sands. In another part of the country, he saying that we need to grow the oil sands. At one end of the country, he is funding protestors. At the other end of the country, he is buying pipelines. It is bizarre. It does not make sense. We need a change of government.

Hon. Ed Fast (Abbotsford, CPC): Madam Speaker, my colleague from Langley—Aldergrove's riding is right next to mine. We have a lot in common. We used to serve on city council together.

I appreciate the fact that he truly understands sustainability. He referenced greenhouse gases. Yes, we all acknowledge that greenhouse gases have to be addressed, but that does not mean we need a carbon tax. Sustainability does not necessarily mean we have to penalize Canadians by taxing them to death.

He and I both come from the province of British Columbia, where a carbon tax was implemented almost a decade ago. The target at the time was to reduce emissions by 2020 by 33%. Today, emissions are down by 2%. The carbon price is \$35 per tonne. It is hurting British Columbians, but not achieving any measurable, truly substantial reductions in emissions.

I would gladly solicit the member's comments on whether a carbon tax has to be part of a sustainable approach to addressing some of the environmental challenges we have in Canada today.

Mr. Mark Warawa: Madam Speaker, his question about putting a price on carbon is an important one. When we were discussing this in the early 2000s, the suggestion was maybe \$15 a tonne, and then it went up to \$50 a tonne. Now under the Liberal government, it could go to \$100 tonne or \$200 a tonne. That means possibly \$3 or \$4 a litre.

British Columbians in my neighbourhood are outraged by the price of fuel to heat their homes and drive their cars. However, the Liberal government has said it will raise the price on fuel as high as it has to go to get people out of their cars. They do not want people driving their cars anymore. That is not reality and the Liberals are wrong. The carbon tax they are proposing is hurting Canadians, and it needs to stop.

● (2345)

Hon. Michael Chong (Wellington—Halton Hills, CPC): Madam Speaker, I will be supporting the bill and I want to explain why. It will make decision-making related to sustainable development more transparent and more accountable to Parliament.

Among other things, the bill would make the government more transparent because it would expand the number of government entities that would be required to report to both houses of Parliament, and it would expand the information required in these reports to Parliament.

It would also make the government more accountable by establishing principles that need to be taken into account, such as the precautionary principle, the polluter pays principle, and the principle of intergenerational equity, which is important for meeting the needs of the present generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.

It also supports the principle of internalization, the whole idea that externalities in our economy, such as producing carbon dioxide

in the atmosphere, cannot continue to be free, that a price needs to be put on this pollution. We need to internalize those costs in our economic system to ensure we reduce emissions and pollution and ensure sustainable development.

The legislation is needed because the government is not doing a good enough job. It is not doing a good enough job in ensuring the efficient use of natural, social, and economic resources. It is not doing a good enough job with respect to the words in proposed subsection 5(a) to ensure that environmental, economic, and social factors are integrated in the making of all of the government's decisions.

We have an example of how the government is not doing that.

Today the Auditor General released his spring 2018 report on a variety of aspects related to what the government was doing. I want to point to report 4 in particular, which concerns Montreal's Champlain Bridge. I want to highlight what the Auditor General said in that report that determines the government is not taking into account environmental considerations when it makes its decisions.

In 2015, the government decided to remove the tolls from the new Champlain Bridge in Montreal, a project that is costing Canadians well over \$4 billion, and a project that is going to replace the old Champlain Bridge. Here is the problem with the government removing the tolls. It not only created inequity in federal bridge policy across the country, where now people who cross this \$4-billion-plus bridge in Montreal will not have to pay a toll, but people crossing the Confederation Bridge between the mainland and Prince Edward Island will have to pay a toll of some \$46. People who cross the new Gordie Howe bridge at the Detroit-Windsor crossing will have to pay a toll, but the people of Montreal will not have to pay a toll. Not only has it created this inequity and unfairness between the different regions on the country, it has also not ensured economic sustainability.

The Auditor General points out that the lost revenue from this decision will cost the consolidated revenue fund some \$3 billion over the next 30 years. That is not economically sustainable.

It is also not environmentally sustainable, and this is where the government's decision-making is flawed.

The Auditor General has said in report 4 that the government's decision to eliminate the tolls on the new Champlain Bridge has had far-reaching implications. The elimination of tolls is expected to increase traffic volumes significantly by 20%. The Auditor General says that 50 million cars and trucks cross the Champlain Bridge each year. We all know this produces a significant amount of greenhouse gas emissions in the country. Twenty-five percent of all greenhouse gases emitted in the country, which is far more than the oil and gas sector, come from the tailpipes of automobiles, trucks, and other modes of transportation.

