



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

House of Commons Debates

Official Report
(Hansard)

Volume 151 No. 227
Friday, September 29, 2023

Speaker: The Honourable Louis Plamondon



CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, September 29, 2023

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayer

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1000)

[*English*]

CANADIAN SUSTAINABLE JOBS ACT

Hon. Diane Lebouthillier (for the Minister of Natural Resources) moved that Bill C-50, An Act respecting accountability, transparency and engagement to support the creation of sustainable jobs for workers and economic growth in a net-zero economy, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change and to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is an honour to stand today to start our debate on Bill C-50, an act respecting federal accountability, transparency and engagement to support the creation of sustainable jobs for workers and economic growth in a net-zero economy.

By introducing legislation for sustainable jobs, the Government of Canada is providing strong leadership through good governance, strong accountability and effective engagement. We would take action through five key elements.

The first element is to introduce guiding principles that ensure a cohesive approach to economic development and climate action, including measures to support workers and help to create sustainable jobs, all while aligning with international best practices and sending a strong signal to investors that Canada is ready to lead in an emerging clean-growth industry world.

The second element is to create a sustainable jobs partnership council tasked with providing independent annual advice to the Government of Canada and engaging with Canadians. This council will ensure that experts including workers, indigenous leaders, industry and young people are at the table to guide governmental actions.

The third element is a requirement to publish action plans every five years, informed by input from stakeholders and partners, as well as expert advice from the partnership council.

The fourth element is to create a sustainable jobs secretariat to ensure coordinated action on the implementation of the act across the federal government.

The fifth and final element is to designate responsible and specified ministers to carry out this legislation.

Much like the Canadian Net-Zero Emissions Accountability Act, this legislation would help to ensure that the Government of Canada has every region of Canada and every Canadian worker at the centre of its policy and decision-making with respect to sustainable jobs. The Canadian sustainable jobs act would respect Canada's workers, regardless of the industry they work in, and would be inclusive of Canadians of all stripes, no matter what their background or where they live.

[*Translation*]

This legislation builds on the progress we have made over several years, as the government encouraged significant growth in our clean energy industries and other sectors that help us achieve net-zero emissions.

Since 2015, we have invested more than \$120 billion in clean growth initiatives and pledged more than \$80 billion in tax incentives.

If we had followed the path advocated by some Conservatives—one of austerity and inaction—our constituents and their communities would be at a considerable disadvantage. This head-in-the-sand approach fails to take into account the areas where investments are being made, namely, natural resources, energy, buildings, transportation, manufacturing and many others.

• (1005)

[*English*]

An approach of inaction would let competing nations take leadership roles in the sectors and industries where Canada is a natural leader, letting them innovate and attract global investments, while we wait and simply hope for the best. Such a reckless approach of inaction would put our economic well-being and our environmental stability at risk, but we are not going to let that happen. Instead we are acting decisively.

Government Orders

Whether it is this bill to ensure Canadian workers can seize the economic opportunity in front of us, or Bill C-49, which is helping to deploy an offshore wind industry in Atlantic Canada, or our historic budget investments that allowed us to compete with the U.S. IRA and attract new job-creating sustainable investments, initiatives that support the creation of sustainable jobs are happening across government.

Canadians have an opportunity to take the lead in many fields in jobs that play a key role in reducing energy consumption like developing new green housing plans, retrofitting existing homes and buildings, or innovating in cutting-edge low-carbon technology.

[*Translation*]

These activities will all create sustainable jobs from coast to coast for our people, whether we are talking about a skilled worker at the Volkswagen plant in St. Thomas, another who installs heat pumps in Nova Scotia or yet another who builds the batteries of the future at the new Northvolt plant we announced yesterday in Quebec.

We know that such investments are essential if we want to grow the Canadian economy and, consequently, create sustainable jobs.

[*English*]

While we attract industrial development, we are also focused on building out the backbone of Canada's economy, namely, Canada's electrical grid. The federal government is proud to support growing, sustainable industries, like renewable energy, hydrogen and nuclear energy. They are helping us to scale new technologies while delivering clean, reliable and affordable power to Canadian homes and industry.

Canada's clean electricity advantage has helped us to land international investors like Northvolt, Umicore, Ford and many others. We need to keep expanding our electricity system to attract investment, create sustainable jobs and fight climate change. That is why we have invested to deploy job-creating clean energy projects, like the 47-megawatt wind farm we announced yesterday near Medicine Hat, Alberta, or the 45-megawatt Burchill wind project in New Brunswick. These projects are helping to deploy more clean power to our grid every day.

The Government of Canada is also investing to deliver clean power storage, like the 250-megawatt Oneida project being built in the Six Nations of the Grand River in Ontario.

All of these projects include indigenous leaders. This kind of work is critical to advancing economic reconciliation with indigenous peoples. Accordingly, an important commitment in this legislation is to create more meaningful, ongoing, respectful relationships with indigenous peoples. We need more indigenous peoples to lead business as directors, managers and workers. Their skills, knowledge and leadership are helping accelerate the fight against climate change, the modernization of our energy sector and the development of sustainable jobs for Canadian workers, including in the energy space.

As I mentioned earlier, we need a connected, affordable, reliable and non-emitting grid to supply more electrical energy than ever before. Not only will it power our emerging sources of new energy,

it will also become a standard part of heating our homes, powering our vehicles and driving all types of industry.

There are lots of jobs associated with this new era of clean-power development. It is no wonder that the IBEW, the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, endorsed our sustainable job plan and this bill. Its vice-president endorsed our plan and said, "The IBEW's almost 70,000 members in Canada are ready to help build the next generation of Canada's vital energy infrastructure to help us reach our net-zero goals."

The work being done to build out our grid, a job that is so massive that it must be tackled jointly by every level of government, will facilitate the growth of our nation's economy and our jobs, thanks to its status as a multi-trillion dollar market.

● (1010)

[*Translation*]

The eight years of investments made by our entire government have put us on the road to a strong economy that supports workers and job creation.

As a government, we have made informed choices aimed at supporting and growing our economy and modernizing our industrial sectors so we can succeed in the global race to invest in the clean economy.

The legislation we are debating today complements the billions of dollars in job-creating investments we have released so far, as well as our climate action policies, including pollution pricing and the Canadian Net-Zero Emissions Accountability Act.

That act requires us to set greenhouse gas emissions targets, encourages transparency and accountability, and calls on us to take immediate and ambitious action to reach these targets.

Bill C-50 builds on that act and on the clean industries strategy described in budget 2023. Thanks to this solid base, Canada and its workforce are in an enviable position compared to most countries of the world.

[*English*]

We are privileged, because we live in a peaceful country that has a wealth of sustainable resources, resources that demand a central role in whether we will be able to reach our goal of net-zero emissions by 2050, resources that are abundant and diverse and that provide our workers and communities with opportunities that only come with concerted, determined shifts toward a low-carbon future.

As we focus on driving down the emissions that are fuelling the climate crisis, we are equally determined to ensure our young people have a bright future ahead of them in careers that help build a strong, sustainable and prosperous economy. Both are possible and they go hand in hand.

As Sean Strickland, the executive director of Canada's Building Trades Unions said, "If you take climate change seriously, you must, by definition, be pro-worker."

If the world wants more clean energy, and it does, let our talented workforce meet that demand. If the world wants more products made by cleaner manufacturing processes, let us attract the business that helps our workers fill that gap.

The Royal Bank of Canada estimates that in this decade alone, just in the next few years, the global shift to a low-carbon economy will create up to 400,000 new Canadian jobs in fields where enhanced skills will be required. Some of these are because of action we are taking to partner with industry, communities and others, to pair talent with training.

Last Monday, in Edmonton, we announced support for over 20,000 new green jobs being supported by ESDC. Of the 400,000 jobs that require upskilling, a good percentage of those jobs are thanks to the sustainable development of our natural resources, which includes clean energy and hydrogen.

There is no question we are blessed with an abundance of resources, but to access the potential they provide, we must also ensure our workforce is well equipped. That is exactly what this legislation would do.

During the many discussions we had in the lead-up to this legislation, many of Canada's indigenous leaders, provinces, territories and local leaders identified tangible opportunities to pursue the development of new industries. They are taking concrete steps to realize their economic future. They are facing what much of the world sees as an enviable task of narrowing those options down to the top few that will create good-paying jobs and prosperity in their communities.

Our existing resources and initiatives created an ideal footing for our interim sustainable jobs plan. The strengths of the plan are the concrete actions it contains; notably, this legislation. There is also the start of a lot of work on nine other federal actions that will have a positive impact on the number of good, sustainable jobs in every part of this country.

I would like to speak to some of those actions today with the time I have left. First and foremost, I will mention the call to establish new legislation, the one we are debating today. It offers a framework that would allow us to take sound actions to address both the opportunities and challenges in a low-carbon economy, informed by ongoing engagement between government and Canada's workers, partners and stakeholders, as well as indigenous peoples.

This legislation would also put accountability front and centre by designating a lead minister to guide these efforts. This would be accompanied by a requirement the government publish five-year action plans Canadians can use to measure and judge our efforts, sup-

Government Orders

ported by regular reporting on our progress, because Canadians deserve nothing less.

The legislation would also make good on another action item from the sustainable jobs plan, which is the establishment of a sustainable jobs partnership council. This would be an independent body that would provide advice to government on how it can best support the shift to a low-carbon economy. If we really want to give workers a voice, if we sincerely intend to empower them to influence the decisions that affect their jobs and their future, then we must create this council.

Through these efforts, workers, rural and remote communities, provinces and territories, indigenous groups, industry, young people, academics and others will be able to provide the council and the federal government with invaluable advice as we continue to move ahead.

What we are talking about is real-world perspectives and information from those individuals in the workplace who are experiencing the transformation of our economy.

● (1015)

The council would apply its own expertise to these lived experiences to provide independent, actionable advice on how to create good-paying, skilled, sustainable jobs for Canada's workers and ensure that workers have the supports that they need to succeed. Through the council, we would have the opportunity to bring many voices to the table, working together in the process known as social dialogue, essentially bringing workers, employers and governments together to find solutions that work for real life.

Some of my colleagues will go into more detail about the other elements in this legislation, like the commitment to releasing regular action plans and the sustainable job secretariat that would be created to work across federal departments and agencies on those plans.

[*Translation*]

The Canadian sustainable jobs act will ensure that Canadian workers have a clear path to the future. The measures we are taking here will help Canada lead the competition as our economy achieves net-zero emissions.

This plan is based on the thoughts and experiences of thousands of Canadians over more than two years of engagement and consultation. I would like to express our deep gratitude for their work and for their interest in helping us develop this legislation.

*Government Orders**[English]*

It was views like these that helped build the strong bill we have before us today. We even won endorsements from groups like the Canadian Labour Congress, which represents three million Canadian workers. It said that the plan in this bill would be a big win for workers. We know that when workers win, so does Canada. This legislation is needed to ensure that the interim plan can support workers today while standing up the partnership council and secretariat to ensure an ongoing process.

When I speak about endorsements from the groups that have looked at this legislation, I wanted to also include the voice of the president of the Business Council of Alberta, who said, “The Sustainable Jobs Act represents an important opportunity for Canada: to shape our future and create jobs by providing the resources that the world needs—including energy, food, and minerals. The act is a good step forward in helping equip Canadians with the skills for the jobs for our future economy.”

Today, it is up to us to make the smartest possible choices and to put in place a framework that commits our government to supporting workers as they seek to build the sustainable economy of the future.

This bill reflects consultation with indigenous peoples, union members, new Canadians, industry leaders and community advocates from every region of the country. We owe it to them and to all Canadians to ensure that we are advancing a thoughtful plan to help them ensure that our country succeeds and that we can access great careers for generations to come.

- (1020)

[Translation]

This legislation will be used to create solidarity measures and strengthen training opportunities for all workers in Canada. It will ensure that Canadian workers can participate in discussions and enjoy equal opportunities to obtain and benefit from the jobs of the future. Like many of our government's initiatives, this bill is based on the need to tackle the existential threat of the climate crisis head-on, and to seize once-in-a-lifetime economic opportunities.

[English]

Countries around the world know that we have two choices ahead of us. We can advance plans for the future that allow us to seize economic opportunities while fighting climate change, or we can simply stick our heads in the sand and hope for the best. I sincerely hope that every member of the House agrees to choose the first path, because as countries around the world race to seize economic opportunities ahead of us, we must also quickly pass Bill C-50. We need to keep working to ensure and build a sustainable future while securing abundant, sustainable jobs for future generations.

Mrs. Stephanie Kusie (Calgary Midnapore, CPC): Madam Speaker, my apologies, but I have a very difficult time believing the sincerity of the government with this bill, and that is a result of its constant retaliation against the natural resources sector. We saw this with Bill C-48. We also saw this with Bill C-69. We have seen this with the endless carbon tax after carbon tax, as well as with emissions standards, which the government forced industry to meet.

This results in a larger mental health crisis among industry workers and higher suicide rates. Perhaps it is even fuelling the opioid crisis.

With a \$41-billion deficit and \$2.1 trillion of debt across Canada, and with oil and gas making up 7.5% of the GDP, how are the Liberals going to replace the funds in the coffers from a dying industry that they have killed at a time when they are also overspending?

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: Madam Speaker, we know that natural resources are at the centre of our future economy, and Canada is blessed with so many resources that the world is looking for. That is why we are actually reaching agreements with other countries, like Germany with our memorandum on hydrogen, and our recent agreement with Romania when it comes to nuclear power.

We know that Canada has the expertise, and we have the workers to make those different clean energy industries a success. We are relying on their ingenuity to get us through to where we know we need to be, because, as I mentioned, RBC has estimated that by the end of this decade, there will be 400,000 new jobs for Canadians. We know and we believe in Canadian workers. They have the know-how. They have the go, the energy to keep us moving forward. We are making agreements with international countries to be able to make those jobs a reality.

[Translation]

Ms. Monique Pauzé (Repentigny, BQ): Madam Speaker, I listened carefully to my colleague's speech. The most important part of it was when she spoke about new jobs in new technologies.

Does this bill not seek to help retrain workers in polluting industries, declining industries? There was no mention of that. In any case, I did not hear my colleague mention it in her speech.

If Canada is moving toward oil expansion, then there is no energy transition, and so there is no need to talk about a fair transition for workers, since there are going to be jobs.

I think it is simplistic to talk about jobs in new technologies. Yes, these jobs must be created according to the principles of the fair transition. However, the fair transition is the approach taken to keep workers in declining industries in the labour market.

- (1025)

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: Madam Speaker, as I said in my speech, sustainable jobs are part of what we are doing to address climate change. Canada is transitioning to a net-zero economy. That is important because it attracts the interest of industries that want to do their manufacturing here in Canada.

We just saw an example of that yesterday in Quebec with Northvolt, a company that is going to manufacture batteries in Saint-Basile-le-Grand. That will create jobs for 3,000 people, and that is not the only announcement that we made. We are seeing it everywhere. There are companies out there, whether it be Volkswagen or Rio Tinto. Everyone is looking to see how we can develop a net-zero industry here in Canada.

[English]

Ms. Leah Gazan (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Madam Speaker, New Democrats are going to continue to use our position in Parliament to push for a sustainable future rooted in clean technology and good-paying union jobs. We are not going to give up until the government delivers.

Although we welcome this legislation, under the Liberals' watch, we are watching the country burn down as they continue to invest in the fossil fuel industry. We are in a climate emergency. While the Liberals fail to act, the Conservatives pretty much completely deny the climate emergency and are not willing to move forward into the future into a clean economy that brings workers along.

We are happy that the Liberals are putting forth this legislation. How long is it going to take them to actually act? We are in a climate crisis. We need climate action now.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: Madam Speaker, I could agree more with the member opposite that we have to make sure we steer our economy to where the world is looking. We are in a global shift, and fighting climate change has to be at the top of our agenda. We have seen it with the wildfires, hurricanes, floods and droughts. It is terrible when we see things like yesterday, when the Conservatives brought a motion specifically based on denying that fighting climate change is something we must do. We know we must do it, and we know we must put workers and their communities at the centre of where we are moving. That is why I am looking forward to working with the member opposite, and any member of the House who feels like doing that, to move this file quickly to committee so we can do the important work of making this law.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Democratic Institutions and Intergovernmental Affairs (Cybersecurity), Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to ask my hon. colleague a question following along the same line as the last question. What is the risk to the Canadian economy and workers if we do not put into place a clear plan, and if we are not strategic about supporting our workers as the world's economy is developing to address climate change? What risk does Canada face by burying our head in the sand and not acknowledging that the jobs of the future are also the jobs that are going to solve the climate crisis?

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for that question because it is so important that we recognize that fighting climate change not only helps us to avert the natural disasters we are seeing in our country, but also that, more than that, it is economic policy. It is so important we make sure our economy is a net-zero economy. When we talk to people in industry, and I have talked with different people from companies around the world, they say that they looked at Canada because we have one of the cleanest grids in the world. We can do better than that; we can have a net-zero grid, which is what we are working toward.

Government Orders

More than that, we can talk about things like, for example, the EU, which in only a few days is putting in place a border carbon adjustment. If we want to be able to continue to trade with that important bloc, getting rid of things like a price on carbon pollution and stopping action to fight climate change would make our trade relationships more difficult.

If we believe in a strong economy, in workers and in trade, we need to fight climate change. This bill is part of the work that we need to do.

[Translation]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette, BQ): Madam Speaker, can the government confirm that this bill includes respect for jurisdictions and that the way Quebec deals with labour will be respected as well?

Did the government think about that when it drafted Bill C-50? Can my colleague confirm that?

• (1030)

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: Madam Speaker, this bill applies to work that is done under federal jurisdiction. We consulted the provinces and territories during the drafting of this bill. We know that is very important.

We will work with the provinces and territories because they too want to ensure that we are ready for net-zero and to support workers in their province and territory. We are working with them to be sure of that.

[English]

Mr. Richard Cannings (South Okanagan—West Kootenay, NDP): Madam Speaker, I want to pick up on this idea of working on creating a clean energy grid and cleaning all our forms of energy in the Canadian energy ecosystem. One way we could do that to fight climate change, bring down our emissions, and keep Canadians safe is to have a really serious program to bring heat pumps to all Canadians. There is a small program in Atlantic Canada now. We really need this across the country. Heat pumps are safe and efficient, and they work everywhere across Canada. I wonder why the government is not really picking up on that in a big way.

