



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

House of Commons Debates

Official Report
(Hansard)

Volume 151 No. 298
Thursday, April 11, 2024

Speaker: The Honourable Greg Fergus



CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, April 11, 2024

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayer

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

• (1005)
[*English*]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8)(a), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 16 petitions. These returns will be tabled in an electronic format.

While I am on my feet, I move:

That the House do now proceed to orders of the day.

The Speaker: The hon. member for Regina—Qu'Appelle is rising on a point of order.

Hon. Andrew Scheer: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the government has just moved a motion, but the Chair had given notice that a ruling on a question of privilege would be forthcoming. Because it is a question of privilege, that always supersedes everything else that goes throughout the day. I was wondering if the Speaker would be delivering his ruling on the question of privilege before entertaining this motion.

The Speaker: I thank the hon. member. I will consult with the table officers to ensure that is the case.

The hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, the only concern I would express is that we actually now have a motion on the floor, and I think the motion has to be dealt with before anything else. That would be my interpretation.

The Speaker: I thank the hon. parliamentary secretary and I would like to thank the hon. House leader for the opposition for raising the point.

Questions of privilege, once accepted, do supersede other considerations, but the Chair has not given his response to the question of privilege. Yes, the Chair did give indication to the opposition House leader that we will be providing a response to the question of

privilege, and I will endeavour to do that as soon as possible, once this matter is dealt with.

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

Hon. Andrew Scheer: Mr. Speaker, I would request a recorded division.

The Speaker: Call in the members.

• (1050)
[*Translation*]

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

(*Division No. 686*)

YEAS

Members

Alghabra	Ali
Anand	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Bachrach
Badawey	Bains
Baker	Barron
Beech	Bibeau
Bittle	Blair
Blaney	Boissonnault
Boulerice	Bradford
Brière	Cannings
Carr	Casey
Chagger	Champagne
Chatel	Chen
Chiang	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Collins (Victoria)	Cormier
Coteau	Dabrusin
Damoff	Davies
Desjarlais	Dhillon
Diab	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Dzerowicz
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith	Fillmore
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Fry	Gaheer
Gainey	Garrison
Gazan	Gerretsen
Gould	Green
Guilbeault	Hajdu
Hanley	Hardie
Hepfner	Holland
Housefather	Hughes

Government Orders

Hutchings	Iacono	Findlay	Fortin
Idlout	Ien	Gallant	Garon
Jaczek	Joly	Gaudreau	Généreux
Jowhari	Julian	Genius	Gill
Kayabaga	Kelloway	Gladu	Godin
Khalid	Khera	Goodridge	Gourde
Koutrakis	Kusmierczyk	Gray	Hallan
Kwan	Lalonde	Jeneroux	Jivani
Lambropoulos	Lamoureux	Kelly	Khanna
Lapointe	Lattanzio	Kitchen	Kmiec
Lauzon	Lebouthillier	Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Lightbound	Long	Kurek	Kusie
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	Lake	Lantsman
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacGregor	Larouche	Lawrence
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney	Lehoux	Lemire
Martinez Ferrada	Masse	Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
May (Saenich—Gulf Islands)	McDonald (Avalon)	Lloyd	Lobb
McGuinty	McKay	Maguire	Majumdar
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod	Martel	Mazier
McPherson	Mendès	McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLean
Mendicino	Miao	Melillo	Moore
Miller	Morrice	Morantz	Morrison
Morrissey	Murray	Motz	Muys
Naqvi	Ng	Nater	Normandin
Noormohamed	O'Connell	Patzner	Paul-Hus
Oliphant	O'Regan	Pauzé	Perkins
Petitpas Taylor	Powlowski	Perron	Rayes
Qualtrough	Robillard	Redekopp	Reid
Rogers	Romanado	Rempel Garner	Richards
Rota	Sahota	Roberts	Rood
Sajjan	Saks	Ruff	Savard-Tremblay
Samson	Sarai	Scheer	Schmale
Scarpaleggia	Serré	Seeback	Shields
Sgro	Shanahan	Shipley	Simard
Sheehan	Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sinclair-Desgagné	Small
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Singh	Soroka	Steinley
Sorbara	Sousa	Ste-Marie	Stewart
St-Onge	Sudds	Strahl	Stubbs
Tassi	Taylor Roy	Thériault	Thomas
Thompson	Trudeau	Tochor	Tolmie
Turnbull	Valdez	Trudel	Uppal
Van Bynen	van Koeverden	Van Popta	Vecchio
Vandenbeld	Virani	Vidal	Vien
Weiler	Wilkinson	Viersen	Vignola
Yip	Zahid	Villemure	Vis
Zarrillo	Zuberi — 164	Vuong	Wagantall
		Warkentin	Waugh
		Webber	Williams
		Williamson — 143	

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barrett	Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu	Bergeron
Berthold	Bérubé
Bezan	Blanchet
Blanchette-Joncas	Block
Bragdon	Brassard
Brock	Brunelle-Duceppe
Calkins	Caputo
Carrie	Chabot
Chambers	Champoux
Chong	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho
DeBellefeuille	Deltell
Desbiens	Desilets
Doherty	Dowdall
Dreeschen	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Ellis	Epp
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)
Fast	Ferreri

PAIRED

Members

Barlow	Blois
Davidson	MacDonald (Malpeque)
Plamondon	Rodriguez
Vandal	Zimmer — 8

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS**CANADIAN SUSTAINABLE JOBS ACT**

The House proceeded to the consideration of 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, as reported (with amendments) from the committee.

[English]

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Speaker: Given the large number of report stage motions for Bill C-50, the Canadian sustainable jobs act, the Chair would like to explain some of the principles applied in the selection and grouping of these motions. In arriving at this ruling, I have sought to be guided by precedents established by my predecessors, especially Speaker Milliken, whose landmark ruling on March 21, 2001, serves as the basis for our modern report stage practice, as well as one of my predecessors, the member for Regina—Qu'Appelle, who faced a number of lengthy and complex report stages when he was Speaker.

[Translation]

In general, the motions most often selected for debate at report stage are those that delete clauses of a bill and those that further amend clauses that were amended at committee. Regarding motions to delete, as the member for Regina—Qu'Appelle remarked in decisions rendered on June 11, and December 12, 2012, the Chair frequently groups as many of them as possible and applies the vote on one to as many others as possible.

As for motions that further amend changes made in committee, the Chair often faces a dilemma in deciding how to group them in a way that ensures members can clearly express their point of view while appropriately managing the House's time. Where possible, the Chair has endeavoured to group motions that are similar or that deal with a similar subject matter.

Finally, the Chair would like to draw members' attention to the note to Standing Order 76.1(5), which states, and I quote:

For greater clarity, the Speaker will not select for debate a motion or series of motions of a repetitive, frivolous or vexatious nature or of a nature that would serve merely to prolong unnecessarily proceedings at the report stage.