Government Orders

The government took a decision that would directly increase the number of trucks and cars crossing that bridge, from 50 million to 60 million every year. In fact, 62 million, a 20% increase in 50 million, is about 10-plus million vehicles a year. We are looking at 10 million more vehicles crossing the Champlain Bridge every year, with the attendant greenhouse gas emissions, because of the government's decision to cancel the tolls on that bridge.

• (2350)

Not only did the Liberals create inequity for Prince Edward Islanders, southwestern Ontarians, and Montrealers, not only did they create economic non-sustainability because of a \$3 billion loss to the consolidated revenue fund, they also did not abide by their own principles of environmental sustainability.

The Auditor General makes it quite clear that there will be a massive increase in traffic on the bridge, with the attendant greenhouse gas emissions. This is why the legislation is so very important. We need the government to be forced to walk the walk and to match its talk. It has been talking a good game about reducing emissions, but its actions belie that talk.

The Liberals committed to Mr. Harper's targets of May 2015 to reduce Canada's greenhouse gas emissions by some 30% from 2005 levels by 2030, but they are failing to meet that commitment—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I want to remind members that the House is in session. If they want to have conversations other than listen to what is going on, then they should take that into the lobby out of respect to the people who are speaking.

The hon. member for Wellington—Halton Hills.

Hon. Michael Chong: Madam Speaker, the Liberals have failed to introduce actions that will meet that target. The \$50 per tonne target they have established does not get us to the Paris accord targets. It does not get us anywhere near it.

The other actions they have taken, such as their confusion on the regulatory approval process for major and natural resource projects, belies their commitment to both moving ahead with the economy and the environment, moving ahead with sustainable development.

The actions of the Liberals on the Champlain Bridge demonstrate their lack of commitment to sustainable development, the idea that we can both develop the economy and protect the environment. Today's Auditor General report proves that very point.

That is why we need the legislation. It is time for the Liberals to uphold their talk and to deliver real actions that will meet those twin goals of growing our economy while protecting our environment.

This legislation is necessary. It is going to increase accountability and transparency. It is going to force the government to incorporate these things into its decision-making. It is going to force the government, when it looks at something like a Champlain Bridge toll, to realize that it should not be political gamesmanship to win political points. It also has to take into consideration the economic impacts on the fiscal framework, the \$3 billion hole it has created

now because of that flip decision to cancel the tolls on the Champlain Bridge.

The Liberals have to consider the environmental impacts. Because of their decision to cancel the tolls, we now see an increase in 10 million vehicles a year, a 20% increase of cars and trucks a year crossing that bridge, with the attendant increase in greenhouse gases. They have to take into account these considerations. No longer can they get away with making these trite political decisions that impact our children's economic and environmental futures.

Mr. Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am amazed my colleague was able to bring in the Auditor General's report from this morning on this issue.

One of the issues we have with the government, and my colleague talked about the hypocrisy, is the choosing of winners and losers. We are using taxpayers money to subsidize Toyota, one of the most profitable companies in the world. It makes cars that spew out greenhouse gases. At the same time, it is trying to end other industries, such as phasing out the oil sands.

Could my colleague discuss that in light of his conversation about the Champlain Bridge?

• (2355)

Hon. Michael Chong: Madam Speaker, the member raises a very valid point that a tonne of carbon is a tonne of carbon is a tonne of carbon. Too often, the government has singled out the source of carbon rather than the carbon itself. If the carbon comes out of the oil and gas sector, that is seen as way worse than a tonne of carbon coming out of the tailpipe of one of the 15 million or 16 million commuters who go to work every morning. It sees a tonne of carbon coming out of a coal-fired electricity plant as somehow being worse than a tonne of carbon coming out of a cement factory in central Canada, or a tonne of carbon coming out of a natural gas facility being somehow worse than a tonne of carbon coming out of an automobile manufacturing plant in Ontario, whether that be Ford of Oakville, Linamar in Guelph, Toyota of Cambridge, Honda of Alliston, or the dozens of parts and assembly plants located in the Windsor-Quebec City corridor.

A tonne of carbon should be priced the same across the country. The oil and gas sector and the coal sector should not be singled out for unfair treatment vis-à-vis the other sectors, such as other large emitters in manufacturing or the millions of automobiles on the road.

The government's decision on the Champlain Bridge in Montreal, which will increase vehicular traffic by some 10 million cars and trucks every year, as stated in today's Auditor General's report, proves that the government treats one sector and one region of the country differently than others, and that is not fair.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher (Beauport—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île d'Orléans—Charlevoix, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to rise to speak to Bill C-57. We are going to support this bill, but there are a lot of "buts".