Government Orders

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: Madam Speaker, we know that how we heat our homes and power our vehicles is such an important part of what we are doing to reach net zero. I would like to make sure that the member opposite lets all of his constituents know about the greener homes loans and grants. These are a chance for an auditor to make an assessment as to what is most needed. It might be insulation. It might be a heat pump. There might be different steps that are needed, but, absolutely, energy efficiency and making sure we power our homes in a way that reduces emissions are both so very important to the transition to a net-zero economy.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC): Madam Speaker, for all Canadians everywhere; for my bosses, the people of Lakeland; and on behalf of the official opposition, Conservatives oppose Bill C-50.

It is dressed up as something else, but it is really the culmination and symbol of the NDP-Liberal costly coalition's divisive, top-down, central planning, economy-restructuring and wealth-redistributing, anti-private sector, antidevelopment, anti-energy agenda, known previously and around the world as the so-called just transition.

The reality is anything but just. It really represents a transition to poverty and a diminishment of the standard of living and way of life most Canadians are able to enjoy. I will make that case today and expand on it later as MPs do our job and our due diligence on this bill, which is about so much more than it seems at first.

The NDP-Liberals say it is about job training and helping workers in one sector develop some new skills for jobs in a sector yet to get fully on its feet. Canadians should know that it embodies almost a decade of incremental, punitive policies, taxes, bans and penalties, and red tape to end energy development in Canada and to kill those and all related jobs.

It shows the core philosophical gap between Conservatives and, I think, most Canadians and all the other parties in this House. It puts top-down, command and control planning, and power in the hands of politicians and government to set and restructure the fundamentals of Canada's economy instead of job creators, entrepreneurs, inventors, dreamers and individual Canadian citizens and consumers, who built our country into the blessed place that it is.

As a consequence, it would ultimately make life more expensive and more unstable for all Canadians, like nearly everything else the costly coalition has done during the last eight years.

The just transition is a dangerous, government-mandated and direct threat to hundreds of thousands of Canadian jobs. It would displace hundreds of thousands of workers and risk the livelihoods of Canadians across all provinces and territories in all sectors.

Members should mark Conservatives' words: It would negatively impact the whole Canadian economy while disproportionately harming certain people and provinces, such as B.C., the Prairies and Atlantic Canada, and regions. There is nothing just about it, and the government knows it. After months of naming it preparing it, at the very last minute, the government changed the wording from "just transition" to the so-called sustainable jobs plan, because it sounds better. Canadians were worried about the just transition when they found out what it meant, so the NDP-Liberals switched

it out, for their own PR and political purposes; their early framework document from last summer even admits this.

However, it is the same old plan, anchored on the NDP-Liberal agenda to end Canada's energy sector and to harm all the other spinoff jobs and sectors in all provinces that depend on it. The damage to Canada cannot be overstated. Whether the blind and divisive ideology of the other parties would allow them to admit this reality or not, let us get real about the stakes of this debate.

Despite eight years of layers of anti-energy policies, laws, bans, vetoes, caps, standards, penalties, taxes and red tape that have driven billions of dollars and the livelihoods of hundreds of thousands of Canadians out of our country, the fact remains today that oil and gas is literally the top private sector investor in Canada's economy, and energy is still Canada's largest export.

It is the leading contributor to tax revenues at every level of government, with more than \$48 billion last year alone. Almost a decade into the coalition's anti-energy agenda, it still directly employs almost 200,000 people, with average wages that are more than double the national average.

The truth is that every single provincial and territorial budget depends on revenues from oil and gas. Even in provinces where the elected people pretend it does not pay for the programs and services their citizens expect and count on, it does, both directly and when the revenue from the incomes of energy workers are shared across the country in transfers.

On top of that, oil and gas companies in Canada are the top private sector investors in clean technology, covering 75% of private sector investment in Canada in clean tech. They have been the private sector pioneers of alternative and renewable energy innovation for decades, because energy transformation is their expertise.

Government Orders

I am appalled that I even have to point out these facts in the hope that we can have some semblance of a realistic debate here, since the anti-energy coalition has spent so much time dismissing, distorting and denying it. At this point, I do not even know whether all these legislators here actually do not know the facts, which is obviously alarming in itself, or whether they are just wilfully ignorant and deliberately evasive in order to impose their own agenda.

However, the magnitude and gravity of what the end days of this approach would look like for Canadians means I must speak the truth. Conservatives will keep doing so to do our duty in the best public interest of all Canadians, which is our priority.

• (1035)

The responsible development of Canada's natural resources has been the main driver in closing the gap between the wealthy and poor, and it is disproportionately responsible for the relatively high standard of living that most Canadians have enjoyed compared with other countries around the world. Energy development here constantly innovates and transforms. Engineers, inventors and risk-takers have built a globally renowned means to displace higher-polluting alternatives, accelerate technology to improve environmental stewardship, and help reduce emissions globally. It is also the most environmentally and socially responsible means to do so. It is often the only source of job and economic opportunities in rural and remote communities, especially indigenous communities, which make up more than double the workforce percentage in oil and gas of indigenous people in other sectors compared with the national average.

As always, vulnerable people, people in rural and remote communities and people the Liberals say they care about, especially on the Prairies and in Atlantic Canada, are the people whom Bill C-50 would disproportionately hurt the most. The truth is, though, that this whole agenda would negatively impact all Canadians and all major sectors. It would cascade through the economy, which is already happening in real time. This top-down, central planning attempt to restructure the economy would hurt manufacturers in metals, rubber, plastics and chemicals; technicians in the oil and gas sector; workers and truck drivers in the transportation sector bringing food to grocery stores; servers and cooks in food services; farms and ranchers and agribusiness; and hotels, convenience stores and all individual Canadians, as the cost of living goes higher and higher as a result of the Liberals' anti-energy, anti-private sector policies. Canadians are already bearing all these costs at just the beginning of these anti-energy laws, taxes and red tape; it will get worse.

The carbon tax, of course, has hiked the cost of everything, with no overall reductions in emissions or improved environmental performance to show for it. It is clearly not worth the cost, because almost a decade in, it is not doing what the NDP-Liberals claim; it is fuelling inflation and the cost of living crisis their government has caused. Basics, and not luxuries, such as groceries, gas and home heating, are all more expensive, with no end in sight. A stick of butter is almost seven bucks where I live. Gas has been hovering around two bucks a litre in Alberta, Ontario and Atlantic Canada; it is more than that in parts of B.C.

Provinces have been working to try to lower fuel costs. Alberta suspended its gas tax, only to have the NDP-Liberals drive the costs right back up by bringing in their second carbon tax, from which, let us be clear, no Canadian in any province is exempt. Other provinces, such as those in Atlantic Canada, plead with the federal NDP-Liberals to pause the carbon taxes because their residents have to choose between eating and heating and cannot make ends meet.

The NDP-Liberals wax eloquent about caring, but they make light of the struggles Canadians face. They criticize Conservatives for being the only party actually fighting to lower costs and prices for everyone. They call names, impugn motives, distract and divide, and they keep right on rolling their agenda over everyone in the way. Layers of NDP-Liberal anti-energy policies, such as the no more pipelines bill, shipping bans, drilling bans, vetoes of approved energy infrastructure and gatekeeping red tape, designed to get to no and not to yes, have already destroyed over 300,000 jobs. Massive long-term promising oil and gas and pipeline investments, LNG terminals and export facilities, and mining operations have all been cancelled or delayed or cannot even get started because of the uncertainty of the NDP-Liberal agenda.

What really concerns me is all the costly coalition's efforts, or its ignorance, about the direct link between energy development and Canadians' everyday real lives. Right now, if Canada keeps going in the NDP-Liberal government's direction, our country is on track to be one of the worst performers in standard-of-living increases in the world over the next 40 years. There would be real costs, as there already are.

Based on the NDP-Liberals' catastrophically failed experiment with the coal transition, which left workers and whole communities behind, this next phase of the global just transition agenda will cost Canada almost \$40 billion each year it is implemented. That does not even include the loss in tax revenue and royalties from oil and gas. However, members should not take my word for it. The government's own internal brief says its just transition plan will kill 170,000 direct jobs, displace up to 450,000 direct and indirect jobs, and cause large-scale disruptions to manufacturing, agriculture, transportation, energy and construction, impacting a staggering 2.7 million Canadian livelihoods. That is why Conservatives stand alone, opposed to this agenda. It is absolutely not worth the cost.

I am going to touch on disproportionate impacts. Despite all the empty rhetoric, which individual Canadians are going to be hurt directly and the most?

Government Orders

• (1040)

The truth is this: Visible minority Canadians and indigenous Canadians, who are more highly represented in the energy sector, are expected to face higher job disruptions and will have more trouble finding new opportunities as a result of this truly unjust plan. That is gross. What is really gross is that the government knows it.

Dale Swampy, president of the National Coalition of Chiefs, said, “There is nothing fair or equitable about [it]”. In committee, he put a fine point on how much worse the reality of this agenda would be for indigenous communities. He said there are “high costs” to this poor plan and the “crisis we now face in first nations.” He also said:

Many of our communities rely on diesel generation. People have to drive for hours to get to doctors appointments or a grocery store. A lot of people aren't on the grid, and even those who are don't have the electricity capacity to add charging stations in garages they don't have. You won't find any electric cars on the [reserve].

That is the case for lots of Canadians all across the country. The reality is that oil and gas are still more readily available for remote communities. The projects last longer and have better wages, job security, benefits and opportunities than other sectors provide. That is just the truth.

The NDP-Liberals' plan to phase out oil and gas is bad for Canada, but it has international implications, too. The ongoing attack on Ukraine should make it clear to the Liberals and the NDP that where the world gets its energy from really matters and underscores the importance of energy security. The NDP-Liberal government should actually learn lessons from other countries instead of plunging Canada down the same destructive path.

Germany, for example, ignored energy security to try to phase out its own energy sector and relied on dictatorships, such as Russia, to supply its citizens' needs, until Russia turned off the taps and Germany was forced to bring their coal power back online. After cancelling the KXL pipeline, President Joe Biden had to plead with OPEC dictators to increase oil exports. That failed, so he had to empty the U.S.'s strategic petroleum reserve and end sanctions in Venezuela, even though he was also the VP when the U.S. ramped up shale gas and oil exports outside of North America, and in the same year, the U.S. imported more of that very same oil from Canada than ever before in its history.

Apparently, hypocrisy abounds for the sake of domestic politics there, just like here. Of course, now the U.S. has upped the competitive ante on Canada even more while the NDP-Liberals leave us vulnerable and hold us back, and the U.S. has not actually slowed down its traditional energy development or exports either; they are ramping up. Canada can and should be an energy superpower, and Conservatives believe we still can be, with a change of government. However, it is not for the title; instead, it is to bring home energy self-sufficiency and security for our country, for the standard of living of our citizens first, and then to support free and democratic allies and developing nations around the world.

It is wild that even now, the NDP-Liberals will not reverse their destructive plan, despite geopolitical realities and the necessity of stable, reliable, accessible, predictable and affordable energy of all kinds for Canada's communities, economy and sovereignty. That is more obvious and necessary than ever.

Canada should accelerate energy projects and infrastructure for energy alignment with North America and allies around the world. Canada should maintain and expand its place at the top of energy-producing nations and supply growing global energy demand while alternative energy and other fuels of the future are in development, but not yet abundant or reliable enough for all domestic or global needs. Canada can aim to meet net-zero targets while continuing to reap the benefits of a sector that is leading the entire world in innovation and clean technology.

That is what an actual evidence-based policy would do. In fact, that is the only feasible way to meet Canadian energy needs, grow Canada's economy and achieve environmental goals until other alternatives, which are currently in development, become real, viable options for all Canadians. However, the NDP-Liberals are rushing ahead anyway, ignoring science, economics and expert testimony for their own ideology.

When evidence and experts show their plans' massive flaws, they obfuscate through rebranding campaigns and buzzwords, while ignoring or attacking any critics. For example, when the government held two consultation phases on it, Quebec, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Nunavut were left out. The natural resources committee, which I am on, was in the middle of a study about the just transition, hearing testimony, when the NDP-Liberals brought in the bill before the work was even finished. The final report was selective to suit their agenda.

Government Orders

As they do this, it attacks Canada's energy sector, fails to recognize Canada's world-class environmental standards and encourages an accelerated transition away from the livelihoods and businesses on which millions of Canadians depend. Instead of examining and making recommendations on practical and feasible ways and timelines for increased technological development and grid decarbonization without risking Canada's economy and standard of living, the report was twisted to prop up the bill after the fact and totally excluded the large group of witnesses who highlighted the gaps, contradictions and realities of this agenda.

It is worth noting that, during the entire 64-witness, 23-brief, year-plus-long study, only one non-government witness ever called it “sustainable jobs”. Therefore, it is almost insultingly obvious that it is a cynical last-minute attempt to obscure the real aims and the real consequences.

● (1045)

The Liberals already failed their just transition attempt for 3,400 coal workers in 14 communities, and some say past behaviour is a good predictor of future behaviour. Last year, the environment commissioner said that plan failed by every measure and left those workers and all those communities behind. Now the Liberals claim they can do this for 2.7 million workers across every sector of the economy. We call Canadians skeptical, and rightly so. Bill C-50 is more of the same. It would be that kind of failure, and that is why Conservatives oppose it.

However, the key question for Canadians is this: What is the experience of other countries that are 30 to 40 years down the road of the policy agenda imposed by the NDP-Liberals on Canada? Well, the answer is alarming, and it should cause a serious pause to elect representatives here at home in Canada.

In European countries, after implementing various just transition policies in the late 2010s, electricity bills doubled from 2021 to 2022, but let us talk about some specifics. German citizens faced a 200% increase. Scandinavians saw a 470% increase in power bills. What does that even mean? That was, of course, before Russia's invasion of Ukraine. In the U.K., literally three days ago, governments are stopping big elements of their anti-energy policies, including their ban on internal combustion engines and the transition away from natural gas heating. They are removing their tax on jet fuel and opposing calls to ban new oil and gas production in the North Sea. The U.K. is also, of course, extending coal plant life cycles through next year. This will continue, because this approach does not work.

In Australia, the government scrapped the carbon tax after it made everything more expensive and harmed resource development, a pillar of their middle economy, just like Canada, although it has many advantages over us. The carbon tax caused a spiral of damage across the board, and instead, Australia now uses incentives to spur clean investment and clean energy development like we Conservatives proposed.

France axed its carbon tax more than five years ago in the midst of soaring prices, an escalating cost of living crisis and riots in the streets. In Sweden, the government has slashed taxes on gasoline, just like what Conservatives have been calling for here at home, and actually announced a surprising pause of all its policy efforts toward net zero this past summer instead of tripling taxes and plunging ahead down this perilous path. Germans, of course, have gone on to bring back online 15 coal-fired plants with extended life cycles to combat rising power costs, which also contracted the country's GDP, and now coal accounts for one-third of German energy generation for five million homes.

This is just a few of the many countries that are further ahead of Canada down this road and are backing up because of the severity of the consequences for their citizens: an escalating cost of living crisis, skyrocketing power prices, falling GDP and standards of living, crashing power grids and unstable fuel sources, risks to sovereignty and vulnerability to hostile powers.

All of that is becoming very familiar to Canadians after eight years of the Prime Minister, but it is not a coincidence. Instead it is a consequence, and it is all connected. Conservatives plead for the NDP-Liberals to get this reality before it is too late, and we will keep fighting to protect and maintain Canadians' livelihoods, opportunities and standard of living, while maintaining the best and ever-improving environmental performance in the world that we know Canadians expect.

The Liberal-NDP's just transition must be considered in the context of all these cost-hiking measures that have been imposed on Canadians. They will increase the cost of living; kill Canadian jobs and communities; risk economic activity, jobs and tax revenue at all levels of government from Canada's largest sector; and jeopardize the reliable, affordable and abundant energy that Canadians need every day. Instead of examining practical ways and timelines to get grid decarbonization without risking the economy and the livelihoods of millions Canadians, the just transition attacks Canadian oil and gas workers and all the other jobs and businesses that depend on it.

Government Orders

Environmental stewardship must be addressed with realistic, concrete and effective measures. Conservatives want realistic transformation, not transition; technology, not taxes; and the evolution of energy sources to be led and paid for by the private sector, not forced by a government's command and control agenda. Conservatives believe Canada must develop our traditional alternative energy sources and support the development of industries like hydrogen, biofuels, wind, solar, nuclear, tidal and other innovations. We will make both traditional and alternative energy affordable and accessible, accelerate approvals on infrastructure and export projects, and green-light green projects. We are the only party—

• (1050)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I am sorry, but the hon. member's time is up.

Questions and comments, the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Democratic Institutions and Intergovernmental Affairs.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Democratic Institutions and Intergovernmental Affairs (Cybersecurity), Lib.): Madam Speaker, in my hon. colleague's speech, she spoke about how the Conservatives view tackling climate change through technology, yet they oppose the Atlantic accord, which would allow for technology development in Atlantic Canada. The member also spoke about the cost of energy in Atlantic Canada. However, once again, by blocking the Atlantic accord, Conservatives block economic development in Atlantic Canada, the ability to reduce energy prices in Atlantic Canada and good jobs for Atlantic Canadians.

Do the Conservatives even believe climate change is real? How do they plan to address it if they continue to block technological advancements? Why will they not allow Atlantic Canadians to have the good, clean jobs of the future?

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Madam Speaker, I really appreciate that question because it gives me the ability to address the reality of Bill C-49 rather than the Liberals' false claims.

Here is the truth about Bill C-49. It imports a number of clauses from Bill C-69 and includes a number of clauses from another bill, Bill C-55. The consequences of both of those bills embedded in Bill C-49 are exactly what has unfolded and what Conservatives warned about in previous debates. Bill C-49 would hold up, delay, road block and gatekeep alternative and renewable offshore development, just as it is also a simultaneous attack on petroleum offshore development.

I am not sure if Liberals do not read bills, do not know what they are talking about or are just reading what someone says, but these issues are grave. They are serious for the underpinning of our economy and our standard of living. We oppose Bill C-49 because it is an attack on energy to end petroleum offshore opportunities, and it would hold up, road block, delay and gatekeep renewable and alternative offshore energy development. Conservatives are going to accelerate approvals, make sure projects can get built, cut timelines and make both traditional and alternative energy sources available at affordable—

• (1055)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. member for Repentigny.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Monique Pauzé (Repentigny, BQ): Madam Speaker, I want to come back to the subject of the debate, which is Bill C-50 and not Bill C-49.

First, I want to say that what I just heard made my skin crawl and it proves that the Conservatives are speaking for the private oil sector, which is made up of billionaires. A recent poll revealed that two-thirds of Albertans polled on the moratorium on solar and wind development disagree with their premier.

Do the Conservatives know that there are other sources of energy other than oil, gas and coal?