• (1055)

[English]

The Chair notes that, in several cases, the same member or members from the same party have submitted a variety of different proposals to amend the same line or lines of the bill. In some cases, each proposal is a slight variation on the other. It would be impossible to apply the results of the vote on one motion to the others, as a line can only be amended once. The Chair has sometimes provided for a distinct vote on each, but in cases where the above-mentioned note seems applicable, the Chair has selected only one proposal per party. I would refer members to a ruling delivered by Speaker Milliken on February 18, 2002, for an example of such an approach being adopted.

There are 207 motions in amendment standing on the Notice Paper for the report stage of Bill C-50.

[Translation]

Motions Nos. 13, 43, 46, 50, 55, 62, 63, 65 to 68, 70, 72, 73, 81 to 89, 92 to 94, 98 to 100, 103 to 105, 107, 109 to 111, 114 to 116, 120 to 122, 124 to 126, 133, 135, 139, 150, 156 to 158, 167, 168, 170, 173 to 175, 179, 186, 195 to 198, 201 to 203 and 205 to 207 will not be selected by the Chair because they are similar proposals that affect the same lines in the bill.

Government Orders

All of the other motions will be grouped for debate and voted upon according to the voting pattern available at the table.

I will now put the following motions to the House.

• (1100)

[English]

MOTIONS IN AMENDMENT

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50 be amended by deleting the preamble.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in the preamble, be amended by replacing lines 13 to 15 on page 2 with the following:

“fostering the creation of sustainable jobs;”

[Translation]

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC) moved:

Motion No. 3

That Bill C-50, in the preamble, be amended by replacing line 13 on page 2 with the following:

“fostering the creation of sustainable jobs and, given an anticipated 170,000 immediate job losses plus a further 2,700,000 disrupted jobs, imple-”

Motion No. 4

That Bill C-50, in the preamble, be amended by replacing lines 14 and 15 on page 2 with the following:

“menting measures to assist workers;”

Motion No. 5

That Bill C-50, in the preamble, be amended by replacing line 41 on page 2 with the following:

“ing good-paying, high-quality jobs — including, but not limited to,”

[English]

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC) moved:

Motion No. 6

That Bill C-50, in the preamble, be amended by replacing lines 43 and 44 on page 2 with the following:

“trade union — as well as job security, social pro-”

Motion No. 7

That Bill C-50, in the preamble, be amended

(a) by replacing line 48 on page 2 with the following:

“and potential of workers and communities, and”; and

(b) by replacing lines 2 to 7 on page 3 with the following:

“sive economies and societies;”

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC) moved:

Motion No. 8

That Bill C-50, in the preamble, be amended by replacing lines 3 to 7 on page 3 with the following:

“(v) advance the well-being of workers;”

Motion No. 9

That Bill C-50, in the preamble, be amended by replacing line 3 on page 3 with the following:

“(v) recognize the anticipated 170,000 immediate job losses and 2,700,000 other jobs which will be disrupted and, therefore, advance the well-being of workers and”

*Government Orders**[Translation]*

Mr. Earl Dreeshen (Red Deer—Mountain View, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in the preamble, be amended by replacing lines 4 to 7 on page 3 with the following:

“communities;”

[English]

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in the preamble, be amended by replacing line 4 on page 3 with the following:

“communities, recognizing that 93% of the oil and gas sector is composed of small businesses each employing fewer than 100 individuals, as well as the achievement of”

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in the preamble, be amended by replacing lines 25 and 26 on page 3 with the following:

“communities and provinces and territories, which all”

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in the preamble, be amended by replacing line 25 on page 3 with the following:

“communities, non-unionized workers, non-governmental organizations and”

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in the preamble, be amended by deleting lines 29 to 31 on page 3.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in the preamble, be amended by replacing line 30 on page 3 with the following:

“ories have their own constitutional jurisdiction relevant to the shift to a net-zero economy;”

Ms. Yvonne Jones: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am hesitant to interrupt you, as I was the Speaker. I have had my hand up for quite a while, but I did not want to interrupt. I am looking for unanimous consent to see my vote as yes.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Is there consent?

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Earl Dreeshen (Red Deer—Mountain View, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in the preamble, be amended by replacing line 31 on page 3 with the following:

“isdiction, without interference from the federal government, to support the shift to a net-zero economy;”

[Translation]

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in the preamble, be amended by replacing lines 39 and 40 on page 3 with the following:

“reduction, are committed to working to ad-”

[English]

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC) moved:

Motion No. 19

That Bill C-50, in the preamble, be amended by replacing lines 39 and 40 on page 3 with the following:

“reduction, are committed to working in their respective areas of responsibility to ad-”

Motion No. 20

That Bill C-50, in the preamble, be amended by replacing line 40 on page 3 with the following:

“roles in their respective areas of responsibility, given an anticipated 170,000 immediate job losses and 2,700,000 other jobs which will be disrupted, to ad-”

Motion No. 21

That Bill C-50, in the preamble, be amended by replacing line 48 on page 3 with the following:

“zero economy and the creation of sustainable jobs, bearing in mind the disproportionate consequences of this transition on Indigenous peoples.”

[Translation]

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC) moved:

Motion No. 22

That Bill C-50, in the preamble, be amended by deleting lines 49 to 51 on page 3.

Motion No. 23

That Bill C-50 be amended by deleting the short title.

Motion No. 24

That Bill C-50 be amended by deleting Clause 2.

Motion No. 25

That Bill C-50, in Clause 2, be amended by deleting lines 3 to 10 on page 5.

● (1105)

[English]

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 2, be amended by replacing lines 3 to 10 on page 5 with the following:

“net-zero economy means an economy in which any anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere are balanced by anthropogenic removals of greenhouse gases from the atmosphere over a specified period. (économie carboneutre)”

[Translation]

Mr. Earl Dreeshen (Red Deer—Mountain View, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 2, be amended by replacing lines 5 to 10 on page 5 with the following:

“municated in accordance with the Paris Agreement. (économie carboneutre)”

[English]

Mr. Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 2, be amended by replacing lines 7 to 10 on page 5 with the following:

“net-zero emissions. (économie carboneutre)”

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 2, be amended by deleting lines 11 to 16 on page 5.