Government Orders

Let me explain. I have to say that what the Prime Minister did today with the Trans Mountain pipeline really bothered me. He is alienating all of the provinces. Everyone objected to the way he handled Kinder Morgan. The provinces are all realizing that they elected a prime minister who is all about appearances. He never takes any real action. He is someone who does things too quickly without ever listening to anyone. Canada is a democratic country, and ever since the Liberals took office the Prime Minister has been saying that he wants to hear our suggestions, but as soon as someone says something or disagrees with him, he throws a bit of a tantrum and stops being sensible. It is rather odd. He had allies in many of the provinces, but he is losing them because of his uninformed decisions.

That is too bad because we could have worked as a team here in the House.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. member will have eight minutes the next time this bill is debated in the House.

It being midnight, the House stands adjourned until later this day, at 2 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 12 a.m.)

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 29, 2018

Points of Order

Proceedings on Government Motion No. 22—Speaker's Ruling

The Speaker 19777

Main Estimates 2018-19—Speaker's Ruling

The Speaker 19778

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Auditor General of Canada

The Speaker 19779

Committees of the House

Environment and Sustainable Development

Mrs. Schulte 19779

Assisted Human Reproduction Act

Mr. Housefather 19779

Bill C-404. Introduction and first reading 19779

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed) 19779

Petitions

Banking Services

Mrs. Hughes 19779

Canada Summer Jobs Program

Ms. Gladu 19779

Rail Transportation

Mr. Aubin 19779

Housing

Mr. MacKinnon 19779

Democratic Reform

Mr. Genuis 19780

Questions on the Order Paper

Mr. Lamoureux 19780

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Federal Sustainable Development Act

Bill C-57—Time Allocation Motion

Ms. Chagger 19780

Motion 19780

Mr. Sopuck 19780

Ms. McKenna 19780

Mr. Genuis 19780

Mr. Masse (Windsor West) 19781

Ms. Gladu 19781

Mr. Aldag 19781

Mr. Dusseault 19782

Mr. Anderson 19782

Mrs. Caesar-Chavannes 19782

Mr. MacGregor 19783

Mrs. Vecchio 19783

Ms. May (Saamich—Gulf Islands) 19784

Mr. Blaikie 19784

Mr. Lamoureux 19785

Motion agreed to 19786

Report Stage

Bill C-57. Report Stage 19786

Mr. Mendicino 19786

Mr. MacGregor 19787

Mrs. Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster) 19788

Mr. Fergus 19788

Mr. Sopuck 19789

Mr. Badawey 19790

Mr. Sopuck 19790

Mrs. Caesar-Chavannes 19792

Mr. Badawey 19792

Mrs. Caesar-Chavannes 19793

Mr. Berthold 19794

Mr. Boulerice 19794

Mr. MacGregor 19795

Mrs. Caesar-Chavannes 19796

Mrs. Caesar-Chavannes 19796

Mr. Dreeshen 19797

Mr. Masse (Windsor West) 19798

Mr. Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis) 19798

Mr. Lamoureux 19799

Ms. Boutin-Sweet 19799

Mr. Berthold 19800

Mr. Baylis 19800

Points of Order

Main Estimates 2018-19

Mr. Blaikie 19801

Federal Sustainable Development Act

Bill C-57. Report stage 19804

Mr. Dusseault 19804

Mr. Baylis 19805

Mr. Dreeshen 19805

Mr. Gerretsen 19805

Mr. Berthold 19805

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

The Environment and Trans Mountain

Ms. Paupé 19805

Order of Canada Recipient

Mr. Blair 19806

Community Service

Mrs. Wong 19806

Health

Mr. Erskine-Smith 19806

Eddy Lefrançois

Mrs. Hughes 19806

Laurentides—Labelle

Mr. Graham 19807

| | |
|---|-------|
| Immigration | |
| Mr. Eglinski | 19807 |
| Retirement Congratulations | |
| Mr. Tabbara | 19807 |
| Duhamel Family Restaurant | |
| Mr. Breton | 19807 |
| Long Service Awards | |
| Mr. Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound) | 19807 |
| Cambridge Youth Council | |
| Mr. May (Cambridge) | 19808 |
| Insurance Brokers Association of Canada | |
| Mrs. Mendès | 19808 |
| Stratford Festival | |
| Mr. Nater | 19808 |
| Chinese Cultural Centre of Greater Toronto | |
| Mr. Chen | 19808 |
| Special Recognition | |
| Mr. Mulcair | 19808 |
| Justice | |
| Mr. Anderson | 19809 |
| Student Summer Employment | |
| Mr. Sarai | 19809 |