[*English*]

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Madam Speaker, I appreciate my colleague's question because it allows me to put some reality and facts on the table. Again, I am not sure if the Bloc knows the facts either, but here they are.

I hate to be a homer all the time, but Alberta for decades has led this country in renewable and alternative energy development. We have the largest and oldest commercial wind farms in this country, to the point that they are already being decommissioned. Maybe people want to point out that it is still only 2% of our grid, which should be a lesson, but this is the thing: We are also the leader in Alberta on the development of alternative and renewable energy technologies and the fuels of the future right now.

The provincial government is setting certain conditions and giving certainty and clarity to private sector proponents and all Albertans to have confidence in the regulatory regime. We have always led the country on renewable and alternative energy because that is our energy companies' expertise. We do not have a history of putting that on governments, ratepayers and taxpayers. We do it through free enterprise policies. That is the opportunity that awaits all of Canada. What concerns me is that these guys do not seem to know that it is oil and gas companies doing all that work.

Mr. Richard Cannings (South Okanagan—West Kootenay, NDP): Madam Speaker, my colleague said she wanted to base her speech on facts, but there is apparently some alternate world out there about facts.

She mentioned that the fossil fuel sector has just less than 200,000 employees in Canada. The clean energy sector already has 430 employees, and it is expected to grow by more than 200,000 over the next 10 years. That is where her constituents and workers across Canada are looking.

I will close by saying she should read John Vaillant's book *Fire Weather*, which is about her province, about the world, about climate change and about the industry that she is such a fierce protector of.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Madam Speaker, what I am a fierce protector of is the livelihoods, the cost of living and the standard of living of the people I represent and every single vulnerable community and citizen across this country.

While I appreciated working with that hon. member on the natural resources committee in my first term, he should probably get into the coalition cabinet and ask them about why they have not done the interties and have set unrealistic targets that are impossible, about which they will answer no single concrete question regarding who is going to pay for them and how we are going to get there.

People may not want to take my word for it, which I understand because I am a politician. So that Canadians understand, this is not just about a war on oil and gas, which it absolutely is. How do we know it is about economic restructuring? We know that because the Prime Minister and the natural resources minister have said that.

I would note that there are only parliamentary secretaries here, so it seems like this is a real priority. Last week, in the House of Commons the minister talked on this issue and referred to economic restructuring. During COVID, the Prime Minister said it was an opportunity to reset and restructure the economy. That is what this is about.

• (1100)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. member will have three and a half minutes after question period to answer questions and comments.

I also want to remind her that she is not to say indirectly or directly who may be in the House and who is not in the House.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

BRUCE GUTHRO

Mr. Mike Kelloway (Cape Breton—Canso, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise in the House today to pay tribute to Cape Breton's own Bruce Guthro. Whether at home in Cape Breton or across the Atlantic with the Scottish band Runrig, Bruce was a shining star whose musical talent brought so much joy and comfort to so many.

While some folks at home certainly knew of Bruce's health challenges, his recent passing nevertheless sent shockwaves through the riding of Cape Breton—Canso and beyond. Bruce was an incredible singer, songwriter and musician, as well as an ambassador for all of Cape Breton and what we have to offer. This was really re-

Statements by Members

flected in the beautiful send-off, which so many watched via Facebook and other forms of media.

In particular, I want to send my sincere condolences to Bruce's wife, Kim, and their children, Jodi and Dylan, at this difficult time. Cape Breton—Canso will sorely miss Bruce Guthro.

* * *

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC): Madam Speaker, fall is upon us, and in my rural Manitoba riding, farmers are wrapping up harvest with most crops safely in the bin. The fall calf run has started with roundup under way on our ranches. Commercial fishers are busy landing their catch on Lake Winnipeg.

This should be a time of Thanksgiving, but sadly, Canadian farm, ranch and commercial fishing families are being overtaxed and over-regulated by the NDP-Liberal government. This costly coalition is quadrupling the carbon tax, making it more expensive every time hard-working families fuel up their tractors, combines, trucks and boats.

These misinformed Liberals have unilaterally implemented draconian trucking and fertilizer regulations, which will lower farm productivity and increase food insecurity. When we tax the people who grow the food and tax the people who truck the food, it costs us more to buy the food.

After eight long years, Canadians cannot afford this Liberal mismanagement anymore, but better times are ahead. Soon there will be great Thanksgiving and celebration across the land when we get rid of these out-of-touch Liberals and replace them with a common sense Conservative government, which would put Canadians first.

* * *

OFFSHORE RENEWABLE ENERGY SECTOR

Mr. Darrell Samson (Sackville—Preston—Chezzetcook, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I stand today in the House to strongly encourage my Conservative colleagues to support Bill C-49, an important bill for Nova Scotia's future. The proposed amendments in the Atlantic accord would create a framework for the offshore renewable energy sector under the act for the province of Nova Scotia.

With an estimated \$1 trillion to be invested in the sector globally by 2040, it is crucial that Canada position itself to attract investment and become world leaders in clean energy. Despite having the longest coastline and best wind speed in the world, Canada does not have one commissioned offshore wind project to show today.

Statements by Members

Passing Bill C-49 would go a long way towards meeting our emission targets and decarbonizing the power grid, and it would bring great jobs to Nova Scotians.

* * *

TRUTH AND RECONCILIATION

Mr. Blake Desjarlais (Edmonton Griesbach, NDP): Madam Speaker, to kill the Indian in the child was the goal of Canada's horrific residential schools. It was a brutal policy, made in this place, which stole thousands of children, including my kokum Christina, and subjected them to cruel torture and neglect, which has resulted in serious trauma and death.

Intergenerational trauma haunts families of residential school survivors today, and it is up to all of us to stand with them, acknowledge our inheritance and ensure we end this ongoing genocide. Survivors have come forward and have done the impossible. They have told their stories, reopened wounds and shared with us solutions manifested in the 94 TRC calls to action. To date, we have only accomplished 13 of those calls to action. At this rate, it will take us until 2065 to accomplish all of them.

Let us not repeat the mistakes of the past. Let us act diligently and fulfill our country's promise of truth and reparations. Then, and only then, will we have reconciliation.

* * *

• (1105)

[Translation]

FRANCOPHONE COMMUNITY IN KINGSTON

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to the magnificent new building that opened this fall and that will serve Kingston's francophone community.

On September 13, a grand opening ceremony was held for the building that will be home to Kingston's two French-language high schools, École secondaire publique Mille-Îles and École secondaire catholique Sainte-Marie-Rivier.

The two schools have roughly 500 students, and their shared space showcases French-language education in Kingston. The new facilities unite our region's francophone and francophile community, providing an inclusive space to celebrate French-language education, arts and culture.

Congratulations and best wishes for a successful first year in these new facilities.

* * *

[English]

BASEBALL IN BRUCE—GREY—OWEN SOUND

Mr. Alex Ruff (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound, CPC): Madam Speaker, this past summer, there was some real talent on the baseball diamonds in Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound. Two softball teams from my home town in Tara, Ontario, were crowned Canadian champions.

The under-17 Tara Twins took the Canadian Fast Pitch Championship tournament in Fredericton, New Brunswick by storm, winning the gold medal against the Plattsville Lightning. The under-15 Tara Longhorns headed to Prince Albert, Saskatchewan, for their Canadian championships, where they defeated the Newfoundland Selects to bring the gold medal back home to Tara too.

Tara was also honoured to host the under-13 Ontario Amateur Softball Association provincial championship. It was great to see so many keen baseball players from across Ontario make it out to our booming town. With all the visitors, I am sure we even cracked 1,000 people that weekend.

Finally, I want to take the time to thank all of the coaches, parents and volunteers who were involved in putting together a successful season for the Twins, the Longhorns and all the other local sports teams. Their efforts and tireless dedication to youth sports are critical in ensuring our youth live healthy and active lifestyles.

Once again, I send my congratulations. Play ball.

* * *

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

Ms. Lisa Hefpner (Hamilton Mountain, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is an honour to rise for the first time in the House as the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Women and Gender Equality and Youth.

Our government does great work empowering our next generation of leaders through programs such as Canada summer jobs, youth employment and skills and Canada Service Corps.

Like many MPs, I spent this summer touring organizations and small businesses, meeting participants and hearing about how many young people fruitfully employed in Hamilton Mountain today started their careers as summer students through federal programs in years past.

In my consistency office, our summer leadership program participant Sarphina organized more than 30 engaged students to form a Hamilton Mountain constituency youth council, which is working on a project to benefit the whole community.

It is not just our youth who need these programs for a good start in life. The benefit is mutual. When young people apply their energy, ideas and diverse skills to our businesses and organizations, our collective future is brighter.

* * *

YOUTH IN POLICING

Mr. Ryan Turnbull (Whitby, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to start by taking this opportunity to recognize and appreciate our new police chief in Durham region, Peter Moreira.

Earlier this month I had the opportunity to attend the Durham Regional Police Service's youth in policing program graduation ceremony, where they recognized the remarkable achievements of 85 young graduates. Members should have seen it. This diverse group of youth and their families from across Durham region were beaming with pride and overflowing with self expression after a challenging eight-week program where the youth overcame much, learned essential life skills and demonstrated leadership through organizing projects that contributed positively to our community. These projects included organizing a youth soccer tournament, hosting a youth forum and raising over \$10,000 for the Hearth Place Cancer Support Centre.

I invite all members of the House to join me in sending the heartiest congratulations to the graduates on their achievements and letting them know that we anticipate truly great things from them in the future.

* * *

NATIONAL DAY FOR TRUTH AND RECONCILIATION

Mr. Jamie Schmale (Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock, CPC): Madam Speaker, September 30 marks the day put aside to remember the tragedies of the residential school system, the unjust colonial practices of Canada's past, and the trauma and lost opportunities of generations of indigenous peoples. It is crucial to understand that reconciliation is a path, a process that requires our sustained commitment and dedication. It begins with acknowledging the truth and the pain inflicted upon indigenous peoples, and it continues with meaningful actions that address the ongoing disparities and inequities indigenous peoples have faced for far too long.

To truly honour the spirit of reconciliation, we must address this by creating equitable opportunities for indigenous peoples in areas such as employment, education, entrepreneurship and resource sharing. It means dismantling the barriers that have hindered economic progress for indigenous communities and empowering them to shape their economic futures.

Let us commit to indigenous self-determination and prosperity, and to a more just and equitable future to remember the past, honour their survivors and commit ourselves to a future where reconciliation is not just a dream, but a reality for all.

* * *

● (1110)

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mr. Terry Sheehan (Sault Ste. Marie, Lib.): Madam Speaker, public safety is an issue that is important to each and every member of the House and one which I have heard about from my constituents. This is why I am proud that our government is implementing reforms to the bail system that would help keep repeat offenders off of the street.

Bill C-48, which passed the House last week and is moving swiftly through the Senate, creates a reverse onus for repeat offenders and those accused of crimes with a firearm and a knife.

It examines the onus on those accused of intimate partner violence and requires the courts to consider whether an accused person

Statements by Members

has a history of convictions involving violence when making a bail order. This bill was crafted responsibly, with input from all relevant stakeholders, and has the supports of provincial and territorial leaders.

It sends a strong message that judges ought to seriously consider the public safety risks posed by repeat offenders at the bail stage.

This bill is just one of a suite of measures that our government has introduced to protect the public from violent offenders and to ensure the people of the Sault and all across this country are safe on the streets.

* * *

[Translation]

CARBON TAX

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Madam Speaker, Quebecers have seen how acrimonious the leader of the Bloc Québécois has been over the past few days. He has been using words like “crook”, “cockroach” and “knock-off lobbyist” more and more regularly to describe those who do not think like him. The leader of the Bloc Québécois is clearly at war, but he is not at war against the Conservatives. He is at war against Quebecers who do not want to pay more at the pump.

Yesterday, we moved a motion to do away with the carbon tax hikes in order to leave more money in the pockets of young Quebecers who are living from paycheque to paycheque. Every dollar paid in tax at the pump is a dollar less to buy groceries, and yet all of the Bloc members agree with a tax hike on gas. What is worse, the Bloc member for Longueuil—Saint-Hubert is calling for a drastic hike.

I will close with a quote from a speech that the Conservative leader gave in Quebec City. He said, and I quote:

I have a message for you gentlemen [the Liberal Prime Minister and the leader of the Bloc Québécois]. People in the regions, particularly farmers, need their trucks and fuel every day.

You do not have the right to take money out of their pockets again.

I am going to abolish the [Bloc-Liberal] tax to bring prices down and put an end to the war on cars. That is common sense.

* * *

[English]

FREEDOM

Mrs. Rachael Thomas (Lethbridge, CPC): Madam Speaker, Canadians are fed up with the woke NDP-Liberal policies that censor Canadians and attack their basic freedoms. Whether it is the freedom to dream of a vibrant future, the freedom to watch the YouTube channel they wish to, or the freedom to access news online, the current federal government has exercised an inordinate amount of autocratic power for the last eight years.

Statements by Members

However, I am encouraged by the growing number of Canadians who are dreaming of a better and more vibrant future, a future that only freedom can deliver. Imagine what Canada would look like if the Canadian people were put before government, if attacks on personal liberties were relinquished and if hard-working people were freed up to earn powerful paycheques that would buy affordable gas, groceries and homes.

This is the type of Canada we can create, and we can do so by generating opportunity for each and every person to reach their greatest potential. It is time to bring home freedom.

* * *

[Translation]

NATIONAL DAY FOR TRUTH AND RECONCILIATION

Hon. Greg Fergus (Hull—Aylmer, Lib.): Madam Speaker, September 30 is the National Day for Truth and Reconciliation. Tomorrow, we will gather on the unceded territory of the Algonquin Anishinabe Nation to commemorate the immense significance of this day, as we come together to remember, to reflect and to take collective action.

To be clear, this is not a one-day conversation. It is a call to become lifelong learners, constantly striving to understand a painful history and its ongoing impacts. This day is a time to dive deeper into the complex relationship between indigenous and non-indigenous peoples. It is an opportunity to learn, show empathy and grow together.

Today, tomorrow and every day, let us take a moment to reflect on the resilience of indigenous communities. Let us commit to standing by their side as we work together to create a better future. Change begins with each of us. Together, we can honour the strength and spirit of indigenous communities by working to create a Canada where reconciliation is more than a word, it is a reality.

* * *

● (1115)

[English]

NATIONAL DAY FOR TRUTH AND RECONCILIATION

Ms. Laurel Collins (Victoria, NDP): Madam Speaker, this Saturday, September 30, is the National Day for Truth and Reconciliation.

In my community, on the homelands of the Lekwungen people, the Songhees and Esquimalt nations, the second annual South Island Powwow will be taking place at Royal Athletic Park. The Songhees Nation is partnering with the City of Victoria to host this event to honour survivors and their families and to celebrate traditional indigenous culture through song and dance.

First nations far and wide will be joining the Songhees Nation to celebrate in its time-honoured powwow. Last year's powwow brought over 10,000 people to witness, participate and stand together on Orange Shirt Day. Eddy Charlie and Kristin Spray, the organizers of Victoria Orange Shirt Day, will be there. I want to thank Eddy for his tireless advocacy to make September 30 a national holiday.

I will be at the South Island Powwow this weekend, but wherever people are, I hope they take the opportunity to remember the children who never came home, to recognize survivors and the intergenerational impacts of residential schools and to honour the strength of indigenous communities and the power of indigenous culture.

* * *

[Translation]

NATIONAL DAY FOR TRUTH AND RECONCILIATION

Mrs. Marilène Gill (Manicouagan, BQ): Madam Speaker, September 30 is the National Day for Truth and Reconciliation, a first nations initiative to commemorate the painful history of residential schools. It is an opportunity to remember all those who suffered trauma that then followed them throughout their lives. It also gives us an opportunity to think of all those children who never returned home, as well as their families.

On this occasion, everyone is invited to show their solidarity by wearing the colour orange, which, for indigenous peoples, symbolizes truth and healing. There is still more work to be done to uncover the truth about residential schools and bring it to light. We need to know the truth in order to understand the terrible multi-generational consequences of this systematic cultural dispossession.

Time alone is not enough to heal the wounds. Healing requires meaningful acts of reconciliation towards first nations, Inuit and Métis people. Only they can tell us what form those acts must take. It is up to us to demonstrate the respect that has too often been lacking throughout our history. In order to write the next chapter together, we must show them that respect.

Shutshiteiemueu.

* * *

[English]

JUSTICE

Mr. Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Madam Speaker, crime and chaos are running rampant on the streets of our country due to this Prime Minister's soft-on-crime approach. Nowhere is this more apparent than in my home province of British Columbia. The B.C. NDP, with the support of the NDP-Liberal government, is now actively involved in the illegal drug trade. Overnight, we learned that the B.C. NDP is funnelling hundreds of thousands of dollars to a group that buys drugs on the black market and then distributes them on the streets of my province.

After eight long years of this Prime Minister, this shocking story should come as no surprise. Rather than creating real solutions to the opioid and overdose crisis, the Prime Minister prefers to take the easy way out and to transfer Canadians' hard-earned money to illegal drug dealers instead. With overdoses now the leading cause of death among people aged 10 to 59 in our country, it is clear to Canadians that this Prime Minister is out of touch and just not worth the cost.

NATIONAL DAY FOR TRUTH AND RECONCILIATION

Mr. Jaime Battiste (Sydney—Victoria, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I rise today to reflect on the National Day for Truth and Reconciliation. I cannot overstate the harms that the Indian residential schools caused. For comparison, during World War II, one in 26 soldiers who went over to fight did not come home; with respect to the Indian residential schools, one in 25 children did not come home. Those who came home struggled, many having lost language, culture and family values. Tomorrow I ask Canadians if they meet a survivor to show kindness and compassion because they do not know what they have been through.

I think about so many members of my community and my family who went to the Shubenacadie Indian Residential School. We have so much work to do in this country and we have so much to learn about our shared history. Tomorrow and every day after, let us walk the journey of reconciliation together.

• (1120)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Again, I just want to remind members that during Statements by Members, some of the statements are very emotional and touching. It is really important that when members come into the House they keep their voices very low and if they want to have conversations to please take them outside. Everybody has the right to ensure that their statement is not disturbed.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[English]

GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY

Ms. Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC): Madam Speaker, the Prime Minister said that it is not his job to control the inflationary spending, the out-of-control cost of living or the sky-high interest rates that he has caused. He said that it is not his job to bring down the price of gas, groceries or home heating. Instead, he is raising the carbon tax. He said it is not his job to take personal responsibility for our diplomatic relations or to vet the people who come in contact with a wartime leader. He said that housing is not his job either, while the housing crisis is getting worse.