[Translation]

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 2, be amended by replacing lines 14 to 16 on page 5 with the following:

“from the atmosphere. (carboneutralité)”

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC) moved:

Government Orders

That Bill C-50, in Clause 2, be amended by deleting lines 24 to 32 on page 5.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 2, be amended by replacing lines 24 to 32 on page 5 with the following:

“sustainable job means any job which provides a powerful pay cheque for a Canadian worker. (emploi durable)”

[*English*]

Mr. Earl Dreeshen (Red Deer—Mountain View, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 2, be amended by replacing lines 25 and 26 on page 5 with the following:

“Canada’s pathway to achieving a net-zero-emissions future and that reflects the concept of”

Mr. Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 2, be amended by replacing lines 27 to 29 on page 5 with the following:

“decent work, namely work that can support the work-”

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 2, be amended by replacing lines 27 and 28 on page 5 with the following:

“decent work, namely work — including, but not limited to, jobs in which workers are represented by a trade union that has entered”

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 2, be amended by replacing lines 31 and 32 on page 5 with the following:

“such as fair income, job security and social protection. (emploi durable)”

[*English*]

Hon. Jonathan Wilkinson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.) moved:

That Bill C-50 be amended by restoring Clause 3 as follows:

Purpose

3 The purpose of this Act is to facilitate and promote economic growth, the creation of sustainable jobs and support for workers and communities in Canada in the shift to a net-zero economy through a framework to ensure transparency, accountability, engagement and action by relevant federal entities, including those focused — at the national and regional level — on matters such as skills development, the labour market, rights at work, economic development and emissions reduction.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC) moved:

Motion No. 38

That Bill C-50 be amended by deleting Clause 4.

Motion No. 39

That Bill C-50 be amended by deleting Clause 5.

Motion No. 40

That Bill C-50 be amended by deleting Clause 6.

Motion No. 41

That Bill C-50, in Clause 6, be amended by replacing lines 10 to 14 on page 6 with the following:

“through skills development, training, retraining; and”

● (1110)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Earl Dreeshen (Red Deer—Mountain View, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 6, be amended by replacing lines 11 to 14 on page 6 with the following:

“economic development and diversification; and”

Mr. Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 6, be amended by replacing lines 13 and 14 on page 6 with the following:

“eral-territorial initiatives; and”

[*English*]

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC) moved:

Motion No. 45

That Bill C-50, in Clause 6, be amended by replacing lines 19 and 20 on page 6 with the following:

“Ministers, amend the terms of reference.”

Motion No. 47

That Bill C-50 be amended by deleting Clause 7.

Motion No. 48

That Bill C-50, in Clause 7, be amended by replacing lines 25 and 26 on page 6 with the following:

“strategies and measures to encourage growth in goodpaying, high-quality jobs;”

Mr. Earl Dreeshen (Red Deer—Mountain View, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 7, be amended by replacing lines 25 and 26 on page 6 with the following:

“strategies and measures to encourage growth in goodpaying, high-quality jobs including jobs in which workers are represented by a trade union — in a net-zero economy;”

Mr. Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 7, be amended by replacing line 26 on page 6 with the following:

“tainable jobs;”

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 7, be amended by deleting lines 3 to 7 on page 7.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 7, be amended by replacing lines 4 to 6 on page 7 with the following:

“ters on potential areas of cooperation in relation to the Sustainable”

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 7, be amended by replacing lines 5 and 6 on page 7 with the following:

“ments of the provinces and territories and Indigenous governments in Canada in relation to the Sustainable”

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 7, be amended by replacing lines 8 to 10 on page 7 with the following:

“(e) engaging relevant partners and stakeholders in accordance with the terms of”

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 7, be amended by replacing lines 9 and 10 on page 7 with the following:

“cluding at the national, provincial and territorial levels, in accordance with the terms of”

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC) moved:

Motion No. 58

That Bill C-50 be amended by deleting Clause 8.

Motion No. 59

Government Orders

That Bill C-50, in Clause 8, be amended

(a) by replacing lines 15 and 16 on page 7 with the following:

“8 (1) The Council consists of no more than 15 members, including two co-chairs, who are to be appointed by the Governor in Council, on the recommendation-”; and

(b) by deleting lines 19 to 28 on page 7.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 8, be amended by deleting lines 19 to 28 on page 7

[*English*]

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 8, be amended

(a) by replacing line 19 on page 7 with the following:

“(1.1) The Council includes the following mem-”; and

(b) by replacing lines 22 to 24 on page 7 with the following:

“(b) two members who represent trade unions;

(c) two members who represent Indigenous peoples;

(d) two members who represent industry;”

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC) moved:

Motion No. 64

That Bill C-50, in Clause 8, be amended by replacing line 22 on page 7 with the following:

“(b) three members who, among them, represent unionized and non-unionized workers;”

Motion No. 69

That Bill C-50, in Clause 8, be amended by replacing line 23 on page 7 with the following:

“(c) three members who represent Indigenous peoples, of whom at least two also represent workers or employers;”

Motion No. 71

That Bill C-50, in Clause 8, be amended by replacing lines 25 to 28 on page 7 with the following:

“(e) two members who represent other key stakeholder groups.”

[*English*]

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 8, be amended by replacing line 34 on page 7 with the following:

“and underrepresented groups;

(a.1) the importance of having a balance of members who represent labour, Indigenous organizations and industry; and”

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 8, be amended by replacing line 3 on page 8 with the following:

“(i) the key sectors impacted by the shift to a net-zero”

[*English*]

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC) moved:

Motion No. 76

That Bill C-50 be amended by deleting Clause 9.

Motion No. 77

That Bill C-50 be amended by deleting Clause 10.

Motion No. 78

That Bill C-50 be amended by deleting Clause 11.

Motion No. 79

That Bill C-50, in Clause 11, be amended by replacing lines 6 to 9 on page 9 with the following:

“than October 15 of each year.”

Motion No. 80

That Bill C-50, in Clause 11, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 9 with the following:

“than 20 days after the day on which a fall economic”

Motion No. 90

That Bill C-50 be amended by deleting Clause 12.

Motion No. 91

That Bill C-50, in Clause 12, be amended by replacing line 17 on page 9 with the following:

“within 30 days after the day on which the Minister re-”

Motion No. 95

That Bill C-50 be amended by deleting Clause 13.

Hon. Jonathan Wilkinson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 13, be amended by replacing lines 21 and 22 on page 9 with the following:

“prepare a written response to the Council’s annual report and must make public the response within 120 days after the”

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC) moved:

Motion No. 97

That Bill C-50, in Clause 13, be amended by replacing line 22 on page 9 with the following:

“must make public the response within 80 days after the”

Motion No. 101

That Bill C-50 be amended by deleting Clause 14.

Motion No. 102

That Bill C-50, in Clause 14, be amended by replacing lines 27 to 29 on page 9 with the following:

“search and report on any particular matter specified by the Minister and the Minister may make”

Motion No. 106

That Bill C-50 be amended by deleting Clause 15.

Motion No. 108

That Bill C-50, in Clause 15, be amended by replacing line 33 on page 9 with the following:

“activities specified by the Minister within 30 days after”

Motion No. 112

That Bill C-50 be amended by deleting Clause 16.

Motion No. 113

That Bill C-50, in Clause 16, be amended

(a) by replacing line 3 on page 10 with the following:

“Action Plan no later than December 31, 2025 and must”; and

(b) by replacing line 10 on page 10 with the following:

“2025; and”

Hon. Jonathan Wilkinson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 16, be amended by

(a) replacing lines 3 and 4 on page 10 with the following:

“Action Plan no later than December 31, 2025 and must prepare a new Plan no later than December 31 of every fifth”;

(b) replacing line 10 on page 10 with the following:

“2025; and”; and

(c) replacing line 12 on page 10 with the following:
“the fifteenth sitting day of that House after December 31”

...
...