ORAL QUESTIONS

| | |
|--------------------------|-------|
| Natural Resources | |
| Mr. Scheer | 19809 |
| Mr. Morneau | 19809 |
| Mr. Scheer | 19810 |
| Mr. Morneau | 19810 |
| Mr. Scheer | 19810 |
| Mr. Morneau | 19810 |
| Mr. Morneau | 19810 |
| Mr. Rayes | 19810 |
| Mr. Morneau | 19810 |
| Mr. Caron | 19810 |
| Mr. Morneau | 19811 |
| Mr. Caron | 19811 |
| Mr. Morneau | 19811 |
| Mr. Cullen | 19811 |
| Mr. Morneau | 19811 |
| Mr. Cullen | 19811 |
| Mr. Morneau | 19811 |
| Mrs. Stubbs | 19811 |
| Mr. Morneau | 19811 |
| Mrs. Stubbs | 19811 |
| Mr. Morneau | 19812 |
| Mr. Jeneroux | 19812 |
| Mr. Morneau | 19812 |
| Ms. Rempel | 19812 |
| Mr. Morneau | 19812 |
| Mr. Strahl | 19812 |

| | |
|--|-------|
| Mr. Morneau | 19812 |
| Mr. Strahl | 19812 |
| Mr. Morneau | 19812 |
| Public Services and Procurement | |
| Ms. Trudel | 19813 |
| Ms. Qualtrough | 19813 |
| Ms. Ramsey | 19813 |
| Ms. Qualtrough | 19813 |
| Natural Resources | |
| Mr. Deltell | 19813 |
| Mr. Morneau | 19813 |
| Mr. Deltell | 19813 |
| Mr. Morneau | 19813 |
| Mr. Poilievre | 19813 |
| Mr. Morneau | 19814 |
| Mr. Poilievre | 19814 |
| Mr. Morneau | 19814 |
| Consumer Protection | |
| Mr. Masse (Windsor West) | 19814 |
| Mr. Bains | 19814 |
| Air Transportation | |
| Mr. Aubin | 19814 |
| Mr. Garneau | 19814 |
| Natural Resources | |
| Mr. Boissonnault | 19814 |
| Mr. Morneau | 19814 |
| Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship | |
| Mr. Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis) | 19815 |
| Mr. Garneau | 19815 |
| Mr. Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis) | 19815 |
| Mr. Garneau | 19815 |
| International Trade | |
| Mr. Berthold | 19815 |
| Mr. MacAulay | 19815 |
| Mr. Berthold | 19815 |
| Mr. Leslie | 19815 |
| Labour | |
| Mr. Blaikie | 19816 |
| Ms. Hajdu | 19816 |
| International Trade | |
| Ms. Brosseau | 19816 |
| Mr. Leslie | 19816 |
| Justice | |
| Mr. Nicholson | 19816 |
| Ms. Wilson-Raybould | 19816 |
| Mr. Cooper | 19816 |
| Ms. Wilson-Raybould | 19816 |
| Mrs. Boucher | 19816 |
| Ms. Wilson-Raybould | 19817 |
| Tourism Industry | |
| Ms. Hutchings | 19817 |
| Ms. Chagger | 19817 |

Labour

| | |
|-----------------|-------|
| Ms. Raitt | 19817 |
| Ms. Hajdu | 19817 |

The Environment

| | |
|----------------------|-------|
| Ms. Malcolmson | 19817 |
| Mr. Garneau | 19817 |

Health

| | |
|---------------------------|-------|
| Mr. Robillard | 19817 |
| Ms. Petitpas Taylor | 19818 |

Democratic Reform

| | |
|-----------------|-------|
| Mr. Kent | 19818 |
| Ms. Gould | 19818 |

The Environment

| | |
|--------------------------------------|-------|
| Mrs. Gill | 19818 |
| Mr. Morneau | 19818 |
| Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) | 19818 |
| Mr. Carr | 19818 |
| Mr. Weir | 19818 |
| Mr. Morneau | 19818 |

Presence in Gallery

| | |
|-------------------|-------|
| The Speaker | 19818 |
|-------------------|-------|