If it is not his job to do any of these things, what is his job?

Mr. Peter Fragiskatos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I find that rather rich, with all due respect to the member, when it was the Leader of the Opposition's responsibility to put forward constructive policy. When he was in government as the minister responsible for housing, he put forward a plan for \$300 million, with fewer than 100 homes built. His plan on housing today is full of holes. If he taxed builders, for example, nothing would get built under his watch.

* * *

HOUSING

Ms. Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC): Madam Speaker, the Liberals have spent almost \$90 billion to double the price of a home, to double the price of rent and to double the price of a mort-

Oral Questions

gage. In Toronto, it now takes 80% of what Canadians take home to keep a roof over their heads.

More Liberal spending equals higher inflation, which leads to higher interest rates, which leads to higher mortgages. How many Canadians have to be in jeopardy of losing their homes before the Liberals stop spending, stop raising taxes and actually start building homes?

Mr. Peter Fragiskatos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Madam Speaker, Canadians are having a difficult time. That is why during the pandemic we put forward emergency programs to sustain the economy, individuals and families, when the Conservative Party did not want to do any of those things.

Today, we see a government that has put forward a plan to get more homes built. How? In partnership with provinces and municipalities. That is how we are going to get things done, not by the measures on the other side that instill nothing but fear in the wider Canadian economy and the wider Canadian society. That is not responsible leadership.

Ms. Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC): Madam Speaker, homebuilding is down. Just because the Liberals have a fancy program or a new acronym every month, it does not mean that any of this is working.

The government had a plan in 2015 to build housing on surplus land. Do members know how many homes it has built since 2015? Thirteen. That is fewer than two a year. Liberal MPs have flipped more houses than that since 2015.

It has been eight years. We need shovels in the ground, not pies in the sky. Will the Liberals finally support a common-sense Conservative plan to actually build homes Canadians can afford?

• (1125)

Mr. Peter Fragiskatos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Madam Speaker, talking about common sense, it is a shame the member was not at yesterday's finance committee. Witnesses from the Ministry of Finance confirmed that if the Conservatives' idea for housing were to be put in place, fewer homes would be built compared to our particular plan, which is a plan that takes taxes off. The GST comes off, for example, which incents greater building. Combine that with the approach they have taken to municipalities, to provinces. When it comes to ending things like exclusionary zoning, we want to work with those municipalities. We are doing that through the housing accelerator fund, which will continue, and the result will be 200,000 to 300,000 homes built as a result.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Madam Speaker, the Prime Minister dragged out the Nazi scandal around the world for five long days. For five days, the Prime Minister hid and let Canada's international reputation become more and more tarnished.

When a country, any country, is humiliated, it is the head of government's ultimate duty to take action to protect that country's reputation. What did the Liberal Prime Minister do? He went into hiding. Why?

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Public Services and Procurement, Lib.): Madam Speaker, as my colleague is well aware, the former speaker of the House of Commons clearly indicated that he alone was responsible for inviting that person and for recognizing him in the House of Commons. It was his initiative. No other parliamentarian was involved or informed, and neither was the government. The former speaker invited his own guests for the speech on Friday. They were selected by him and his office.

The same day we learned about this horrendous incident in the House, the Prime Minister recognized that this was painful for Canadians and all others affected by the Holocaust.

* * *

CARBON PRICING

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Madam Speaker, after eight years of this Liberal government, Quebecers are struggling to get by.

Yesterday, the Journal de Montréal reported on the findings of a survey indicating that 51% of young Quebecers are living paycheck to paycheck. No one wants to see this happen because when young people are traumatized, the very future of Canada and Quebec hangs in the balance. Quebec's young people need help in these hard times. What brilliant new idea has this Liberal government come up with, supported by the Bloc Québécois? It wants to increase taxes and create a new carbon tax. Voting for the Bloc Québécois is more costly than ever.

Could the "Liberal Bloc" tell us why, when Quebecers and young Quebecers are struggling to get by, it intends to impose more taxes, including a carbon tax?

Hon. Pablo Rodriguez (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Madam Speaker, my colleague wants to talk costs. How much do our burning forests cost? How much does flooding from our lakes and rivers cost? How much does the destruction of our infrastructure cost? How much does the health of our children cost when they are breathing polluted air? How much does that cost?

The answer is obvious: We cannot afford the Conservatives.

* * *

OIL AND GAS INDUSTRY

Ms. Christine Normandin (Saint-Jean, BQ): Madam Speaker, Canada did not reduce its greenhouse gas emissions last year. On the contrary, they increased by 2.1%. That is according to the Cana-

dian Climate Institute. That increase is almost entirely down to one sector, a sector whose five biggest companies made \$200 billion in profits last year. This sector receives billions of dollars in subsidies to create less pollution, yet it continues to single-handedly increase emissions across Canada. Which sector am I talking about? It is the oil sector, of course.

When will the government stop subsidizing this sector with public funds?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for her question.

I have some really good news for her. Canada is the first G20 country to eliminate fossil fuel subsidies. We did so this year, two years ahead of the 2025 deadline, and we plan to do even more. We will eliminate public funding for fossil fuels. Canada is the only G20 country to have made this commitment. Canada is fighting climate change, and it is working. In fact, we have the best record of any G7 country for reducing greenhouse gas emissions in 2019 and 2021.

Ms. Christine Normandin (Saint-Jean, BQ): Madam Speaker, the oil and gas sector caused a 2.1% increase in greenhouse gas emissions, and yet the government is not cracking down on oil companies. Instead, it is rewarding them.

Last week, the government announced that it wanted to double oil production off the coast of Newfoundland. Oil companies are polluting so much that they are increasing the entire country's emissions. However, instead of asking them to reduce those emissions, the federal government is paving the way for them to generate more.

When will this government stop being part of the climate change problem?

● (1130)

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I invite my hon. colleague to read our climate change plan, which was praised by the entire environmental community, by scientists and by municipalities, including the City of Montreal. The plan shows that the oil and gas industry will have to co-operate, as will every other industry in Canada.

That is why we already have methane regulations to reduce emissions of this very potent greenhouse gas by at least 40% by 2025. That is one of the most ambitious targets on the planet. We already have a clean fuel standard to force gas and diesel suppliers to reduce the environmental footprint of their fuel.

We are taking action to combat climate change.

[English]

JUSTICE

Mr. Blake Desjarlais (Edmonton Griesbach, NDP): Madam Speaker, it pains me to say that Saskatchewan has one of the highest rates of child poverty in the country.

Instead of ensuring that children do not go hungry, the Conservative Government of Saskatchewan wants to use the notwithstanding clause to save a policy that a judge said was causing irreparable harm. Is that what Conservatives stand for, dividing people and trampling on human rights? That does not sound like common sense to me.

Will the government do everything it can to stop the harm against Canadian children?

Mr. James Maloney (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Madam Speaker, we are fully aware of the Government of Saskatchewan's proposed use of the notwithstanding clause.

We are dead set against the pre-emptive use of the notwithstanding clause in any circumstances. The notwithstanding clause is intended to protect minority rights, not suppress them.

In light of the decision by the court in Saskatchewan yesterday, we would have thought that the Government of Saskatchewan would have taken a moment to pause, reflect and wait until the process played itself out.

* * *

HOUSING

Ms. Lori Idlout (Nunavut, NDP): *Uqaqtittiji*, homes are supposed to be where dreams are cultivated.

For Inuit and indigenous peoples, homes are overcrowded, mouldy spaces where dreams vanish. Children have no space to do homework. Women have no space to flee abusive partners. Inuit and indigenous peoples have little to no space to take care of their mental well-being. This is the result of decades of Liberal and Conservative underfunding.

When will the Liberals finally close this housing funding gap?

Mr. Jaime Battiste (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the member for her passion.

Our government is fully aware that in order to advance reconciliation, we need to close the gap between indigenous people and the rest of Canada, as well as address the harms caused through colonization and underfunding. Our government is committed to doing that. We have a tremendous ability and record of being first in our country for indigenous people.

We will continue to make progress. I look forward to working together with the member on the INAN committee to do so.

Oral Questions

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mrs. Rachael Thomas (Lethbridge, CPC): Madam Speaker, just a week ago under the Prime Minister's watch, a Nazi was welcomed in this place and actually honoured in the chamber. When the Prime Minister should have been a statesman and taken full responsibility, instead he chose to flee and hide, not just for one day, not just for two days, but actually for five days. For five days he was mute. For five days he watched as our reputation was tarnished, and for five days he was in hiding. He utterly embarrassed our country.

The Prime Minister has yet to take responsibility. Will he stand up, do the right thing and do that today?

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Public Services and Procurement, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the former Speaker made it very clear that he alone was responsible for inviting this individual to the House and recognizing him. It was his initiative, and no other parliamentarians and no other government members were involved. The former Speaker invited his own guests for Friday's address, who were determined by him and his own office. No advance notice was provided to the Prime Minister's office nor to the Ukrainian delegation about the invitation or the recognition.

There are many Canadians who were hurt by this, and this mistake has been especially difficult for Jewish, Ukrainian and—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. member for Lethbridge.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas (Lethbridge, CPC): Madam Speaker, the member proved my point. It is the Prime Minister of Canada who is meant to function as a statesman, to take personal responsibility when a mistake happens. Instead, he chose to flee. He chose to hide.

An hon. member: Cowardly.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: Madam Speaker, why did he? Why not take personal responsibility? Why not remedy this on the world stage? Why not acknowledge the grave atrocities that have taken place in our history, the mistake that was made here in the House and the impact that would have on Canadians?

I will give him an opportunity today. Would he honourably stand up, take that personal responsibility and apologize to Canadians?

● (1135)

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Public Services and Procurement, Lib.): Madam Speaker, again, the former Speaker has made it very clear that he alone was responsible for inviting this individual to the House and recognizing him. It was his initiative, and no one in the House knew about it.

The same day we learned of this horrendous incident that occurred in the House, the Prime Minister recognized that it was painful for Canadians and communities who were affected by the Holocaust.

*Oral Questions***HOUSING**

Mr. Philip Lawrence (Northumberland—Peterborough South, CPC): Madam Speaker, yesterday at the finance committee, the government's own department told the committee that in fact, in 2018, it had warned the Liberal government of an impending housing crisis, yet it did nothing. Incredibly, CMHC officials went on to say that the policies currently employed by the federal government are not sufficient to solve the housing problem.

If, in fact, the government's own department does not believe in the Liberal government, why should Canadians?

Mr. Peter Fragiskatos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would remind my hon. colleague to look at the actual record and at the actions of the opposition leader, who this summer, while presenting himself as some sort of champion of the working class, stood in front of a Canadian's home, took a video and called that home a shack. If he is serious about dealing with affordability, the housing crisis and the supply crisis that underpins it, I want to hear from him and his party serious plans along the lines of what we have presented on this side. We are going to continue to fight for Canadians.

Mr. Philip Lawrence (Northumberland—Peterborough South, CPC): Madam Speaker, Canada's problems are real. We have incredible food bank usage. We have housing costs doubling. Millions of Canadians cannot afford their own homes, yet this side decides to play games. When the Leader of the Opposition was the housing minister, housing was affordable in the country.

When will the government finally get serious, remove the gatekeepers and balance the budget so Canadians can keep their homes?

Mr. Peter Fragiskatos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Madam Speaker, he is quite correct; that side does play games. Do people know what else they do? They also vote against tax cuts for the middle class. They also vote against child care for kids. They vote against dental care for kids. Discussions on pharmacare are happening at this time, and that side wants to entertain none of it.

At a time when Canadians are facing real challenges of affordability, the government can be there to help. The government has put serious measures on the table. It is having an effect. We are going to continue to do that. They should wake up and come to the party.

Mrs. Tracy Gray (Kelowna—Lake Country, CPC): Madam Speaker, 97% is the percentage of shared income a household would need in order to cover home ownership costs now in Vancouver. This is from a new RBC report, which says that housing affordability in most major Canadian cities is near all-time worst levels.

The Prime Minister also holds the all-time record for incurring more debt during his eight years than all other prime ministers combined. Housing is less affordable than ever. The Prime Minister is just not worth the cost.

Will the Prime Minister finally stop his inflationary spending so Canadians can keep a roof over their head?

Mr. Peter Fragiskatos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I remind the hon. member that Canada has the lowest deficit and debt in the G7, but times remain hard. We see that and understand that.

On housing affordability, what are we doing? The supply crisis that underpins the housing crisis facing the country is one that requires building. That is why we have lifted GST for the purposes of rental construction on apartments, and that is why we have made changes to the borrowing limit of the Canada mortgage bond. I do not want to get into the technical details, because they are vast, but the result is more homes built for Canadians, and that is what we are going to continue to do.

Mrs. Tracy Gray (Kelowna—Lake Country, CPC): Madam Speaker, the OECD says that, in the G7, Canada has the biggest gap between housing prices and wages.

The finance minister said that her plan to bring down inflation is working, yet it has soared to 4%. Mortgage interest costs have also soared now to 31%. It is no wonder Mortgage Professionals Canada's recent survey showed that 48% of young people say they have given up on ever owning a home. The NDP-Liberal government's spending is driving up inflation, which is driving up interest rates, which is driving up mortgage interest costs.

Will the Prime Minister finally stop his inflationary spending so Canadians can keep a roof over their head?

• (1140)

Mr. Peter Fragiskatos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Madam Speaker, here we go again. The contradictions just speak for themselves, but I will highlight them for members.

In July 2022, we had inflation at over 8%, which is now down to 4%. It is certainly not low enough, but we see progress on that front.

I also hear all sorts of ideas from the other side that would not have a tangible impact in terms of affordability. Let us take pensions, by the way. I have heard nothing from that side at all with respect to Premier Smith's pension plan that would deplete the fund by 53%. Combine that with their lack of focus on EI. They voted against all these measures that would—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. member for Manicouagan.

[Translation]

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Mrs. Marilène Gill (Manicouagan, BQ): Madam Speaker, let us talk about Chalk River and the proposal to build a radioactive waste disposal facility on the shores of the Ottawa River. The chiefs of the Kebaowek, Kitigan Zibi Anishinabeg and Mitchikanibikok Inik First Nations are adding their voices to the widespread grassroots opposition campaign in Quebec.

They are obviously worried about the impact on the river. They are worried about having a nuclear waste dump near their sacred lands. They are worried, but no one consulted them, and that failure to consult is a direct violation of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

When will this government listen to them and call off the Chalk River project?

Ms. Julie Dabrusin (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change and to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the health and safety of Canadians, reconciliation, and protecting the environment are our top priorities when it comes to nuclear energy. The project proposal is currently being reviewed by the commission, and a hearing just wrapped up. All radioactive waste in Canada is managed safely in accordance with international standards at licensed facilities overseen by our world-class regulatory agency, the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission.

Mrs. Marilène Gill (Manicouagan, BQ): Madam Speaker, the first step would be to show some basic respect for the concerns of first nations. Chief Haymond of the Kebaowek First Nation wrote to the Prime Minister to share the concerns of his people. He never got a response. The federal government must at the very least put the Chalk River project on hold and ensure that first nations are heard.

Could Ottawa start by showing the bare minimum of respect in a nation-to-nation relationship and respond to the Kebaowek First Nation's letter?

[English]

Mr. Jaime Battiste (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I acknowledge that we have work to do on this file. I know this is something that might be coming before the INAN committee. We look forward to hearing from the chiefs and from the member opposite, and to working with them to ensure that we are fulfilling our obligations under UNDRIP and our duty to consult.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC): Madam Speaker, we learned yesterday that the Liberals are cutting another \$1 billion from our armed forces. This is in addition to the \$2.5 billion they already let lapse last year.

The Prime Minister has no problem wasting taxpayer money and running up massive deficits on things like the \$116 million for McKinsey, \$54 million on the ArriveCAN app or \$20-million bonuses for the Bank of Canada executives. Let us not forget that

Oral Questions

the Liberals allowed \$4.6 billion of abuse under their COVID programs. The Liberals waste money on just about everything but do not spend it on our military.

Why does the Prime Minister cut spending only when it hurts our troops?

Hon. Bill Blair (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I think we all remember when the Conservatives set back defence capability by years when they reduced defence expenditures to below 1% of our GDP.

We are committed to the significant and strategic long-term investments that will ensure that the CAF continues to function as an agile combat-ready force capable of making tangible contributions and delivering on our commitments. At the same time, we must ensure that all expenditures are carefully controlled so each dollar produces real value for Canadians.

* * *

● (1145)

HEALTH

Mr. Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Madam Speaker, the Prime Minister is failing our vulnerable Canadians. Our country is gripped in the worst drug and crime crisis in generations. Last night, we learned that the Prime Minister and the B.C. NDP are using taxpayer dollars to fund a group that buys drugs on the black market and then hands them out on the streets of Vancouver. We cannot get people into recovery, but we can perpetuate their addiction and support organized crime?

When will the Prime Minister put a stop to his failed drug policy, finally take real action and end this crisis?

Hon. Ya'ara Saks (Minister of Mental Health and Addictions and Associate Minister of Health, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I do not think there is a single member of the House who does not mourn the tragic loss of anyone in this overdose crisis. However, I have to say to the member across the way that spreading misinformation about harm reduction, and conflating harm reduction and treatment, loses lives rather than saves them.

The provinces are responsible for providing safe supply prescriptions to clients who need help as they go through recovery. On this side of the House, we will continue to save lives. They should get on board with us with that.

*Oral Questions***PUBLIC SAFETY**

Mr. Dane Lloyd (Sturgeon River—Parkland, CPC): Madam Speaker, after eight years under the Liberal government, it is clear that the rights of victims and their families are not a priority. Correctional Service Canada, with the full knowledge of the government, transferred Canada's most notorious killer to a medium-security prison. Public safety officials even wanted to keep it quiet, and victims' families were notified only after the fact. At committee, Conservatives are calling for the government to let victims' voices be heard, but the Liberals are refusing to allow it.

Why is the Liberal government trying to cover up this outrageous affair, and why is it shamefully blocking the voices of victims from being heard?

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Democratic Institutions and Intergovernmental Affairs (Cybersecurity), Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is clear that the member opposite is distancing himself from the truth once again. In fact, all members of the committee came together to bring forward—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order, please.

I think members on all sides actually have used these things, so I want to ask members to please be careful with their words. One cannot do indirectly what one cannot do directly.