● (1120)

[*English*]

Mr. Mike Morrice (Kitchener Centre, GP) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 16, be amended
(a) by replacing lines 3 and 4 on page 10 with the following:
“Action Plan no later than December 31, 2024 and must prepare a new Plan no later than December 31 of every fifth”
(b) by replacing, in the French version, line 6 on page 10 with the following:
“au plus tard le 31 décembre de la cinquième année.”
(c) by replacing line 10 on page 10 with the following:
“2024; and”
(d) by replacing line 12 on page 10 with the following:
“the fifteenth sitting day of that House after December 31”

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC) moved:

Motion No. 119
That Bill C-50, in Clause 16, be amended
(a) by replacing line 4 on page 10 with the following:
“prepare a new Plan no later than December 31 of every fifth”; and
(b) by replacing line 12 on page 10 with the following:
“the fifteenth sitting day of that House after December 31”

Motion No. 123

That Bill C-50, in Clause 16, be amended by replacing lines 19 to 23 on page 10 with the following:
“ing five-year period”

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 16, be amended by replacing line 23 on page 10 with the following:
“to sustainable jobs for workers, particularly those who are Indigenous peoples or Black or other racialized individuals;”

[*English*]

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 16, be amended by deleting lines 24 and 25 on page 10.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC) moved:

Motion No. 129
That Bill C-50, in Clause 16, be amended by replacing line 25 on page 10 with the following:
“ing the guiding principles set out in the preamble while respecting the constitutional jurisdiction of the provinces and territories;”

Motion No. 130

That Bill C-50, in Clause 16, be amended by replacing line 25 on page 10 with the following:
“ing the guiding principles set out in the preamble, including the recognition of an anticipated 170,000 immediate job losses and 2,700,000 other jobs which will be disrupted;”

Motion No. 131

That Bill C-50, in Clause 16, be amended by replacing line 25 on page 10 with the following:

Government Orders

“ing the guiding principles set out in the preamble, including the recognition that 93% of the oil and gas sector is composed of small businesses each employing fewer than 100 individuals;”

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 16, be amended by replacing lines 28 to 31 on page 10 with the following:

“identified to be implemented;”

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 16, be amended by replacing lines 29 and 30 on page 10 with the following:

“relating to skills development and measures that support workers on an”

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 16, be amended by replacing line 35 on page 10 to line 6 on page 11 with the following:

“include a summary of available data related to economic growth and the labour market in a net-zero economy;”

[*English*]

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 16, be amended by replacing lines 1 to 6 on page 11 with the following:

“growth and the labour market in a net-zero economy;”

Mr. Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 16, be amended by replacing lines 2 to 4 on page 11 with the following:

“and that was used in the development of the Plan, along with a description of how”

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 16, be amended by deleting lines 7 to 11 on page 11.

[*English*]

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC) moved:

Motion No. 141

That Bill C-50, in Clause 16, be amended by replacing lines 8 to 11 on page 11 with the following:

“graph (c);”

Motion No. 142

That Bill C-50, in Clause 16, be amended by replacing line 9 on page 11 with the following:

“ing data in relation to Indigenous peoples or Black and other racialized individuals, describe”

[*Translation*]

Mr. Earl Dreeshen (Red Deer—Mountain View, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 16, be amended by deleting lines 12 to 16 on page 11.

[*English*]

Mr. Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 16, be amended by replacing lines 14 to 16 on page 11 with the following:

“skills development, training and retraining;”

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 16, be amended by deleting lines 17 to 20 on page 11.

*Government Orders**[English]***Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC)** moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 16, be amended by deleting lines 21 to 25 on page 11.

Mr. Earl Dreeshen (Red Deer—Mountain View, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 16, be amended by replacing line 23 on page 11 with the following:

“of the provinces and territories and Indigenous govern-”

*[Translation]***Mr. Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC)** moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 16, be amended by replacing lines 24 and 25 on page 11 with the following:

“ments in Canada in relation to the Plan;”

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 16, be amended by deleting lines 26 to 31 on page 11.

*[English]***Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC)** moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 16, be amended by replacing line 28 on page 11 with the following:

“territories, Indigenous peoples, trade unions, non-unionized workers, municipi-”

*[Translation]***Mr. Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC)** moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 16, be amended by replacing line 30 on page 11 with the following:

“tribute to the creation and retention of sustainable jobs and to sup-”

Mr. Earl Dreeshen (Red Deer—Mountain View, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 16, be amended by replacing lines 30 and 31 on page 11 with the following:

“tribute to the creation of sustainable jobs; and”

*[English]***Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC)** moved:

Motion No. 154

That Bill C-50 be amended by deleting Clause 17.

Motion No. 155

That Bill C-50, in Clause 17, be amended by replacing line 2 on page 12 with the following:

“tabled in each House of Parliament on any of the first 15”

Motion No. 159

That Bill C-50 be amended by deleting Clause 18.

Motion No. 160

That Bill C-50, in Clause 18, be amended by replacing lines 9 to 11 on page 12 with the following:

“federal ministers;”

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 18, be amended by replacing lines 10 and 11 on page 12 with the following:

“labour market analyses;”

● (1135)

*[Translation]***Mr. Earl Dreeshen (Red Deer—Mountain View, CPC)** moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 18, be amended by replacing line 11 on page 12 with the following:

“isting emissions reduction measures;”

*[English]***Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC)** moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 18, be amended by replacing line 11 on page 12 with the following:

“isting and planned emissions reduction measures, together with their implications for workers who are Indigenous peoples or Black and other racialized individuals;”

Mr. Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 18, be amended by deleting lines 12 to 15 on page 12.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 18, be amended by deleting lines 16 to 20 on page 12.

Mr. Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 18, be amended by replacing line 17 on page 12 with the following:

“ritories, Indigenous peoples and any other ex-”

*[Translation]***Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC)** moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 18, be amended by replacing line 18 on page 12 with the following:

“perts, partners and stakeholders, including those representing Black and other racialized individuals or from non-”

*[English]***Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC)** moved:

Motion No. 171

That Bill C-50 be amended by deleting Clause 19.

Motion No. 172

That Bill C-50, in Clause 19, be amended by replacing line 22 on page 12 with the following:

“later than June 1, 2034 and additional progress reports”

Hon. Jonathan Wilkinson (North Vancouver, Lib.) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 19, be amended by

(a) replacing line 22 on page 12 with the following:

“later than June 1, 2028 and additional progress reports”; and

(b) replacing line 25 on page 12 with the following:

“tabled in each House of Parliament on any of the first 15”

Mr. Mike Morrice (Kitchener Centre, GP) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 19, be amended by replacing line 22 on page 12 with the following:

“later than June 1, 2027 and additional progress reports”

*[Translation]***Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC)** moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 19, be amended by replacing lines 28 to 33 on page 12 with the following:

“(3) Each progress report must describe the progress made towards achieving the milestones under the most recent Sustainable Jobs Action Plan.”