Privilege**Firearms Act**

| | |
|----------------|-------|
| Mr. Motz | 19819 |
|----------------|-------|

GOVERNMENT ORDERS**Extension of Sitting Hours****Motion that debate be not further adjourned**

| | |
|-----------------------------|-------|
| Ms. Chagger | 19821 |
| Motion | 19821 |
| Mr. Berthold | 19821 |
| Mr. Dubé | 19821 |
| Mr. O'Toole | 19821 |
| Mrs. Caesar-Chavannes | 19822 |
| Mrs. Boucher | 19822 |
| Mr. Blaikie | 19822 |
| Mr. Anderson | 19823 |
| Mr. Ouellette | 19823 |
| Mr. Fast | 19823 |
| Ms. Kwan | 19824 |
| Mr. Warawa | 19824 |
| Mr. Gerretsen | 19824 |
| Mr. Anderson | 19825 |
| Motion agreed to | 19827 |

Extension of Sitting Hours

| | |
|---------------------|-------|
| Mr. Genuis | 19827 |
| Amendment | 19830 |
| Mr. Cuzner | 19830 |
| Mr. Dubé | 19830 |
| Mrs. Jordan | 19831 |
| Mr. Albas | 19831 |
| Mr. Gerretsen | 19831 |
| Mr. Blaikie | 19832 |

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS**United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act**

| | |
|---|-------|
| Bill C-262. Report stage | 19833 |
| Mr. Saganash | 19834 |
| Motion for concurrence | 19834 |
| (Motion agreed to) | 19834 |
| Mr. Saganash | 19834 |
| Bill C-262. Third reading | 19834 |
| Mr. Anandasangaree | 19835 |
| Mrs. McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo) | 19835 |
| Mr. Anandasangaree | 19835 |
| Mrs. McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo) | 19836 |
| Ms. Benson | 19837 |
| Mr. Tootoo | 19838 |
| Ms. Malcolmson | 19839 |
| Mr. Longfield | 19840 |
| Mr. Ouellette | 19840 |
| Mr. Saganash | 19841 |
| Division on motion deferred | 19841 |

GOVERNMENT ORDERS**Extension of Sitting Hours**

| | |
|--|-------|
| Motion | 19841 |
| Mr. Blaikie | 19841 |
| Amendment to amendment | 19842 |
| Mr. Lamoureux | 19842 |
| Mr. Genuis | 19842 |
| Ms. Trudel | 19843 |
| Ms. Fry | 19843 |
| Mr. Genuis | 19845 |
| Mr. Rankin | 19846 |
| Mr. Gerretsen | 19846 |
| Mr. Warawa | 19847 |
| Ms. Bergen | 19847 |
| Mrs. Caesar-Chavannes | 19850 |
| Ms. Trudel | 19850 |
| Mrs. Boucher | 19851 |
| Mr. Gerretsen | 19851 |
| Mrs. Caesar-Chavannes | 19852 |
| Mr. Fast | 19853 |
| Mr. Bittle | 19853 |
| Amendment to the amendment negatived | 19854 |
| Amendment negatived | 19856 |
| Motion agreed to | 19857 |

Criminal Code**Bill C-75—Time Allocation Motion**

| | |
|--------------------------------|-------|
| Ms. Chagger | 19857 |
| Motion | 19857 |
| Mr. Nicholson | 19857 |
| Ms. Wilson-Raybould | 19857 |
| Mr. Garrison | 19857 |
| Mr. Masse (Windsor West) | 19858 |
| Mr. Strahl | 19858 |
| Mrs. Caesar-Chavannes | 19858 |
| Mr. O'Toole | 19858 |

| | | | |
|--|-------|-------------------------------------|-------|
| Mr. MacGregor..... | 19859 | Mr. Fast..... | 19866 |
| Mr. Albas..... | 19859 | Mr. Genuis..... | 19867 |
| Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)..... | 19859 | Mr. Scarpaleggia..... | 19868 |
| Mr. Cooper..... | 19860 | Mr. Masse (Windsor West)..... | 19868 |
| Mr. Blaikie..... | 19860 | Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)..... | 19869 |
| Mrs. Vecchio..... | 19860 | Mr. Fast..... | 19870 |
| Mrs. Boucher..... | 19861 | Mr. McCauley..... | 19871 |
| Mr. Warawa..... | 19862 | Mr. Whalen..... | 19872 |
| Motion agreed to..... | 19863 | Mr. Cooper..... | 19873 |
| Federal Sustainable Development Act | | Mr. Warawa..... | 19873 |
| Bill C-57. Report Stage..... | 19863 | Mr. Cooper..... | 19874 |
| Mr. Berthold..... | 19863 | Mr. Fast..... | 19875 |
| Mr. Choquette..... | 19864 | Mr. Chong..... | 19875 |
| Mr. Choquette..... | 19865 | Mr. McCauley..... | 19876 |
| Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)..... | 19866 | Mrs. Boucher..... | 19876 |

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>