The hon. parliamentary secretary has the floor.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Madam Speaker, let me clarify the facts for the member opposite. What happened at the public safety committee was that all members of the committee came together to move forward to do a study on putting forward the rights of victims of crime and to look into how reclassifications and transfers are handled. Do members know what happened? The Conservatives voted against it. They talk tough in front of the cameras, but when it comes time to act, they do nothing.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CARBON PRICING

Mr. Richard Lehoux (Beauce, CPC): Madam Speaker, after eight years, the Liberals still do not understand how to help our farmers, who are a fundamental part of our ability to eat.

They, along with their Bloc Québécois partners, would rather send families out on the street than cancel the carbon tax. What is worse, they want to see it drastically increased. They are stoking the inflationary fire and want to further increase the cost of living. It is costly to vote for the Bloc Québécois.

When will the Bloc-Liberal coalition put an end to its infamous carbon tax and listen to common-sense Conservatives?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to remind my hon. colleague that federal carbon pricing does not apply in Quebec. For many, many years, Quebec has had its own system, a cap-and-trade system, for greenhouse gas emissions

I would also like to remind him that it is certainly not common sense to ignore the impact climate change is having on our farmers across the country, especially in Quebec. I meet farmers who are experiencing the repercussions of climate change: too much water, not enough water, too much heat, not enough heat, pests. However, the Conservatives have not said a single word about what they are going to do to help our farmers deal with the consequences of climate change.

* * *

[*English*]

HOUSING

Mr. Matthew Green (Hamilton Centre, NDP): Madam Speaker, Hamilton Community Foundation's Vital Signs report says that for every new unit of affordable housing built, Hamilton is losing 23 units. It also confirms what tenants have always known: Corporate landlords are evicting tenants to jack up rents at a record rate while leaving Hamiltonians out in the cold. The Liberal government is leaving people to fend for themselves while big developers are cashing in on what is left of our city's rental apartment buildings.

Will the government adopt our NDP affordable housing plan to create an acquisition fund to save the affordable rentals left in Hamilton?

● (1150)

Mr. Peter Fragiskatos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I know the member has a passion for dealing with homelessness and addressing issues of affordability more generally. This government has put substantial investment forward through the national housing strategy to combat homelessness. It is a difficult challenge for sure, but one that we are getting results on.

It is not over. That fight continues and is combined with efforts to build more by lifting GST from rental construction, for example, and to make changes to the Canada mortgage bond borrowing limit. All of these things combine, and the bottom line is that we are going to see more homes built. Affordability is the result from that.

Mr. Matthew Green (Hamilton Centre, NDP): Madam Speaker, maybe the hon. member heard my question, but clearly he was not listening, because if he was, he would know that the winter months are approaching and it is going to be life or death for the increasing number of people who are being left on the streets to live in tent encampments. Cities like Hamilton are facing double digit property tax increases in order to fill the crucial gaps in funding for social housing. In Hamilton, there is a seven-year wait-list. This is life or death.

Will the government immediately respond to the Federation of Canadian Municipalities' demand for direct funding in order to repair existing social housing units in order to address our seven-year wait-list?

Mr. Peter Fragiskatos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Madam Speaker, we have been there for cities like Hamilton and other Canadian cities and towns through programs like Reaching Home and the rapid housing initiative, and in other ways, to help not-for-profits that are on the ground doing the very hard work.

I know the member cares very much about this issue. I am happy to have further discussions with him, but I go back to the point that we are going to advance issues around this through collaboration with the private sector, the not-for-profit sector and municipalities as well.

* * *

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Mr. Michael McLeod (Northwest Territories, Lib.): Madam Speaker, tomorrow is the National Day for Truth and Reconciliation. It is a day that recognizes first nations, Inuit and Métis children who were separated from their families, their culture and their communities. While the Leader of the Opposition fails to advance on indigenous issues such as UNDRIP, which he voted against, our government will be there to work with indigenous peoples.

Can the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations update the House on our government's record on reconciliation?

Mr. Jaime Battiste (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations, Lib.): Madam Speaker, when it comes to indigenous issues, the record of the Leader of the Opposition is almost as shameful as his comments—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order. I just want to remind members to ensure that we have respect here in the House. I know that hon. members would like to hear the answers.

The hon. parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Jaime Battiste: Madam Speaker, when it comes to indigenous issues, the shameful record of the Leader of the Opposition on voting is almost as shameful as his words when he said that instead of compensation for abuses suffered at Indian residential schools, aboriginals need to learn the value of hard work. In contrast, our government has a record of historic firsts. We passed UNDRIP into law. We had the first-ever indigenous languages commissioner, the first-ever indigenous Governor General and the first-ever indigenous Supreme Court justice. I will stand on our record of historic firsts every day, including the National Day for Truth and Reconciliation.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Again, there are some interruptions going on while members are speaking. I would just ask members to please hold off on any questions they may have, or thoughts.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order. If individuals want to have conversations they should take them out. If this continues, someone is going to end up losing a question.

Oral Questions

The hon. member for Calgary Heritage.

* * *

CARBON PRICING

Mr. Shuvaloy Majumdar (Calgary Heritage, CPC): Madam Speaker, after eight long years of an incompetent NDP-Liberal government, there has been diplomatic disaster after diplomatic disaster; one in five Canadians is skipping meals; crime, chaos, drugs and disorder rage across our streets; and a carbon tax is making gas, groceries and home heating more expensive, a tax that does nothing to achieve climate targets, a tax inflating everything and devastating everyone.

When will the Prime Minister finally axe the tax?

• (1155)

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Madam Speaker, last week, during the United Nations Climate Ambition Summit in New York, I was at an event with West Kelowna's fire chief, Jason Brolund. Chief Brolund vividly described the trauma of fighting this summer's massive wildfires, of sending his team into danger, of fighting to protect homes and lives. It was a miracle that no one died in Kelowna. He called it a once-in-a-lifetime fire, but then told us it was the second once-in-a-lifetime fire he has faced in 20 years. That is the impact of climate change.

Mr. Martin Shields (Bow River, CPC): Madam Speaker, after eight years of the NDP-Liberal government, Alberta farmers and families are paying more tax than ever. When we tax Stamp Seeds, which grows food; Reimer Trucking, which ships food; Drost Farms, which processes food; and Sunterra Market, which sells food, we are taxing everyone who buys food. The Prime Minister is just not worth it.

Alberta farmers need to keep feeding the world. Will the Prime Minister axe his carbon tax?

Hon. Bill Blair (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Madam Speaker, we have seen the impact of climate change devastating provinces right across this country and impacting most significantly our farmers. In winter, we saw record cold temperatures, leading to damaged homes, businesses and crop results.

Canadian farmers are on the front line of climate change, and that is exactly why we are investing nearly half a billion dollars in programs like the agricultural technology program and the climate solutions program. We will continue to do everything that is necessary to help our farmers deal with the increasing effects of climate change.

*Oral Questions**[Translation]*

Mr. Bernard Généreux (Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, CPC): Madam Speaker, the Bloc Québécois is scrambling to convince Quebecers that the carbon tax will have no impact on Quebec. Nothing could be further from the truth. Everything that is transported from one province to another and ends up in our shops costs more because of this tax. Everything, including voting for the Bloc, costs more. After eight years of this government, many Quebecers are being squeezed.

Will the Prime Minister finally call off this costly Bloc-Liberal tax?

Hon. Pablo Rodriguez (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I find the attacks against the Bloc Québécois to be very mean, but I would like to say that if the Conservatives are the least bit interested in the economy in Quebec, they would acknowledge yesterday's historic announcement that will lead to the creation of 3,000 jobs. We are making a green shift, a shift to the future. We are going to produce the greenest batteries in the world. This represents 3,000 direct jobs, thousands of indirect jobs and Quebec and Canadian batteries in cars around the world.

They do not even acknowledge it. The Conservatives do not care at all about Quebec.

Mr. Bernard Généreux (Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, CPC): Madam Speaker, the Bloc Québécois said it wanted to drastically increase the carbon tax. The Liberals got their wish. A second carbon tax now applies in Quebec. According to the Parliamentary Budget Officer, it will cost 17¢ more per litre. This Bloc-Liberal alliance is always looking for ways to take more money from Quebecers' pockets. It is just ridiculous.

Will the Prime Minister put an end to these inflationary taxes?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Madam Speaker, in 2023, it is incomprehensible, and I would even say immoral, that a political party aspiring to form the government has nothing to say on the issue of climate change, when tens of thousands of people were displaced by forest fires this summer. The smoke was detected as far away as New York and, even further, on the coasts of Europe.

Meanwhile, the official position of the Conservative Party of Canada is that climate change does not exist, even though it is costing Canadians tens of billions of dollars. That is outrageous.

* * *

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Mr. Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Madam Speaker, Radio-Canada has made deeply disturbing revelations about close ties between major GMO companies and the federal government. In fact, the ties are so close that the two are literally playing on the same team, known as the Tiger Team. It includes lobbyists for giants like Bayer, but also federal public servants who allegedly drafted the GMO reform together. Worse than having the fox guard the henhouse, the fox is in charge of the henhouse.

Is the government going to hire truly independent experts to re-examine all of the changes introduced by the Tiger Team?

[English]

Hon. Bill Blair (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Madam Speaker, we have had extensive consultations with people from the organic, conventional and seed sectors to find new food-production solutions to feed the world's growing population. It is common practice for the government to actively engage with implicated stakeholders when discussing regulatory matters.

The tiger team process was intended as a time-limited mechanism through which multiple stakeholders in the grain supply chain would have an opportunity to provide their views on the very complex topic of plant breeding and innovation. We will continue doing all that we can to support Canada's farmers and farm families.

• (1200)

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Madam Speaker, it is outrageous to let the people making money from a product decide what rules apply to their product. It is even worse when food or public health are involved. How can we let a company like Bayer write the rules on GMOs and gene editing?

The public needs reassurance. A breach of trust has occurred. Nothing less than a rigorous regulatory review by truly independent experts can fix the total lapse in judgment shown by the government. When is it going to launch such a review?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Madam Speaker, that is why the former minister of agriculture and agri-food, the former minister of health and I worked together to start implementing the reforms the hon. member is talking about. In fact, that work led to the federal government's announcement that pesticides would no longer be used on any federal lands. It is also what led to a review of the way pesticides are approved in Canada. We are allowing more independent scientists to review each of these pesticides. We are in the process of carrying out the review that our hon. colleague has asked us to do.

* * *

*[English]***CARBON PRICING**

Mr. Jake Stewart (Miramichi—Grand Lake, CPC): Madam Speaker, Atlantic Canadians are struggling to pay for their groceries, gas and home heating. Meanwhile, the Atlantic Liberal MPs support measures to quadruple the carbon tax to 61¢ a litre. Atlantic Liberal MPs have continued to support carbon taxes since 2015.

Will the Atlantic Liberal MPs vote on the Conservative motion next week to axe the tax so that Atlantic Canadians can afford gas, groceries and home heating?

Mr. Darrell Samson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Rural Economic Development and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.): Madam Speaker, that is an important question. Let us talk about what is important for Atlantic Canadians. Earlier this week, I stood here and listened to Conservative MPs from Atlantic Canada who are voting against the Atlantic accord, which would give Nova Scotia and Newfoundland and Labrador an opportunity to find prosperity and meet our green goals. I am hoping the Conservatives vote for the Atlantic accord and those changes to help Nova Scotia and Atlantic Canada.

Mr. Jake Stewart (Miramichi—Grand Lake, CPC): Madam Speaker, they have already ruined one tidal project, and I invite the member opposite to tell the people of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, choosing between fuelling their cars and purchasing groceries, how the carbon tax is not punishing them every single day.

Atlantic Liberal MPs allege they are not in favour of carbon taxes while back home but have supported them 23 times since 2015. Again, they claim they are now against the carbon tax. Will they put their money where their mouth is and vote next week to axe the tax?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to remind my hon. colleague that his party campaigned on putting in place a price on pollution in Canada in the 2021 election.

I would like to pick up on what my colleague was saying. Why is the Conservative Party opposing the development of clean energy in Canada, like the moratorium that Premier Smith has put in place in Alberta, which is putting at risk \$30 billion of investment in renewable energy in the clean technology sector? Thousands of jobs are at risk. Will the Leader of the Opposition stand in this House and explain to us whether he supports clean energy?

Mr. Michael Kram (Regina—Wascana, CPC): Madam Speaker, according to Food Banks Canada, nearly seven million Canadians are struggling to put food on the table. That is because farmers pay the carbon tax on the food they grow, truckers pay the carbon tax on the food they transport, grocers pay the carbon tax on the food they refrigerate and all of those carbon taxes get passed on to the consumer. Will the Liberal-NDP government cancel its plan to increase its inflationary carbon tax?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Madam Speaker, Fire Chief Brolund of West Kelowna said another thing that stuck with me. He said Kelowna spent more than \$20 million battling the summer's wildfires and that insurance losses would triple that amount. Chief Brolund asked, "What could we have accomplished if we used that same amount of money proactively?" He said money spent fighting fires was spent on the wrong end of the problem, and he said that at an event in support of carbon pricing, a proven policy designed to reduce emissions that are driving climate change, as well as more intense wildfires and flooding all across our nation and all across the world.

Oral Questions

• (1205)

[Translation]

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Mrs. Brenda Shanahan (Châteauguay—Lacolle, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the National Day for Truth and Reconciliation reminds us, as citizens of this country, to look deep into our hearts and minds as we consider the impact that colonialism has had on indigenous people. It is a day for us, as Canadians, to once again reflect on the tragic history of residential schools and remember the children who never came home.

Can the minister tell us about some of the ways we are commemorating this day?

Hon. Pascale St-Onge (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Madam Speaker, listening to and amplifying indigenous voices is one way to mark the National Day for Truth and Reconciliation. On Wednesday, I had the opportunity to attend the premier of *Bones of Crows*. This series, which was created by Marie Clements and features indigenous actors, tells the terrible history of residential schools in Canada. It also highlights the valuable contributions that the Cree and members of various first nations made to our common history.

Thanks to this partnership between the APTN and CBC/Radio-Canada, the voices of first nations will be heard so that, together, we can honour the truth and create healing spaces.

* * *

[English]

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Mrs. Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Madam Speaker, ranchers know that their herds are crucial to our grasslands, environment, food security and trade. Saskatchewan livestock producers also know that the Prime Minister is not worth the cost. His inflationary policies and stifling carbon taxes are crippling our producers. They are stressed, and they need to keep their breeding herds alive. Winter is coming. Time is running out.

When will the NDP-Liberal government provide its share of AgriRecovery funding?

Oral Questions

Hon. Bill Blair (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I agree with the member that Canadian farmers produce some of the highest-quality agriculture products around the world; that is one of the reasons that our government, alongside our provinces and territories, is investing \$3.5 billion in the next five years into new sustainable Canadian agricultural partnerships. We have also invested nearly \$2 billion in supply-managed farmers and processors, as well as half a billion dollars in environmental programs, such as the agricultural clean technology program and the agricultural climate solutions program.

I want to assure the member opposite, and all members of this House, that we will continue to do everything that is necessary to support the important work of our Canadian farmers.

* * *

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. Jamie Schmale (Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock, CPC): Madam Speaker, for three years, the residents of Bobcaygeon have been waiting for repairs to the lock 32 swing bridge. The lack of action from Parks Canada has left the town angry and frustrated. Precious tourist dollars have left, along with several businesses that just cannot wait anymore. While the minister responsible is busy gifting millions to bolster infrastructure in Communist China, he ignores the pleas of rural Canadians.

If the minister is too busy supporting the Communist Party in Beijing, will he please hand this file over to someone who can do the job?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would actually take issue with the fact that the member is accusing one of the most respected institutions in our country, Parks Canada, of not doing its job. It is one of the most liked and trusted institutions in Canada. I will work with the officials at Parks Canada to ensure that this issue is dealt with in the most rapid possible terms.

Mr. Jamie Schmale (Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock, CPC): Madam Speaker, I was actually saying the minister cannot do his job, because not only is one federal bridge out, but a second bridge is out in the village of Bolsover. It has been three years and counting with no bridge. There is actually a documented case where someone died of a heart attack; the family could see the ambulance on the other side of the road, but it could not get over. It has been three years with two bridges and two communities cut in half.

When will the minister do his job and get these bridges fixed?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Madam Speaker, as I said, I will be talking with Parks Canada officials to ensure these problems are solved as quickly as possible.

* * *

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Mr. Chad Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek, Lib.): Madam Speaker, this weekend, Canadians in my riding of Hamilton East—Stoney Creek and across the country will honour the victims and survivors of the residential school system as we seek to address

the harmful legacy of residential schools and reflect on our commitment to reconciliation.

For generations, indigenous peoples have kept their culture and language, showing great resilience in the face of discrimination and mistreatment by colonial systems. Canada has a responsibility to address the truth and support their healing.

In my community, people want to know how our government is working toward truth and reconciliation with indigenous peoples?

● (1210)

Mrs. Jenica Atwin (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indigenous Services, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am grateful to see Canadians across the country finding their own special ways to commemorate this important day.

Let me be clear: As a government, we believe that truth and reconciliation need to be at the heart of absolutely everything that we do. We are committed to doing the work.

After Harper refused for years, we launched the National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls. Today, more than 96% of first nations have access to clean drinking water, with a pathway for the remaining 4%. After decades of neglect, we have helped communities build, renovate and retrofit 31,000 homes and counting.

We will continue working with indigenous peoples to build a new relationship based on recognition of rights, respect, co-operation and partnership; that is “reconciliation”.

* * *

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): Madam Speaker, Canadians are putting their heart and soul into creating content for this entire country and the world to enjoy.

However, on TikTok, they are left out of the creator fund and cannot be paid for their work. It is unfair. TikTok compensates its creators in the United States and Europe, but Canadians are left behind. Why are the Liberals allowing this abuse? These content creators are workers. They deserve to be paid. The issue of workers' rights is my Roman Empire.

Will the Liberal government start working for young people and ensure Canadian content creators are compensated fairly?

Hon. Pascale St-Onge (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Madam Speaker, our government is proud to support our creators all over the country. They are among the best in the world. They are sharing our Canadian stories, and it is really important that we keep on supporting them.

This is why we brought forward Bill C-11. Through this new bill, we are going to bring in new revenue so that we could better support our creators in Canada.

* * *

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, I want to raise the concern of the lawyers representing the Stk'emlupsemc te Secwepemc Nation, just in time for the National Day for Truth and Reconciliation, that we are violating a sacred commitment made to that first nation. I say “we” because, thanks to the Liberals, we own the Trans Mountain pipeline.

Their lawyer has asked that at least before they start construction on October 2, the Canada Energy Regulator provide reasons, so the first nation could pursue its legal right to appeal.

Will the government ensure construction does not begin until reasons are provided?