*Government Orders**[English]***Mr. Earl Dreeshen (Red Deer—Mountain View, CPC)** moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 19, be amended by replacing lines 31 to 33 on page 12 with the following:

“cent Sustainable Jobs Action Plan.”

Mr. Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 19, be amended by replacing line 32 on page 12 with the following:

“of any additional measures that are being tak-”

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC) moved:

Motion No. 182

That Bill C-50 be amended by deleting Clause 20.

Motion No. 183

That Bill C-50, in Clause 20, be amended by replacing lines 10 to 16 on page 13 with the following:

“Jobs Action Plan, including by coordinating the implementation of measures set out in those plans across federal entities, including those focused — at the national and regional level — on matters such as”

*[Translation]***Mr. Earl Dreeshen (Red Deer—Mountain View, CPC)** moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 20, be amended by replacing line 11 on page 13 with the following:

“eral government in relation to”

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 20, be amended by replacing lines 13 and 14 on page 13 with the following:

“those measures across federal entities, working within their respective areas of jurisdiction and responsi-”

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC) moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 20, be amended by replacing lines 21 to 24 on page 13 with the following:

“(c) coordinating specific federal-provincial initiatives related to the Plans;”

● (1140)

*[English]***Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC)** moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 20, be amended by replacing lines 22 to 24 on page 13 with the following:

“al-territorial initiatives related to the Plans;”

Mr. Earl Dreeshen (Red Deer—Mountain View, CPC) moved:

Motion No. 189

That Bill C-50, in Clause 20, be amended by replacing lines 23 and 24 on page 13 with the following:

“ing with the governments of provinces and territories;”

Motion No. 190

That Bill C-50, in Clause 20, be amended by replacing lines 25 and 26 on page 13 with the following:

“(c.1) serving as a source of information in respect of federal programs, funding and”

*[Translation]***Mr. Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC)** moved:

Que le projet de loi C-50, à l'article 20, soit modifié par suppression des lignes 31 à 35, page 13.

*[English]***Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC)** moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 20, be amended by replacing line 26 on page 13 with the following:

“contact in respect of federal programs and”

*[Translation]***Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC)** moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 20, be amended by replacing line 27 on page 13 with the following:

“services for workers with respect to”

*[English]***Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC)** moved:

That Bill C-50 be amended by deleting Clause 21.

*[Translation]***Hon. Jonathan Wilkinson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.)** moved:

That Bill C-50, in Clause 21, be amended by

(a) replacing line 1 on page 14 with the following:

“21 (1) Within 10 years after the day on which this Act”;

(b) replacing line 3 on page 14 with the following:

“period of 10 years, the Minister must cause a review of”; and

(c) replacing line 6 on page 14 with the following:

“tabled in each House of Parliament on any of the first 15”

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC) moved:

Motion No. 200

That Bill C-50, in Clause 21, be amended by replacing line 3 on page 14 with the following:

“period of 10 years, the Minister must cause a review of”

Motion No. 204

That Bill C-50, in Clause 21, be amended by replacing line 6 on page 14 with the following:

“tabled in each House of Parliament on any of the first five”

[English]

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC): Madam Speaker, in December, while the NDP-Liberals’ self-proclaimed socialist environment minister hung out with 70,000 sanctimonious politicians and wealthy elites at a sprawling air-conditioned steel complex in a major petro-state, without a hint of shame or irony, I might add, who all flew from around the world on publicly funded, commercial and private airplanes and jets, even though virtual attendance was also an option, to scheme up ways to make life poorer, colder, dirtier, slower, darker, more inconvenient, more isolated, more uncomfortable and more expensive for everyone else, the NDP-Liberals colluded to ram through and cover up the pinnacle of their anti-energy, anti-private sector, anti-capitalist agenda here at home.

Government Orders

From away, the minister announced yet more damaging policy for Canadians, and even bragged that he was the first environment minister in the world out of touch and radical enough to do something to Canada that no other major resource or oil and gas-producing country is doing to itself, no other country in the world at all, to impose a cap clearly designed to function as a Canadian oil and gas production cap, which really means a cap on the biggest private sector investor in Canada's economy; a cap on affordable and reliable power and fuel; a cap on clean tech investment in Canada, which primarily comes from the energy sector; a cap on jobs, on businesses, on tax revenues for social programs and services for Canadians.

That is not leadership; it is putting one's own radical activist ideology ahead of the best interests of the people he serves, which are supposed to be Canadians. It is not at all worthy of celebration.

No other competing oil and gas producer, for which global demand is expected to increase significantly for the foreseeable future, is doing this to themselves. They know it is bad for their citizens and bad for their countries. Rather, it is entitled, out of touch, powermongering and not worth the cost to Canadians.

The NDP-Liberals do not seem to know or care that petro-state dictators, terrorists and despots who control and weaponize the energy supply against others, and Canada's best ally, customer and biggest oil and gas competitor, the U.S., are, at best, shaking their heads at our government's self-inflicted harm on Canadians. Those countries are all ramped up to provide for the world's energy needs, while Canada is home to an abundance of extraordinary resources, expertise and talent, which are, by the way, leaving in droves for friendlier jurisdictions.

The NDP-Liberals constantly roadblock, gatekeep, hamper, punish and kill, by delay, Canadian oil and gas development and exports. They reject every ally who desperately wants and needs Canada's LNG. Their red tape prevents any meaningful production of critical minerals and rare earth metals, since mines can take up to 25 years to get going in Canada. Because of that, everything is broken and nothing can get built under these NDP-Liberals.

When the PM said he wanted to phase out oil and gas, many thought it was a gaffe, but, it was a tell, and every action, after eight years, shows it.

On one hand, it was appropriate that the announcement was there, given that it is exactly global planning gatherings for global economic and foreign policy like what happens regularly at the annual COP meetings, and many other global policy focused groups, where this whole concept of the just transition started and where it advances still.

On the other hand, it was very disturbing, because it truly shows how totally out of touch the NDP-Liberals really are with the realities of everyday life for the majority of Canadians and how far away the NDP-Liberals are from their long-ago empty claims that they valued inclusion, diversity, transparency and, most starkly, democracy.

The spectacle of the NDP-Liberal collusion and cover-up in the natural resources committee, to impose the globally-planned just transition on Canada and reject nearly all amendments proposed by

Conservatives in the early hours of the morning and to silence and sideline every Canadian who will be impacted by the costly coalition's anti-energy, anti-private sector agenda embodied in Bill C-50 immediately and in the long run, was almost shocking to witness, if it was not such a predictable pattern after eight years.