Mr. Peter Fragiskatos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I know this issue matters a great deal to our colleague.

I would point out, however, as the Minister of Finance said earlier this week, that it is an independent decision that was reached by an independent agency.

* * *

[Translation]

POINTS OF ORDER

DECORUM

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Madam Speaker, during Statements by Members, I did not properly observe the code of conduct in the House. Accordingly, I wish to offer my heartfelt and unreserved apologies to the hon. member for Hull—Aylmer, who made a very fine statement. Well done.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I appreciate the hon. member's apology. I know he was not the only one, but I appreciate his honesty.

[English]

On a point of order, the hon. member for Lakeland.

Ms. Shannon Stubbs: Madam Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise to address an exchange stemming from question period. I am a descendant of the Bear family from the Brokenhead Ojibway Nation in Manitoba, so I raise this with grave concern and seriousness.

The Prime Minister's pick for the parliamentary secretary for Crown-indigenous relations, who mischaracterized our leader earlier in question period and was focusing on words, actually said,

Points of Order

“Why do I assume every skinny aboriginal girl is on crystal meth or pills? #toomuchaptn.”

I would beg all members of Parliament to treat these issues seriously, particularly those of deep concern to indigenous Canadians in every corner of their country, all of us who are descended from them and non-indigenous Canadians who are treaty partners. We should take these issues seriously, with the gravity they deserve, and stop name-calling, imputing motives and mischaracterizing words.

These topics deserve seriousness. That is why the Harper Conservative government apologized for the residential schools and launched—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I think we are getting more into points of debate. I do not have all of the context from the hon. member. She made a statement, and I did not hear that during question period or the specific language used, so I would tend to think that is more a point of debate.

I have another point of order, from the hon. parliamentary secretary.

● (1215)

Mr. Jaime Battiste: Madam Speaker, I would like to table documents with the comments the Leader of the Opposition made when he was a member of Parliament. He talked about his view. The actual words from the Leader of the Opposition were, “My view is that we need to engender the values”—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those opposed to the hon. member's moving the motion will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): On a point of order, the hon. member for Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock.

Mr. Jamie Schmale: Madam Speaker, this is coming out of question period and the comments from the member for Sydney—Victoria. I would like unanimous consent to table this document reminding Canadians that during the first truth and reconciliation day, the Prime Minister was surfing in Tofino.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I am already getting some nays, but I will ask the question.

All those opposed to the hon. member's moving the motion will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I have a point of order from the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands.

Ms. Elizabeth May: Madam Speaker, I want to thank you for your valiant efforts today in maintaining order through question period.

[Translation]

I would also like to thank the hon. member for Louis-Saint-Laurent for apologizing. He is a role model for us all.

*Routine Proceedings**[English]*

I did hear something that can be taken up later, and I know that if I heard it clearly it may end up in Hansard. It was not something said by the hon. member for Lethbridge, but while she had the floor, a male voice was heard quite clearly saying the word “cowardly”. I think it may end up in Hansard, unless someone attends to it.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): It is not something that I heard. I am sure we can double-check the record and come back to the House if need be.

The hon. member for Winnipeg Centre has a point of order.

Ms. Leah Gazan: Madam Speaker, certainly emotions run high here when we are debating. September 30 is the National Day for Truth and Reconciliation, and I find it really abhorrent that we are using this time, when we are supposed to be lifting up survivors, to get into petty political arguments on the backs of survivors. I am encouraging members to stop this behaviour.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I appreciate the point of order that was raised, but, again, I think it falls on debate.

I want to remind everyone that we should be respectful of each other in the House. There are ways to debate our different points of views, and we have to be mindful of the occasion that we are going to be marking.

The hon. member for Cariboo—Prince George also has a point of order.

Mr. Todd Doherty: Madam Speaker, I rise with a heavy heart as well. As many know, my family is first nations as well.

The comments that came from the member for Sydney—Victoria on a day before truth and reconciliation day are indeed damaging. I remind the House that not only did the member for Sydney—Victoria use disparaging remarks toward indigenous women prior to his elected life, but our Prime Minister also heckled indigenous protesters and thanked them for their donation.

Madam Speaker, through you, I ask for unanimous support to table a document that highlights that our Prime Minister thanked indigenous protesters for their donation when they were protesting his inability to fight the potable water situation in our first nations communities throughout our country.

This is shameless. I seek unanimous support to table this document.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those opposed to the hon. member's moving the motion will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. member for Lakeland is rising on a point of order.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Madam Speaker, I wrote my undergraduate honour's thesis, 21 years ago, about harm and responsibility in the residential school system, and called for apology and compensation from government, among many other measures. I forgot,

when you allowed me the time earlier, to ask for unanimous consent to table documents that show the Prime Minister's pick for indigenous-Crown relations making misogynist and anti-indigenous comments.

To the comment from our colleague who talked about how she is urging people to not make political points, I agree. That is the point of me rising and I hope I am taken in good faith. She should definitely talk to her Liberal cabinet minister colleagues—

• (1220)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I just want to remind members that if they want to table a document, I do not know that they have to go into in-depth detail about what the document is.

All those opposed to the hon. member's moving the motion will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. member for Winnipeg Centre is rising on a point of order.

Ms. Leah Gazan: Madam Speaker, I am very saddened by what is occurring. Again, I am going to urge all parliamentarians, if they have any level of decency, to stop using residential school survivors for political games. This is inappropriate and it is violent.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I appreciate all of the points of order that have been made. If members could please be very respectful in the language that they use, that would allow the House to function much better.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[Translation]

PETITIONS

POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

Hon. Greg Fergus (Hull—Aylmer, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is my duty to table a petition on behalf of Canadians, particularly post-doctoral researchers and graduate students.

The petitioners are calling upon the Government of Canada to do the following: increase the value of tri-agency graduate scholarships and post-doctoral fellowships by 50%; increase the number of tri-agency graduate student scholarships by 50%; increase the number of tri-agency post-doctoral fellowships by 100%; and increase the tri-agency research grant budget provided to faculty by at least 10% per year for the next 10 years, to allow for increased graduate student and post-doctoral pay.

This petition was signed by 1,841 people.

Routine Proceedings

[English]

CARBON PRICING

Mrs. Tracy Gray (Kelowna—Lake Country, CPC): Madam Speaker, I have two petitions to table today.

I am tabling a petition from constituents in Kelowna—Lake Country and surrounding area. This petition talks about the combination of carbon tax 1 and carbon tax 2, which will mean Canadians will pay an extra 61¢ for each litre of gas.

The petition refers to making life more expensive for Canadians, and a cost of living crisis, by implementing a second carbon tax, demonstrating how out of touch the Liberal Prime Minister is, and how the Parliamentary Budget Officer confirmed that both carbon taxes will have a net cost of up to \$4,000 per family, depending on the province in which they live.

Therefore, the petitioners are calling on the Government of Canada to recognize this failure and to immediately cancel the clean fuel regulations.

• (1225)

HEALTH

Mrs. Tracy Gray (Kelowna—Lake Country, CPC): Madam Speaker, I have a petition from residents in Kelowna—Lake Country and surrounding area that refers to Health Canada proposing to significantly change natural health product regulations. Natural health products include basic everyday products used by Canadians as part of their proactive health care. According to petitioners, these regulations will cause consumer prices to rise significantly and consumer choices to decline drastically, and that is a major concern.

The petition calls on the Minister of Health to work with the industry to accurately reflect the size and scope of the industry. The petitioners ask that the new regulatory changes only be considered once the self-care framework is adjusted, backlogs are cleared, operations are running efficiently and policies and procedures are in place to ensure that stable operations and selection of natural health product choices continues for all Canadians.

OLD-GROWTH FORESTS

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, it is an honour to present a petition today on behalf of residents of Saanich—Gulf Islands concerned about the multiple threats the highly endangered forest- and sea-dwelling bird, the fantastic little marbled murrelet, face. I will not digress into my experiences with marbled murrelet chicks, but it is quite the story. They are endangered because their habitat is being logged. They specifically dwell only in nests in old-growth forests.

The marbled murrelet is protected under the Migratory Birds Convention Act, as the petitioners point out. They call on the federal government to act to protect this critical habitat for the marbled murrelet by working with the provinces, but particularly British Columbia, to protect the last remaining old-growth forest in British Columbia, which is still being logged.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I rise to present a petition.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has warned us repeatedly that rising temperatures over the next two decades will bring widespread devastation and extreme weather. Petitioners are certainly feeling the impacts in Canada today with increased flooding, wildfires and extreme temperatures. Addressing the climate crisis requires a drastic reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. In 2021, the federal government committed to cap and cut emissions from the oil and gas sector to achieve net-zero emissions by 2050.

Petitioners call upon the Government of Canada to move forward immediately with bold emissions caps for the oil and gas sector that are comprehensive in scope and realistic in achieving the necessary targets that Canada has set to reduce emissions by 2030.

CRIMINAL CODE

Mrs. Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is a real privilege to stand in this House and bring the concerns of Canadians to this place.

I want to present this first petition on behalf of Canadians who continue with their concerns in this regard. It is well established that the risk of violence against women increases when they are pregnant. Currently, the injury and death of preborn children as victims of crime are not considered aggravating circumstances for sentencing purposes in our Criminal Code of Canada. Therefore, petitioners indicate justice requires that an attacker who abuses a pregnant woman and her preborn child be sentenced accordingly and the sentence should match the crime.

FREEDOM OF POLITICAL EXPRESSION

Mrs. Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Madam Speaker, the second petition I am presenting is on behalf of Canadians who certainly believe they have the right to be protected against discrimination. We all do.

Canadians can and do face political discrimination, and it is a fundamental Canadian right to be politically active and vocal. It is in the best interest of Canadian democracy to protect public debate and the exchange of different ideas. Bill C-257 seeks to add protection against political discrimination to the Canadian Human Rights Act.

Therefore, these petitioners and residents of Canada call upon the House of Commons to support Bill C-257, which would ban discrimination on the basis of political belief or activity, and to defend the rights of Canadians to peacefully express their political opinions.

Routine Proceedings

Mr. Dane Lloyd (Sturgeon River—Parkland, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to present this petition on behalf of Canadians who are very concerned about the rise in discrimination against political belief and activity. They are calling on the House of Commons to pass Bill C-257, which will enshrine in the Canadian Human Rights Act that political belief and activity are not subject to discrimination.

The petitioners believe that as we live in a world where fear of political retribution is leading to increasing polarization, in order to preserve Canada as a peaceful and strong democracy, legislation like this must pass.

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to table a number of petitions in the House today.

The first petition is in support of private member's bill, Bill C-257, a bill that I put forward, along with a parallel bill, Bill S-257, that has been presented in the Senate by Senator Ataullahjan.

This bill would add political belief and activity as prohibited grounds of discrimination in the Canadian Human Rights Act. We are seeing an increase in incidents where individuals are discriminated against or threatened with discrimination on the basis of their political views. Not only is this an unjustified form of discrimination like many others, but it has a chilling effect on democratic deliberation, according to the petitioners.

Petitioners call on the House to support Bill C-257, which bans discrimination on the basis of political belief and activity, and defend the rights of all Canadians to peacefully express their political opinions.

• (1230)

CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, the second petition notes the elevated risk of violence that pregnant women face, the absence of specific targeted protections for women in this situation and the fact that the current law does not recognize the impact if an active assault results in the death of the preborn child.

Petitioners call on the House to legislate that the abuse of a pregnant woman or the infliction of harm on a preborn child is an aggravating circumstance for sentencing purposes in the Criminal Code.

FALUN GONG

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, the next petition deals with the persecution of Falun Gong practitioners in China. Petitioners note that Falun Gong is a traditional Chinese spiritual discipline that consists of meditation exercises and moral teachings based on the principles of truthfulness, compassion and tolerance.

Petitioners describe the campaign of persecution that has been targeting Falun Gong practitioners for more than 20 years, as well as the work that was done by prominent Canadians, David Matas and the late, great David Kilgour on revealing the forced organ harvesting that has targeted and is targeting Falun Gong practitioners.

Petitioners are therefore calling on the House and the government to take additional action to support Falun Gong practitioners to do more on organ harvesting, as well as to publicly call for an end to persecution of Falun Gong practitioners.

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, the final petition that I am tabling for today deals with the government's so-called feminist international policy. Petitioners note that the Muskoka Initiative, launched by the previous Conservative government, involved historic investments in the well-being of women and girls around the world. This initiative emphasized value for money but also ensured that investments were in made priorities identified by local women.

Conversely, the Liberals' so-called feminist international assistance policy, according to petitioners, has shown a lack of respect for the cultural values and autonomy of women in the developing world by pushing organizations that violate local laws and pushing certain objectives at the expense of international development priorities that local women have, such as clean water, access to basic nutrition and economic development.

The petitioners also note that the Liberals' support for international development for women and girls has been criticized by the Auditor General for failing to measure results. Therefore, petitioners call on the Government of Canada to align international development spending with the approach taken in the Muskoka Initiative, focusing international development dollars on meeting the basic needs of vulnerable women around the world, rather than pushing ideological agendas that may conflict with local values in developing countries. They also want to see the government do more to measure outcomes.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mrs. Sherry Romanado (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the King's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

CANADIAN SUSTAINABLE JOBS ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-50, An Act respecting accountability, transparency and engagement to support the creation of sustainable jobs for workers and economic growth in a net-zero economy, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Mr. Dane Lloyd (Sturgeon River—Parkland, CPC): Madam Speaker, in all this debate about the sustainable jobs act, what I have not heard is an explanation from the Liberal-NDP government of a credible plan to replace over 25% of Canada's exports. Petroleum and petroleum products account for over \$100 billion, over 25% of Canada's annual exports. These exports are absolutely necessary for the protection of the value of the Canada dollar.

If the sustainable jobs act achieves what it intends to achieve, it would cripple our exports and cripple the Canadian dollar, which would lead to a massive increase in inflation, which we are already dealing with. This massive increase in inflation would necessarily be countered by further radical interest rate hikes from the Bank of Canada. Therefore, can my hon. colleague explain the deep economic consequences of this policy that the government simply does not have a credible plan to deal with?

• (1235)

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC): Madam Speaker, I touched on this in my remarks earlier, but the hon. member is exactly right, and that is exactly why Canadians can see countries around the world that are 40 years ahead of us on this agenda now rolling back all of those measures. They are doing the very things Conservatives here at home have been asking the current government to do to protect our citizens' cost of living, future opportunities, standard of living and jobs. We have been asking it to control and bring down the cost of living crisis that the government's anti-private-sector, anti-energy, anti-resource-development command-and-control policies have created.

The member touches on a thing that I really find the most important about this debate. It is that the NDP-Liberal government owes these answers to Canadians about how it is going to achieve the targets it set on these timelines. So far, it is causing all economic pain and no environmental gain. That is why Conservatives and Canadians are asking whether it is worth the cost. That is the government's job to answer.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (deputy House leader of the government, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I understand that the member cares deeply for the oil and gas sector. She talks about it quite a bit, and I appreciate her prerogative on that. Even if one does not think there is a future in clean tech and that there is opportunity here, this still gives the opportunity to unlock the potential of new jobs in a clean sector. All one has to do is open their eyes and look around throughout the world. This industry is really in a growth stage right now. Even if one does not necessarily agree that it is the future, why would they not still take a very easy risk on betting that it will be a positive outcome for the Canadian economy?

Government Orders

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Madam Speaker, we do agree it is the future, which we have said multiple times. We just recognize that the reality that the oil and gas sector in Canada still remains the most abundant, available, affordable source of energy for most Canadians throughout this country and is also the biggest investor in clean tech and alternative energies. What the government wants to do is kill the very sector that leads to the innovation and technology.

The Liberals should answer more questions about how on earth they are going to meet their targets in 2035, when they cannot get critical minerals out of the ground, when they are holding back the ring of fire, when interties do not exist and when there is no grid capacity and no end-user distribution system for Canadians on the back end.

Conservatives are saying, "Answer the questions." How is this going to get done? When, why and in what way will it get done? Who is paying for it? Then, maybe people could have confidence in their plan. However, we all know they are not—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Resuming debate, the hon. member for Repentigny.

[Translation]

Ms. Monique Pausé (Repentigny, BQ): Madam Speaker, the Bloc Québécois supports the energy transition and a fair transition for workers and their families.

For a long time, we have been proposing to change Canada's energy trajectory to make it consistent with the country's commitments and to keep the global increase in temperature below 1.5°C. Those are commitments made by the government and the world. We are proposing to immediately stop the increase in production of fossil fuels and to gradually reduce our total oil and gas production by 2030, not increase it. We are proposing to redirect the money invested in fossil fuels, including generous Liberal subsidies, to developing renewable energy and clean technologies.

We stand in solidarity with workers in the energy sector. Right from the start of the whole Trans Mountain pipeline expansion, we were proposing to abandon the project and redirect those amounts to western Canada's energy transition by investing in solutions for workers and their families. We support collaborative efforts among all stakeholders affected by the transition, including businesses, workers, their representatives and the public. We have always known, recognized and affirmed that the energy transition is a challenge for the economic sectors affected, and that public authorities need to plan this transition for workplaces through engagement, training and other measures to support workers and their families.

Government Orders

In that respect, the Bloc Québécois supports the recommendations for a just transition law coming from environmental groups and labour organizations. They were wise enough to join forces in their demands in favour of this just transition, because they understood that the success of the energy transition and the fight against climate change would depend on the economic and social success of the companies, workers and communities that would be affected by the changes to come. In fact, I recall that at one of the UN conferences on the environment I attended, Antonio Guterres clearly stated that there will be no transition without workers. They are part of the solution. It is simply a question of solidarity. The Bloc Québécois has listened to environmental groups and labour organizations and will support their demands of and recommendations to the government.

We think that just transition legislation should include the following. First, let us call a spade, a spade. This should simply be called the “just transition act”. Then, it should set explicit objectives and principles that are articulated around international commitments on climate, responsibilities to indigenous peoples and obligations with respect to an equitable transition in Canada. This legislation should adopt a collaborative approach that relies on a social dialogue based on equity that respects democratic dialogues already under way in the provinces and territories, especially in Quebec, and respects the democratic choices of that nation, the Quebec nation, and the rights and aspirations of indigenous peoples.

This legislation should set out measures for respecting Canada's objectives and principles when it comes to the just transition, including those related to the climate, indigenous peoples, the need to not leave anyone behind, and groups that deserve equity and suffer inequities related to the degradation of the environment. It is clear that there are people who more or less did not contribute to increasing greenhouse gas emissions whose environment is directly affected by this degradation. Again, I am thinking in particular about indigenous peoples. This legislation, the mandate and mission of organizations created by the government should not in any way exceed the legislative jurisdictions of the federal Parliament. These organizations have to make recommendations to the federal government in areas of federal jurisdiction that can be mobilized in favour of the transition.

• (1240)

This legislation should provide for regional or sectoral planning and reporting requirements along the lines of those established by the Canadian Net-Zero Emissions Accountability Act. This legislation should establish an adequate means of funding by setting up funding agreements with the provinces. Those agreements need to be based on real greenhouse gas reduction targets in order to finance the projects needed for the transition.

Unfortunately, Bill C-50 is not about a just transition. In fact, the Liberal government does not even dare use the term, which really seems to frighten them. Bill C-50 proposes creating committees that will make recommendations on workforce training to the minister who will be responsible for implementing the legislation. That is it.

Workforce training, while not the only aspect of the just transition, is certainly part of the discussion. It is a sphere of activity to

must be taken into account in planning the transition. If we want to legislate workforce training, then we need to take into consideration the legislative jurisdictions of the different governments and take into consideration the official agreements that already exist between the Government of Canada and the provincial governments. Unfortunately, on this, the government still seems to have completely forgotten Quebec in its process of developing Bill C-50. Its advisory body, its secretariat for supporting the implementation of the legislation, all of that already exists in Quebec. The federal government has never understood the labour landscape in Quebec.

They developed Bill C-50 by ignoring the reality in Quebec, and this is not the first time. They developed it by ignoring our laws, our policies, our democratic choices and especially by ignoring agreements between Quebec and Ottawa related to workforce training.

Quebec has been voicing its demands on labour issues for decades now. During the 1990s, discussions between Quebec and Canada on this subject related primarily to repatriating the federal funding for vocational and technical training. It was about righting a certain wrong, specifically the federal government's financial disengagement, which had to be compensated for.

On June 22, 1995, the Quebec National Assembly passed the Act to Foster the Development of Manpower Training. With this legislation, Quebec demonstrated its leadership in workplace training. The Quebec reform laid the foundations for a new model based on partnerships that would make a major contribution to Quebec's economic development. This legislation led to the creation, in 1998, of the Commission des partenaires du marché du travail, or CPMT, which is now celebrating its 25th anniversary. The CPMT was created in the wake of the repatriation of active employment measures from the federal government to the Quebec government. This is not new. We are talking about 1997 and 1998.

In 1997, the governments of Quebec and Canada signed the Canada-Quebec Labour Market Agreement in Principle and the Canada-Quebec Labour Market Agreement Implementation. The Commission des partenaires du marché du travail was created a few months later.

What is the CPMT? It is a consensus-building body that helps develop the Quebec government's labour and employment policies and measures. To find innovative solutions and build consensus, the CPMT coordinates Quebec-wide consultation forums in order to resolve specific employment-related issues. The CPMT brings together employer and labour representatives from the education community, community organizations and economic and social departments.

Government Orders

In addition to the CPMT, which covers all of Quebec, there are regional councils of labour market partners. In fact, I sat on the Conseil régional des partenaires du marché du travail de la Montérégie. In addition, there are a number of sectoral committees, which bring together employers and unions in the various industries. It is important to understand that the CPMT and all its organizations are the only ones of their kind in Canada. That is a source of pride in Quebec. The creation of the CPMT and Emploi-Québec is a gesture of national affirmation for us. It is not just a blip on the radar.

• (1245)

It is somewhat disappointing that no one in the federal government thought of this. In the opinion of the officials who presented Bill C-50 to us, at no point in the process of drafting the bill did the government consider Quebec's specific situation, yet again. This unfortunately speaks volumes about the general mindset of this government, which has so little regard for the sovereignty of the Canadian provinces or for Quebec's distinctiveness that it forgets the agreements it has itself entered into as part of its government action.

That said, the government always has the opportunity to rectify this situation. We need to develop legislation that takes into account the agreements the federal government has signed with the provinces, especially Quebec, which has its own model of partnership and co-operation. The government must introduce an element of asymmetry into the bill to make it compatible with the Canada-Quebec agreements on workforce development. To do so, it must reach an agreement with the Quebec government. In addition, if money is earmarked to support the sustainable jobs action plan that the minister must produce by 2025 and every five years thereafter, Quebec must receive its fair share of that money and it must go through the Quebec government. That is how it is done in other areas.

If the government wants the Bloc Québécois's support in developing legislation that promotes the just transition, then it has to do its homework. In fact, I think that the government needs to go back to the drawing board and come up with a bill that actually takes into account Quebec's laws and the existing agreements between the governments of Quebec and Canada. Some may be thinking, "Good luck with that", but we have every hope that the minister will understand our concern.

I will give an example of a time when, for once in its history, the government understood. In the case of child care, the government understood that Quebec was a pioneer, and it even praised Quebec. The government understood that it must not take any action that would undermine Quebec's network of early child care centres. The government even publicly acknowledged that it was using Quebec's system as a model. I think that the government should do exactly the same thing when it comes to labour. We simply do not understand why the government does not realize that the same logic should apply when it comes to workforce training. That situation definitely needs to be rectified.

While it is going back to the drawing board, the government should also listen to environmental groups and unions, who have specific demands and who were expecting, as we were, a compre-

hensive just transition law that would be aligned with Canada's climate commitments, not just a law creating committees to talk about workforce training.

Finally, the Bloc Québécois has no choice but to criticize the Liberal government's calculated decision to abandon the concept of a "just transition", even though the term did not originate here. I think we first started talking about it in the 1980s. The term is enshrined internationally in the Paris Agreement and the COP26 Just Transition Declaration, which Canada is part of. Why is the government afraid of those words?

We believe that the government's decision to use the term "sustainable jobs" and no longer refer to the just transition is in keeping with its approach to energy. If the energy transition does not take place, which is what is happening now, since the government is currently developing oil expansion, then there is no point in talking about a just transition. Jobs in the oil sands may be sustainable in the eyes of the federal government, given that it has basically ensured that they are here to stay by expanding oil projects. That move has even won the approval of the official opposition. Why are the Liberals and NDP afraid of the term "just transition"?

• (1250)

What are they afraid of? Are they afraid of the Conservatives playing word games with the Prime Minister's name? Are they afraid of the Premier of Alberta, who said she would fight the idea of a just transition with all the tools available to the Alberta government? Is that what they are afraid of?

We believe that if the federal government wants to take action to support the provinces in planning the energy transition, it must engage in frank and respectful dialogue with all the provinces and propose legislation that reflects the quality of that dialogue.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change and to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I listened carefully to my colleague. After yesterday, when we heard all the Conservatives stand up and say they were against fighting climate change, would she not agree that it is important to continue the fight on the federal side?

That is exactly what my bill aims to do, specifically take action on the federal side. Is it not important to think about workers and ensure sustainable jobs for the net-zero economy of the future?

Ms. Monique Pauzé: Madam Speaker, I listened to my colleague's speech this morning and I asked her a question. She spoke about jobs in green technology, clean technology and renewable energy. The principles of a just transition must apply to all of these new jobs, and those principles include sustainable development, respect for the rights of indigenous peoples and the social safety net. We need to respect the principles of this transition.

Government Orders

However, another thing that is important is providing assistance in retraining workers in polluting industries, which should be in decline. This is mostly about them. At all of the conferences of the parties that I participated in and in all of the discussions that I have had with environmental organizations and unions, that was the big issue. Participants said that workers in fossil fuel industries should not have to bear all of the weight of the transition, but there needs to be a transition for that to be an issue.

● (1255)

[*English*]

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC): Madam Speaker, I know that the member and I often debate from our opposing world views on the role and necessity of oil and natural gas for Canada and the globe long into the future, but I certainly appreciate her comments on respecting provincial jurisdiction. I know that we share that principle, but the NDP-Liberals think nothing of running roughshod over provincial governments with whom they disagree.

I know I sound like a broken record, but I represent nine indigenous communities in Lakeland, and the truth is that the oil and gas sector and mining are the biggest private sector employers of indigenous Canadians, with wages that are double the national average. There is a concern about setting realistic timelines and allowing those jobs to continue while the private sector continues to be the biggest investor in clean tech and alternative renewable energies. Does she share that concern?

In addition, could the member tell us how the more than \$7 million in GDP and the 438 businesses in oil and gas in Quebec will be replaced?

[*Translation*]

Ms. Monique Pauzé: Madam Speaker, the Standing Committee on the Environment and Sustainable Development just finished a study proposed by the Conservatives on clean technologies. During this study, witnesses told us that it is primarily SMEs that create jobs in clean technologies. It is not really the oil companies.

The oil companies use smoke and mirrors when they talk about their carbon capture and storage technology, which is fake news, a fake technique that is not even effective. Maybe it will be effective 10 or 12 years from now. The oil companies are billionaires. I maintain that the Conservatives are primarily pawns of these oil companies, which have billions of dollars but just want to offload the fight against climate change onto the consumer.

[*English*]

Ms. Leah Gazan (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Madam Speaker, I agree with my hon. colleague that we need a just transition that brings workers along. Something I have offered to put forward is a guaranteed livable basic income, which could certainly be paid for if we stopped funding big oil and instead put that money into funding people. I am wondering if the hon. member agrees that we need to start supporting people.

I have said very often that I do not think people love oil and gas, but I think they love feeding their families and paying for their houses, and they like to eat. We need a just transition that brings workers along. I know that climate activists are calling for a guar-

anteed livable basic income as one way to assist workers in transitioning. Does she agree with that proposal?

[*Translation*]

Ms. Monique Pauzé: Madam Speaker, as I was saying in my speech, fossil fuel workers should not have to carry all the weight of the energy transition themselves. Yes, we are thinking about the workers.

UN Secretary-General Guterres said that the energy transition will not be possible if we do not think about the workers, if they are not on board with us. Even in Alberta, there is an organization called Beyond Oil and Gas, which represents workers from that sector who want an energy transition.

● (1300)

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette, BQ): Madam Speaker, I would first like to thank and congratulate my hon. colleague, the member for Repentigny, for the quality of her substantive speech, as well as for the quality of her answers. When the Conservative member did not like my colleague's answer, she heckled her throughout. However, my colleague maintained her focus and answered frankly. I take my hat off to her.

An hon. member: Oh, oh!

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie: Madam Speaker, there she goes again.

The part of my colleague's speech that really stood out to me was when she said how little Ottawa understands the ecosystem of Quebec's labour market and workforce and how they operate. Can she share some more examples of that?

Ms. Monique Pauzé: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his intervention.

We are studying Bill C-50 today, but I want to go back to when the Harper government tabled its 2013 budget. The important bit in the 2013 budget was the Canada job grant. That was the centre-piece. Quebec was opposed to it. I remember that, at the time, people in the Conservative government said that we should go and see what was happening in Scandinavia. It was Ms. Maltais, a PQ MNA, who told the government that it did not need to cross the Atlantic, that all it had to do was look at what was happening in Quebec. It was after that that the agreements were respected.

This is not the first time the government has had no sense of what is happening in Quebec. Quebec is a leader in many fields, and we are proud of it. As I said in my speech, Quebec leads the way in terms of day care, employment and, I would add, the environment.

Government Orders

Mr. Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Madam Speaker, I too would like to sincerely congratulate my colleague from Repentigny on the quality of her speech, as well as her ability to remain focused. During part of her speech, she had to put up with three annoying members behind her who would not stop talking. I just wanted to say that I admire how she remained focused on her message.

I am always surprised that this Liberal government, which claims to be a strong advocate for the environment and active in the fight against climate change, continues to support and invest massively in oil companies.

How does my colleague break down and understand the Liberal government's approach to climate change? Does that approach, by any chance, reflect the fact that they are trying to have it both ways, from an electoral perspective? What other reason could they have for continuing to support the oil industry when the planet is falling apart?

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. member for Repentigny has just a little over a minute to respond.

Ms. Monique Pauzé: Madam Speaker, I have just one minute, but it would take me hours to explain everything that is wrong with the government's approach to fighting climate change.

The former Liberal environment minister, Mrs. McKenna, said that Canada could not be part of such a bad movie. That is not nothing. She said that it did not make sense for Canada to rank second in the world when it comes to expanding oil production.

What I find really too bad is that when government ministers open their mouths all I hear are speeches from oil companies.

[*English*]

Mr. Daniel Blaikie (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am grateful for the opportunity to make a contribution to this debate. It is a debate that, certainly in respect of the larger issue of climate change, is the most important of our time. We are being called on to try to navigate what is an increasingly challenging, dangerous and expensive climate crisis. This summer was just the latest and most extreme example so far of what failure to take climate change seriously looks like.

I grew up in a house where climate change was an important theme. At one time it was called global warming. NDP MPs were the first to raise the issue of global warming in the House of Commons as far back as the 1980s. This is a debate that many of us in Canada have been wanting to have for a long time. We have been debating climate change in various ways over the last decade or more.

However, I do not think that the quality of the debate has risen to the occasion. That is not to say that particular people in the context of that debate have not done a good job of presenting the kinds of ideas that I think we need in order to be able to adequately tackle the climate, but I think if we take a step back and look at the debate as a whole, it has not served us well. We are not where we need to be.

These are not my words, but I think they are helpful to kind of get a sense of some of the pitfalls in the climate debate. I have

heard others say that those pitfalls are encapsulated by the three Ds: denial, delay and despair. There is still no shortage of denial, even in the House of Commons, respecting the real threats that the climate poses to life on planet Earth, and, if things do not get that dire, real threats that are posed to the economy.

This year, we saw some of the worst examples so far of that. It seems to me that, for a number of years now, we have been in the unfortunate position of having to say that we have seen some of the worst examples. If the folks who study these things for a living are to be believed, and I think they should be, we are in for more bad weather events and other things that will have a cost not only in human life, property damage and all the rest but also to the very economy that proponents of denial often say they want to save.

Today's bill is not perfect by any stretch, but it is an important part of putting infrastructure in place to be able to deal with the economic impacts of climate change, and to try to put workers at the centre of that.

Often we will hear from opponents of legislation like this that it is all about shutting down the oil and gas industry, and that it is going to hurt workers and the economy. I want to take a moment to speak to that criticism. I do not think that is true, frankly. There is a lot of the pain that workers in the oil and gas industry have been experiencing. We have seen moments of international pricing of fossil fuels falling.

I remember an important debate early on in the 42nd Parliament, around 2016 or 2017, not long after I was first elected, when the international price of western crude plummeted. It had some very real impacts for workers in Alberta and for workers in the oil and gas sector across the country. That was painful for them and painful for us to watch, and merited a response that was centred on workers and how to support workers at that time.

I want to just take a moment to say that the interests of the oil and gas industry and the interests of oil and gas workers are sometimes aligned, but not always. In fact, over the last couple of years, what we have seen is an increase in extraction. If we listen to Conservatives in particular, that can get lost in the noise. It sounds as if oil and gas companies are being told to shut down and cut production. That is actually not true. There are certainly some of us who think that unlimited and unbridled growth in extraction is a recipe to worsen the climate crisis.

There is a reasonable debate to be had about what an appropriate amount of extraction every year could look like and what would be sustainable, but that is not the debate that we hear from Conservatives.

• (1305)

Over the last couple of years, we have seen a decrease in employment in oil and gas, which is why I think a lot of people who work in oil and gas feel that the sector is in trouble, but if we look at the corporate readouts, the fact is that they are extracting more oil and gas than ever and making more money than ever.

Government Orders

Part of the way that they are doing that is by having very close political allies that they have worked for a long time to capture. This has even reached the point that Suncor recently held off on announcing 1,500 layoffs that it was making in a year where it had just almost doubled its previous year's profits.

In 2022, Suncor made \$2.74 billion in profit. Despite having one of their most profitable years ever, almost double the profits from 2021, which itself was a year of record profit, it decided to lay off 1,500 people.

It did not just do that when it suited them. It did it when it suited its political allies in Alberta. It waited until after the Alberta election to announce those layoffs.

It was not that long ago that a story surfaced about Conservative MPs who, on the dime of a right-wing Hungarian think tank and an anti-carbon tax lobby in Canada, flew to the U.K. and were treated to lavish dinners, including \$600 of champagne and expensive meals, because they are part of a political and economic club that benefits from the profit-making of the oil and gas industry, which I say, again, does not always mean something that directly benefits workers.

We see a decline in employment even as we see an increase in production and profit in the oil and gas sector. Therefore, I think Canadians should be suspicious of the denial argument, because there is a lot of money in the oil and gas sector and a lot of people who benefit from that.

What New Democrats are concerned to see is that workers in Alberta and across the country continue to have gainful employment, good union jobs, where they can be assured of good workplace safety and health standards when they go to work. They should be able to go to their shift in the morning, come back at the end of the day and be paid well for the work they perform.

The economy is not static. The fact of the matter is that whether Canada seriously recognizes the threat that climate change represents to the planet and to our economy or not, our international allies and economic competitors are recognizing that.

As some in the House will know, I sit on the finance committee. We have heard from a number of people in the private sector who are talking about the incredible economic opportunities that decarbonization represents. There are opportunities in renewable energy and the emerging and growing electric vehicle market.

That is where the puck is going. I would say, of the oil and gas industry, particularly in Alberta, obviously the private sector has played a huge role in that. Obviously a lot of people in the private sector made a lot of money, and obviously a lot of Canadian workers have benefited, over the decades, from that, in terms of stable and well-paying employment. However, that industry was created with some very deliberate public policy and some very large investments.

That is the kind of foresight that a person like Peter Lougheed exhibited. If we took that same wisdom and apply it to today, what it entails is government once again looking at the public policy agenda and putting into place favourable conditions for those markets of the future.

This is not to say that the oil and gas industry is going to disappear overnight. In fact, we have a government right now that is pumping over \$30 billion into a pipeline exactly because it does not believe the oil and gas industry is disappearing overnight.

I think that was a poor use of public funds. I think the opportunity cost of investing over \$30 billion in a pipeline instead of investing it in the new energy economy will ultimately not serve Canadians well. We could have created a lot of employment and helped position Canada far more competitively in the new energy economy had we spent those public dollars in that economy instead of on a pipeline.

● (1310)

We have a government that is very invested in fossil fuels. It does not matter what the government does for the fossil fuel industry, including saying no to the NDP's calls for an excess profit tax on the oil and gas industry. We have an official opposition that cannot get the Liberals to do that here, although it is something some Conservative governments elsewhere have been willing to agree to.

The fossil fuel industry is alive and well in Canada. It is doing very well for itself. More and more, it is not passing that success on to workers, because the industry is finding ways to do more of that work with fewer workers. We are seeing that the oil and gas industry, including the companies and the shareholders, does not have the same loyalty to the workers that workers have shown to the industry.