If there was any doubt left, it is more obvious than ever that the NDP-Liberals are focused solely on power, not principle; on power, not purpose; on their own partisan, political and parliamentary power and on currying favour with their fellow global policy elites, not on the Canadian people, not on the power of the Canadian people, not on the power to the Canadian people.

Bill C-50 is the NDP-Liberals' behind-closed-doors, top-down central plan for wide-scale, radical economic restructuring for Canada. It does not even achieve their own stated purpose for their power grab to ram it through, but what else is new with those guys?

● (1145)

The truth is that there is not a single tangible skills or jobs training program proposed or even outlined in the bill that the costly coalition says it has worked on, behind closed doors, for nearly two years.

What Bill C-50, which is the global just transition no matter what the NDP-Liberals call it, which is anything but just in every possible way, would do is create a government committee behind closed doors that would create another government committee behind closed doors that would give instructions to governments to centrally plan Canada's economy on a cycle, every five years; soviet-style planning, every five years.

The words are in the title, but Bill C-50 does not actually mandate any transparency or accountability about the committees, the cost, the membership, their plans, except for the government to table reports, but it is granted extraordinary power to direct governments to radically overhaul Canada's economy and redistribute wealth.

Government Orders

The NDP-Liberals also know that their agenda in Bill C-50 would kill over 200,000 jobs in energy and threaten 292,000 Canadian jobs in agriculture, 193,000 Canadian jobs in manufacturing, 642,000 Canadian jobs in transportation and 1.4 million Canadian jobs in building and construction. Those last two are 10% of Canada's employment alone. That is what the government's own internal memo about Bill C-50, the just transition, means when it cautions about "significant labour market disruptions" and "larger-scale transformations" to jobs and the economy. It is sneaky bureaucratise and "parliamentese" that is common in government, but its meaning is clear and it should make every Canadian uneasy.

The NDP-Liberals even know it will lead to lower paid, more precarious work for indigenous and visible minority Canadians, because it is in a memo. They should already know that since indigenous and visible minority Canadians work in the energy sector at double the rate of other sectors. However, the NDP-Liberals do not care.

They will stick with their cruel carbon tax, their energy export ban, Bill C-48, and their half a decade old unconstitutional Bill C-69 and fight for their crazy plastics as toxins decree, even though provinces, indigenous communities and entrepreneurs challenge the NDP-Liberals on all of those harmful anti-energy agendas and policies through federal court and to the Supreme Court.

The NDP-Liberals that know that some Canadians will be hurt more than others. People in Newfoundland and Labrador, in Saskatchewan and in Alberta will be "disproportionately affected", but the NDP-Liberals do not care.

Bill C-50 would build central planning ideological bureaucracy, not Canadian skills training programs; bureaucracy, not Canadian jobs; bureaucracy, not Canadian businesses; bureaucracy, not Canadian clean tech.

Canadians might be wondering what the heck is going on here. The truth is that the NDP-Liberals cooked up up Bill C-50 behind closed doors for about two years, introduced it last summer, with a last-minute spin job name change, and no debate. Before the committee even reported on what, in hindsight, was clearly a collusion charade to appear to help create the legislation in the first place, they brought it back in the fall; shut it down with less than a normal business day of debate for all MPs of all parties; spent a month obsessed with blocking Conservative MPs at committee; and censored any MP and any Canadian with a different view or even with any reasonable questions about their plan, which they imposed through a top-down edict from the House of Commons. By the way, that was used only twice in urgent scenarios in nine years under the previous Conservative government, but has been used at least 10 times by the costly coalition.

Let us talk about the kinds of amendments that were rejected, amendments that were proposed by the Conservatives.

We proposed measures to: ensure access to affordable and reliable energy; ensure a strong export-oriented energy sector; avoid regulatory duplication and necessary delays; outline how the federal government would help ensure the affordability and reliability of energy; improve affordability and to facilitate and promote economic growth, private sector investment, the creation of sustainable

jobs; ensure that major and clean energy projects under the federal regulatory framework could be delivered on time and on budget; the importance of collaborating with all levels of government, including provincial, territorial and municipal governments, and all relevant partners and stakeholders; the inclusion of representatives of provincial, territorial and indigenous governance bodies; measures to recognize local and regional needs, including indigenous communities; ways to create economic opportunities for indigenous communities; ways to promote economic growth, including the economic growth indigenous communities; mandate meaningful consultation and to account for the cultural values, aspirations, strengths; and to include at least two members who represent indigenous organizations, at least one of which has a substantial interest in Canada's natural resources sector.

● (1150)

The Liberals even rejected an amendment where Conservatives called on achieving a fair and equitable plan. The Conservatives will be—

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 government House leader.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, that is a whole lot to digest.

An hon. member: Listen.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: That is the problem, I was listening.

Madam Speaker, the amount of information coming from the member was somewhat misleading. One would think that we have shut down the oil industry completely. By mid-July, we will have had more oil going from Alberta to the west coast than Harper did in 10 years.

In fact, with respect to the TMX, I would like to quote her idol of all premiers, Danielle Smith. Danielle Smith said that the Prime Minister "made the right decision to purchase the project six years ago." If memory serves me correctly, that very member was soundly critical of the Prime Minister's decision back then. I wonder if she would agree to flip-flop on that position in support of her idol, the Premier of Alberta.

Government Orders

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Madam Speaker, on what planet have I ever advocated and would ever support the concept of requiring taxpayer subsidies and governments to nationalize and socialize the energy sector in Canada? The Conservatives, under former prime minister Stephen Harper, eliminated the vast majority of direct subsidies to oil and gas companies, yet the Liberals, who I have been happy to defend for the last nine years, have taken care of the rest that was left.

It is true that they have given a historic subsidy to an energy pipeline that never required a single taxpayer cent. All it required was a government to assert provincial and legal jurisdiction to ensure the private sector proponent could build its approved project and create jobs to the benefit of all Canadians.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I want to remind members that unless they are being recognized to speak, they should not be yelling across the way. All members should not be having conversations across the way, no matter who they are.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Timmins—James Bay.

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Madam Speaker, that was a master class in disinformation, but it was a dismal example of what we have seen from that member in misrepresentations.

I was fascinated that the last time she did one of her spiels, she claimed that Bill C-50, which came to us from working with labour unions and energy workers, was a “woke globalist agenda.” Now, “globalist” has become very much identified as one of the key hate terms of conspiracy theories, and one of the people promoting hate conspiracy is Alex Jones, who of course is supporting the present leader.

I would like to give her the opportunity to explain why her party is so tied into using the hate language of Alex Jones, Tucker Carlson and the extreme right on language like “globalist.”

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Madam Speaker, it just happens to be the case that I have an academic background in political philosophy and globalism is a legitimate and actual theory of policy development. The just transition has been developed over time at global gatherings of countries that are imposing global policies or are aiming to impose global policies on countries around the world.

The Conservatives want to bring home energy jobs, energy businesses, energy technology and energy brainpower to the benefit of all communities in our country. We want to green-light green projects. We also know that part of the way it must be done, because the vast majority of clean tech investment in the private sector comes from the energy sector in Canada right now, is to accelerate and expand the development and the exports of Canadian oil and gas, technologies, clean tech and expertise around the world to help lower global emissions and get our country back on track so Canadians can once again afford fuel, home heating and housing.

• (1155)

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, the hon. member for Lakeland is my friend. Among the things she has said that need correction is that it was possible to participate in COP28 virtually. It was not. That is why the Govern-

ment of Alberta sent so many people and so did the Government of Saskatchewan. The size of the Canadian delegation ballooned with members of the delegations of those provinces, that did not contribute to the negotiations at all but held side events for publicity against action on climate.

I wonder if she wants to correct the record while she has the chance.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Madam Speaker, I know that it was possible to participate in COP21 virtually, because our shadow minister for the environment did. He participated virtually.

I just want to acknowledge and credit the Bloc Québécois and the Green Party members here. Conservatives are the only pro-energy party and, therefore, the only pro-Canada party in the House of Commons. Of all of the anti-energy parties, the Bloc and the Greens are at least honest about Bill C-50 and what it is.

I want to say to the member, whom I also consider a friend, that she should be asking the Liberals why they rejected amendments from the Bloc which actually did talk about ensuring sustainability and reliable jobs and actually taking the needs of workers into account. Those amendments would actually have done what the Liberals claimed this was to be all about: jobs, skills training and an upskilling program. Of course, it is not that at all, and I would note that the Liberals rejected all of those amendments too.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is an honour to rise in the House to speak to Bill C-50, which can be summed up in one short sentence: It is an act to promote Liberal friends to fancy boards and to destroy the economy of western Canada. There is an obsession by this radical socialist environment minister to push his not-so-hidden agenda on Canadians, to wipe oil and gas production off the face of the earth and ensure that we all live in energy poverty.

If members do not believe me, they can listen to his own comments. He said that fossil fuels must be phased out by 2050, and even earlier if possible.

Let us contrast that statement with some comments from Japan’s ambassador to Canada about the role we could be playing in the world’s future energy mix, in particular when it comes to LNG: “The world is waiting for Canada...Canada can and should play a very important role to support the energy situation not only in Japan and South Korea, but the world.”

Government Orders

When it comes to Canada, we are the closest market to Japan and South Korea that could be providers of clean, sustainable and affordable LNG. Canada has a natural advantage in producing LNG, because of the naturally colder climate that we have for more than half of the year. Japan and South Korea are trying to find ways to avoid being energy-dependent on nefarious players like the Communist regime in Beijing. As the Japanese ambassador said, we have an important role to play, but the world is still waiting.

Look around the rest of the world, and we can see what other options there are available to us for selling our LNG. Last year, we saw Germany, Italy and France sign long-term LNG supply agreements with Qatar, but only after they came to Canada asking us to be their provider of choice. They came to us because they did not want to go to a country with a deplorable human rights record, like Qatar. They did not want to go to a country that is housing the leaders of Hamas, but, because of the minister's blind and radical loathing of our world-class energy sector, he said no. The Liberals left those countries with no choice but to basically support the enemies of one of our most important allies, Israel, and in February it was announced that India and Bangladesh are signing agreements, and so has a Chinese company as well.

It is a shame, because if we look at the way the world is right now, there is both a moral case and a business case for producing and exporting Canadian energy, in particular our LNG, but the Liberal government does not get it. We have a radical environment minister and his incompetent Prime Minister, who apparently would rather see energy deals go to a country that houses the head of Hamas than to Canada, with our high standards for things like human rights, high regulatory standards and an abundance of supply.

How does that make any sense?

When the government stands against Canadian energy, we are not doing the world any favours. At the same time, it also hurts a lot of people in our own country, who benefit from having a successful energy industry here at home. There are so many communities that rely on the oil and gas industry for their survival. It is the industry that keeps the lights on at the hockey rink, at the community centre and at the seniors centre, and that pays the royalties and taxes that are needed to invest in things like hospitals, schools, libraries and emergency services.

Here in Ottawa, if we walk down the street across from Parliament, there is a good example of two different billboards, one after the other, that highlight the social benefits of the oil and gas sector. The first billboard says that Canada needs a fully funded Canada disability benefit. The second billboard is a message from Canada Action, and it says, "As Long As The World Needs Oil & Natural Gas Shouldn't It Be Canadian?"

Why are those two billboards related? It is because the royalties and the tax dollars that are raised when the energy sector is going strong fill the government coffers with the necessary money to invest in those types of social programs. They cannot exist or succeed in the first place without generating a significant amount of revenue from our energy sector.

As much as the NDP-Liberals keep trying, we cannot get away with spending money that we do not have. Sooner or later, it runs out, and bad things start to happen, like some of what we are seeing now with inflation. As we know, the Prime Minister does not have the type of common sense or self-control as the Conservative leader, the member for Carleton, to be able to implement a one-for-one policy, whereby for every new dollar of spending the government has to find a dollar of savings.

As such, when the government sets out to destroy the very industry that massively funds government programs and the equalization payments that prop up Quebec, everyone loses. That includes indigenous communities as well.

Natural Law Energy is a company made up of a group of first nations in Saskatchewan and Alberta. They wanted to invest in the Keystone XL pipeline expansion so they could increase their cash flow, which would support their people. It would have been a great opportunity for economic reconciliation. Do members remember when the Prime Minister claimed that no relationship was more important to him than the one with first nations? Apparently, he said that for his own political gain, because once he had a chance to put his words into action, he was nowhere to be found, other than to say that, no, they do not get to participate in the economy or have any economic self-determination and reconciliation.

● (1200)

Then there are the thousands of jobs and economic spinoffs that come from having a robust oil and gas sector in an area. There was a local news headline in my riding recently that read "April Oil and Gas Public Offering Shows Kindersley Area Generated \$234,074.68 in Revenue". That is just from one public offering. It does not include all the wages of workers in the area or the money they are spending in their community.

This past winter was like every other winter across the Prairies, and we had some strong cold snaps. More urgently, there was a period of time when Alberta was sending warnings to its people to reduce their power consumption to avoid rolling blackouts during peak times when the temperature was in the -40°C range.

Government Orders

How could this happen to a province like Alberta? It had an NDP government that drank the same Kool-Aid as the radical environment minister and decided to close down the reliable, affordable baseload power and replace it with expensive, intermittent wind and solar power. The irony is that it was not due to a lack of wind. There is enough wind most days to produce power. The issue was that it was so cold that it was not safe for the turbines to operate. I have actually worked in the wind industry, and I know that actually happens, because it happened all the time on the wind farm I worked at. Quite often, in the winter, it was also overcast, and the days are short, so there was next to no solar capacity that was actually available. The previous NDP government in Alberta literally almost killed people because of its radical ideology.