New Democrats want to build an industry and have governments and public policy that are there for those workers as those companies find ways of moving, and even as they make money. In time, as the world economy shifts to a lower-carbon future, we need to make sure those workers are not left behind but that they are players with skills that are valued, and that people, not just in Canada but across the world, want to hire them for those skills in order to build out that new energy economy.

The path of denial really gets us nowhere. For too long, Canada, under the Liberals, has been on a path of delay. What does that look like? That looks like big investments in a pipeline, tens of billions of public dollars that, had we started spending five or six years ago, Canada would be in a much more competitive position in relation to our peers in terms of generating good union jobs in the emerging sectors.

I hear Conservatives often complaining about the fact that Canada's productivity growth has not kept up with that of our competitors. Business investment in Canada has been stagnant for a long time now. It is not because corporations have not had access to capital. In fact, many Canadian companies have large capital reserves, and they have seen the corporate tax rate go from 28% or 29% in the year 2000 to just 15% now. While that corporate tax rate was being reduced, the argument being made for it, among others, was that this tax reduction would allow Canadian companies to invest back into the Canadian economy. That is not what they have been doing with the money.

The new energy economy provides an opportunity, in at least two ways, to raise the level of business investment and the level of productivity. It is an opportunity for governments to make investments, for sure. We are starting to see some of that. Thankfully, the Biden administration in the U.S. provided real leadership on that. It was not until it provided that leadership that we saw the Liberals here really get going in a meaningful way on investments in the new energy economy. I think we are late to the table, and that is going to create challenges for Canada.

There is also a lot of private capital that wants to invest in renewables, and Canada has a lot going for it. We need to do it in the right way with indigenous people, instead of railroading them and railroading their rights to land and resources. I think Canada has a lot of offer in terms of natural resources, but we also have amazing workers with some awesome skills who can compete on the international stage. That would be a reason why international investors want to come here, and they do want to come here. However, they want certainty, and that is part of having predictability. We have seen a Conservative government, like the government in Alberta, win an election and then completely throw out plans for meaningful investment in renewables.

Conservatives like to talk a lot about how governments signal to the international community and the effects that can have on the economy. When we have a Conservative government like that run one way and then the day after, tear up major plans for investment in renewables, that says to the international investment community that it cannot put its money in Canada because it does not know what will happen when the political winds change.

In fact, in this case, it was not even a change of government. It was a government that got past the election test and figured that if it does this all now, four years from now when we have another election, maybe people will have forgotten about it. It completely changed course. How does that help Canada tell a credible story to international investors that want certainty and predictability on this front? Canada has been delaying for too long.

• (1315)

We are finally seeing some action from the government, but it is reactive and is in response to the Biden administration in the U.S. making the kinds of generational investments that ought to be made in the new energy economy in order to ensure that the United States has a serious foot in the door in that economy. Canada has to get with the program, but there is more than one way to participate in the new energy economy.

What New Democrats do not want to see is what we are starting to see in oil and gas, where workers are not at the centre of this. They get talked about but do not have a seat at the table, and at the end of day, if wealthy investors and shareholders are able to make extra money by screwing workers, they will do it. We are seeing it in the oil and gas sector. It is not the way we want the renewable sector to be set up.

The sustainable jobs act, which is a product of some of what we forced the Liberals to agree to in the confidence and supply agreement, is an attempt to start building infrastructure so that when we push past the denial and delay, we do not end up with the third “d”, which is despair, and people feeling that after all this, as we build

Government Orders

the foundational infrastructure of a new energy economy, there is no real room for workers there and that workers are being pushed into new industries with lower standards for pay and working conditions. The only way to prevent that is to put workers right at the table.

That is not just a defensive manoeuvre for workers to be able to advocate for the wages and working conditions they properly ought to have. It is also an opportunity for Canadians, for public policy-makers and investors to have the wisdom of people who know how to do these jobs at the table. They will then be able to evaluate various specific proposals about building particular things and can ask if they make sense, if they are going to work out and what the challenges involved with them are, and not just the engineering challenges, because there are engineers for that. It will mean having people who are familiar with what it means to commute from Nova Scotia to Alberta to work on a project.

To be able to weigh in on how to get the human resources we need in order to build this new low-carbon infrastructure is a really important part of the story, and I believe that having workers at the table is not just good for workers but good for the projects to help us understand how to staff those projects, particularly in a tight labour market. Although I think this is true generally, they need to know how to do it in way that is genuinely attractive to the kinds of workers who have the talent, skills, education and training that we need in order to make these projects a success.

I talked a bit about what I think is a terrible mistake in Alberta to turn away from building up the renewable energy economy. I think it is a decision that goes against the enterprising spirit of Peter Lougheed back in the 1970s to set up an industry that would serve his province well for decades to come. The clean energy sector's GDP forecast, economists believe, is that it is set to grow by 58% by 2030. They are projecting only 9% growth in fossil fuels. If we want to go where the jobs are and the money is and if we want to take Canada's economy to the places it needs to go to remain competitive and continue providing good livelihoods for Canadian workers, that means investing in the clean energy sector and creating a policy environment that works for the clean energy sector and for workers.

Government Orders

In the United States, we have seen the private sector announce more than \$110 billion in new clean energy manufacturing since the Inflation Reduction Act was put into place. That is an incredible amount of investment, and that means an incredible amount of work for American workers. We do not want Canadians to get left out of those opportunities. It does not make sense for Canadians to be left out of those opportunities if the concern is about workers and the future of families. As my colleague from Winnipeg Centre said very wisely earlier, it is not that Canadian workers love the oil and gas sector. What they love is good employment. What they love are fair wages. What they love is to be able to put food on their tables and afford a home.

In the future, going forward, there are going to be a lot of opportunities to do exactly that: put food on the table, afford a good home and have some financial security in clean energy jobs or in what I call the new energy economy. It is a lower-carbon economy—

• (1320)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. member will be able to add more during questions and comments. We will not be able to get through all the questions and comments, but we will do the best we can.

The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change and to the Minister of Natural Resources has the floor.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change and to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Madam Speaker, what I really appreciated was the focus the member placed on the well-paying jobs that are going to be available to workers as we move toward a net-zero economy and building out the clean electrical grid.

In that speech, one of the points he raised was the need for certainty: We need to make sure there is certainty and transparency as to how things are happening and what the plan is, planning ahead for workers to make sure those well-paying jobs are there.

With this bill, there are proposed requirements for action plans to be tabled and for there to be advice from a partnership council. The members from the official opposition are raising points that would make radical changes to such policies as carbon pricing. Could the member elaborate on the importance of that kind of stability and on perhaps what he sees as the dangers to those well-paying jobs when he hears that?

• (1325)

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Madam Speaker, certainty is very important. That is certainly something we hear around the Standing Committee on Finance table. I have heard it around the Standing Committee on International Trade table as well. Investors are looking for a predictable public policy environment. When we get governments that suddenly pull the rug out from under clean energy investments, what they do is make it harder to attract private capital. It is frustrating in the case where we then have a party that turns around and says that the government cannot fund this transition all on its own and that we need private capital too. Why would it undermine the prerequisites for attracting private capital?

Certainty is important in another sense, because we need certainty for workers in this transition as well. That is why employment insurance reform is really important, and it is something we need to do with a mind to the energy transition, pension-bridging opportunities and training for workers. All these things have to be built into a plan. Again, this bill is not perfect, but it is the beginning of creating some certainty not only for international investors but also for workers about this transition, which is coming led by the market if not led by the government.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Denis Trudel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, BQ): Madam Speaker, in the House, I keep hearing the indignant pleas of my NDP friends, who are very committed to the fight against climate change, as they push the Liberal government to stop investing in fossil fuels and affirm that we must absolutely do more to fight against greenhouse gas emissions.

Unfortunately, when the time comes to take action, one of the few things we can do in the House to act against the government is to vote against it. In the last budget, budget 2023, there were still billions of dollars handed out to the oil industry, including for carbon capture, which we know does not work at all. My friends at the NDP voted in favour of that.

I would like my colleague to explain that to me.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Madam Speaker, my hon. colleague knows full well that the NDP does not sit at the cabinet table. Our job is to criticize the government and try to negotiate with it. They do not agree with us on everything. Perpetual elections will not create the necessary conditions for dealing with the climate crisis, either. We are here to do our work. This includes criticizing the government, but perpetual electioneering is not the solution either.

[*English*]

Mr. Richard Cannings (South Okanagan—West Kootenay, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am glad the member for Elmwood—Transcona brought up signals that the current government and governments around the world are sending. Five years ago, I was at a G20 meeting on energy. The subject was this transition that we are talking about today. Germany, Japan, Argentina and even China were talking about the need to move to renewables quickly, and Canada got up and said we built an oil pipeline and would like to build more natural gas pipelines. It was a real face-smacking moment on the world stage. Workers can see that too. They see this transition is happening. Could the member talk more about how we need to involve workers in this process?

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Madam Speaker, this is where that question of the three Ds comes in. Workers do know, as everyone can see it. We could not miss this summer that there are real problems beginning to happen as a result of climate change. They pose real threats to human life and safety, our property and our economy. We cannot get away from that.

What is on offer in political alternatives? There is a party that is offering the idea that we can just ignore it and maybe it will go away. Too often we have seen from the government a willingness just to say, “Yes, that is important, and we are going to get to it”, and then it just keeps kicking the can down the road. In the face of that, it is easy to despair and say, “What do we do?”

We are not seeing leadership from government. What we are starting to see is some leadership in the market and that is because, thankfully—

• (1330)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I am sorry, but the hon. member will have to continue his questions and comments the next time this matter is before the House. I do apologize for having to interrupt him.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*Translation*]

PROTECTING YOUNG PERSONS FROM EXPOSURE TO PORNOGRAPHY ACT

(Bill S-210. On the Order: Private Members' Business:)

Private Members' Business

May 17, 2023—Second reading of Bill S-210, An Act to restrict young persons' online access to sexually explicit material—Mrs. Karen Vecchio

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Pursuant to Standing Order 91.1, a private member's item may only be considered by the House after a final decision on the votable status of the item has been made.

[*English*]

Although Bill S-210, an act to restrict young persons' online access to sexually explicit material, is scheduled for debate in the House today, no report on the votable status of the bill has been presented and concurred in, as is required before the bill can be debated.

[*Translation*]

I am therefore directing the table officer to drop this item of business to the bottom of the order of precedence. Accordingly, private members' hour is suspended today.

(Order discharged and item dropped to bottom of order of precedence on the Order Paper)

[*English*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Accordingly, it being 1:31, the House stands adjourned until Tuesday, October 3 at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Orders 28(1) and 24(1).

Thank you, everybody. I wish you a great weekend.

(The House adjourned at 1:31 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Friday, September 29, 2023

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Canadian Sustainable Jobs Act

Mrs. Lebouthillier (for the Minister of Natural Resources)	17141
Bill C-50. Second reading	17141
Ms. Dabrusin	17141
Mrs. Kusie	17144
Ms. Pauzé	17144
Ms. Gazan	17145
Ms. O'Connell	17145
Mr. Ste-Marie	17145
Mr. Cannings	17145
Mrs. Stubbs	17146
Ms. O'Connell	17150
Ms. Pauzé	17150
Mr. Cannings	17150

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Bruce Guthro

Mr. Kelloway	17151
--------------------	-------

Agriculture and Agri-Food

Mr. Bezan	17151
-----------------	-------

Offshore Renewable Energy Sector

Mr. Samson	17151
------------------	-------

Truth and Reconciliation

Mr. Desjarlais	17152
----------------------	-------

Francophone Community in Kingston

Mr. Gerretsen	17152
---------------------	-------

Baseball in Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound

Mr. Ruff	17152
----------------	-------

Youth Employment

Ms. Hepfner	17152
-------------------	-------

Youth in Policing

Mr. Turnbull	17152
--------------------	-------

National Day for Truth and Reconciliation

Mr. Schmale	17153
-------------------	-------

Public Safety

Mr. Sheehan	17153
-------------------	-------

Carbon Tax

Mr. Berthold	17153
--------------------	-------

Freedom

Mrs. Thomas	17153
-------------------	-------

National Day for Truth and Reconciliation

Mr. Fergus	17154
------------------	-------

National Day for Truth and Reconciliation

Ms. Collins (Victoria)	17154
------------------------------	-------

National Day for Truth and Reconciliation

Mrs. Gill	17154
-----------------	-------

Justice

Mr. Doherty	17154
-------------------	-------

National Day for Truth and Reconciliation

Mr. Battiste	17155
--------------------	-------

ORAL QUESTIONS

Government Accountability

Ms. Lantsman	17155
--------------------	-------

Mr. Fragiskatos	17155
-----------------------	-------

Housing

Ms. Lantsman	17155
--------------------	-------

Mr. Fragiskatos	17155
-----------------------	-------

Ms. Lantsman	17155
--------------------	-------

Mr. Fragiskatos	17155
-----------------------	-------

Foreign Affairs

Mr. Deltell	17156
-------------------	-------

Mr. Duclos	17156
------------------	-------

Carbon Pricing

Mr. Deltell	17156
-------------------	-------

Mr. Rodriguez	17156
---------------------	-------

Oil and Gas Industry

Ms. Normandin	17156
---------------------	-------

Mr. Guilbeault	17156
----------------------	-------

Ms. Normandin	17156
---------------------	-------

Mr. Guilbeault	17156
----------------------	-------

Justice

Mr. Desjarlais	17157
----------------------	-------

Mr. Maloney	17157
-------------------	-------

Housing

Ms. Idlout	17157
------------------	-------

Mr. Battiste	17157
--------------------	-------

Foreign Affairs

Mrs. Thomas	17157
-------------------	-------

Mr. Duclos	17157
------------------	-------

Mrs. Thomas	17157
-------------------	-------

Mr. Duclos	17157
------------------	-------

Housing

Mr. Lawrence	17158
--------------------	-------

Mr. Fragiskatos	17158
-----------------------	-------

Mr. Lawrence	17158
--------------------	-------

Mr. Fragiskatos	17158
-----------------------	-------

Mrs. Gray	17158
-----------------	-------

Mr. Fragiskatos	17158
Mrs. Gray	17158
Mr. Fragiskatos	17158

Indigenous Affairs

Mrs. Gill	17159
Ms. Dabrusin	17159
Mrs. Gill	17159
Mr. Battiste	17159

National Defence

Mr. Bezan	17159
Mr. Blair	17159

Health

Mr. Doherty	17159
Ms. Saks	17159

Public Safety

Mr. Lloyd	17160
Ms. O'Connell	17160

Carbon Pricing

Mr. Lehoux	17160
Mr. Guilbeault	17160

Housing

Mr. Green	17160
Mr. Fragiskatos	17160
Mr. Green	17160
Mr. Fragiskatos	17161

Indigenous Affairs

Mr. McLeod	17161
Mr. Battiste	17161

Carbon Pricing

Mr. Majumdar	17161
Mr. Guilbeault	17161
Mr. Shields	17161
Mr. Blair	17161
Mr. Généreux	17162
Mr. Rodriguez	17162
Mr. Généreux	17162
Mr. Guilbeault	17162

Agriculture and Agri-Food

Mr. Perron	17162
Mr. Blair	17162
Mr. Perron	17162
Mr. Guilbeault	17162

Carbon Pricing

Mr. Stewart	17162
Mr. Samson	17163
Mr. Stewart	17163
Mr. Guilbeault	17163
Mr. Kram	17163
Mr. Guilbeault	17163

Indigenous Affairs

Mrs. Shanahan	17163
Mrs. St-Onge	17163

Agriculture and Agri-Food

Mrs. Wagantall	17163
Mr. Blair	17164

Infrastructure

Mr. Schmale	17164
Mr. Guilbeault	17164
Mr. Schmale	17164
Mr. Guilbeault	17164

Indigenous Affairs

Mr. Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	17164
Mrs. Atwin	17164

Canadian Heritage

Mr. Masse	17164
Mrs. St-Onge	17165

Indigenous Affairs

Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	17165
Mr. Fragiskatos	17165

Points of Order

Decorum

Mr. Deltell	17165
-------------------	-------

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Petitions

Post-Secondary Education

Mr. Ferguson	17166
--------------------	-------

Carbon Pricing

Mrs. Gray	17167
-----------------	-------

Health

Mrs. Gray	17167
-----------------	-------

Old-Growth Forests

Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	17167
--------------------------------------	-------

Climate Change

Mr. Gerretsen	17167
---------------------	-------

Criminal Code

Mrs. Wagantall	17167
----------------------	-------

Freedom of Political Expression

Mrs. Wagantall	17167
Mr. Lloyd	17168
Mr. Genuis	17168

Criminal Code

Mr. Genuis	17168
------------------	-------

Falun Gong

Mr. Genuis	17168
------------------	-------

International Development

Mr. Genuis	17168
------------------	-------

Questions on the Order Paper

Mrs. Romanado	17168
---------------------	-------

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Canadian Sustainable Jobs Act

Bill C-50. Second reading	17169
Mr. Lloyd	17169
Mrs. Stubbs	17169
Mr. Gerretsen	17169
Ms. Pauzé	17169
Ms. Dabrusin	17171
Mrs. Stubbs	17172
Ms. Gazan	17172
Mr. Ste-Marie	17172
Mr. Champoux	17173
Mr. Blaikie	17173

Ms. Dabrusin	17176
Mr. Trudel	17176
Mr. Cannings	17176

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Protecting Young Persons from Exposure to Pornography Act

(Bill S-210. On the Order: Private Members' Business):..	17177
The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes).....	17177
(Order discharged and item dropped to bottom of order of precedence on the Order Paper)	17177

Published under the authority of the Speaker of
the House of Commons

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

The proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees are hereby made available to provide greater public access. The parliamentary privilege of the House of Commons to control the publication and broadcast of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees is nonetheless reserved. All copyrights therein are also reserved.

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the Copyright Act. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the Copyright Act.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

Also available on the House of Commons website at the following address: <https://www.ourcommons.ca>

Publié en conformité de l'autorité
du Président de la Chambre des communes

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

Les délibérations de la Chambre des communes et de ses comités sont mises à la disposition du public pour mieux le renseigner. La Chambre conserve néanmoins son privilège parlementaire de contrôler la publication et la diffusion des délibérations et elle possède tous les droits d'auteur sur celles-ci.

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la Loi sur le droit d'auteur. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre des communes.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la Loi sur le droit d'auteur.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

Aussi disponible sur le site Web de la Chambre des communes à l'adresse suivante :
<https://www.noscommunes.ca>