Thank God that Saskatchewan had the ability and the capacity to fire up Boundary Dam Unit 4 to be able to help provide power to our neighbours. Thank God that our province has invested in natural gas power stations like the Chinook Power Station in Swift Current, which can provide the equivalent baseload power to hundreds of thousands of homes. If the Liberals' radical agenda is allowed to proceed, this is only going to be the beginning, and this is just a snapshot of what we can expect. The Liberals have this idea that any new natural gas has to be phased out by 2035 too, if not sooner.

I met with some of the turbine suppliers, and they were willing to tell me some of the timelines to get the parts needed to build a plant now. In some cases it might take up to 10 years to get all the parts they need to build a power plant. It is the same story about trying to procure solar panels and wind turbine equipment, because there is minimal manufacturing in North America for that equipment and that industry as well. However, in order to comply with the regulations that the government is rolling out, they have to be in operation before 2035. Simply ordering the power plant prior to the deadline is not good enough. Canadians are at serious risk of being plunged into widespread energy poverty, but the Liberals know that. The regulations that are published in the Canada Gazette told us that the people most at risk or most likely to already live in energy poverty are single mothers and seniors living on a fixed income, and those regulations would disproportionately impact those people.

The Liberals also know the devastating unemployment that their transition is set to cause. The natural resources minister received a memo discussing exactly that. The Liberals' own government document says that their so-called just transition will affect over 200,000 workers in the energy sector. That is listed as 1% of our employment rate and, with how unemployment numbers are already rising, we really cannot afford for that to keep going up.

The memo also happens to mention 292,000 workers in agriculture and 193,000 workers in manufacturing. Does anyone really believe that the Liberals are going to replace hundreds of thousands of jobs on the line?

Combine all this with the carbon tax, the Liberal fuel regulations, the emissions cap regulations and other burdensome regulations like the unconstitutional Impact Assessment Act, and it is quite easy to see the place where the Liberals are trying to take us. Their plan punishes Canadians, and it will bring misery and devastation upon them.

Thank God that there is an election on the horizon, in which Canadians can give this radical socialist environment minister the boot and get Canada back on track with a Conservative government that would axe the tax and fix the budget so that Canadians can get back to living in prosperity instead of poverty. Canada can become an energy-independent country that no longer relies on imported oil from dictators. We can use our own resources to produce what our country needs and what the world needs: clean, affordable, ethical and sustainable Canadian energy. Only a Conservative government would get it done.

● (1205)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to listen to Conservatives speak to this legislation. Obviously, they are four-square against the legislation. They are in election mode. They hate this legislation.

Canadians need to have an understanding of what is actually in the legislation itself that the member is so adamantly opposed to, such as the sustainable jobs partnership council. What is wrong with a council working with Canadians in communities, looking at sustainable jobs into the future and providing a strategic annual report and a report that comes out on a five-year plan? What is wrong with that?

The Conservative Party believes, at the end of the day, that anything that includes the word “sustainable” or “environment” is bad for Canadians. I have news for the Conservative Party: These are good things. Working with Canadians is a good thing. Why is the member opposed to that aspect of the legislation?

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Mr. Speaker, there are so many things wrong with this bill. The member referenced part of it. As I said in my opening, this is an act to promote Liberal friends to fancy boards. That is all that is going to happen. There is going to be a board of Liberal elites who are going to write reports to talk down to and explain to the provinces and the people in the community I represent how they should live their lives and that what they are doing is wrong.

We have seen the job numbers from the internal government briefing department that said there are hundreds of thousands of jobs that are going to be destroyed. Where are they going to be destroyed? They will be destroyed in southwest Saskatchewan, in Lakeland, in Battle River—Crowfoot, in Medicine Hat—Cardston—Warner, in Grande Prairie, in Fort McMurray and all over western Canada. It is going to have a ripple effect across the entire country. The Liberals have failed to recognize it, but Canadians know it.

[Translation]

Mr. Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am a little shocked to see the use of yet another gag order in the House. The truth is, this principle does not respect the spirit of the Constitution.

Here is another thing that does not respect the spirit of the Constitution: infringing on provincial jurisdictions. Employment falls under provincial jurisdiction. Has my colleague done anything to ensure that this will be respected? Do any of the amendments tabled by the Conservatives seek to defend provincial jurisdictions?

This is a new card that the Conservatives are playing. We have been hearing about it since yesterday. I am curious to hear more about it today.

[English]

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for his great question because he is exactly right. The development of natural resources is the sole purview of the provinces. We have a government, propped up by the NDP, that wants to infringe upon provincial jurisdiction yet again. It likes to do it all the time and then it likes to blame the provinces when it does not go the way it thought it was going to go.

I absolutely agree with my Bloc colleague on time allocation. When it came to tabling this bill, there was one day of debate, and the second day started with time allocation on the bill to make sure there was limited debate. This is a pretty substantive piece in the Liberal government's cog of shutting down the western economy and it wants to limit debate as much as possible. When it came time to have witnesses at committee, we also had a very limited amount of time to get witnesses from our communities to come to speak. If we want to hear from the provinces on this, we need to make sure people from the provinces can come to committee and speak.

• (1210)

Ms. Laurel Collins (Victoria, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I hear that the member and his party are opposed to the legislation, but there is a climate emergency happening. There is a climate crisis and it is impacting Canadians across the country. We need to invest in sustainable jobs.

Putting the legislation aside, I am wondering if he can at least agree to those principles.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Mr. Speaker, one of the big crises right now, along with the energy crisis, is the food crisis. We have people lining up at food banks by the millions just trying to get a meal. That is the crisis our country is facing right now that needs to be addressed immediately.

Let us also look at some of the data that exists. We know that the energy sector at large has reduced emissions intensity by over 30%, while increasing production. The province of Saskatchewan has reduced methane emissions by 60% without a government mandate, because industry has figured out a way to do it on its own and it knows it was the right thing to do.

Government Orders

OFFICIAL REPORT

Mr. Chris Warkentin (Grande Prairie—Mackenzie, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I ask for unanimous consent to move the following motion:

That, on Divisions Nos. 683 and 684, the votes of the members for York—Simcoe and Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies in favour of the motion be struck from the record.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed to the hon. member's moving the motion will please say nay. I hear none.

[Translation]

The House has heard the terms of the motion. All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

[English]

CANADIAN SUSTAINABLE JOBS ACT

The House resumed consideration of 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, as reported (with amendments) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

Mr. Earl Dreeshen (Red Deer—Mountain View, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the father of 20th-century modern management, Peter F. Drucker, once said, "There is...nothing quite so useless as doing with great efficiency what should not be done at all." That quote depicts the foundation of the just transition act that we have before us today.

There is nothing just about forcing a transition on an industry or on a community that has made its life journey to produce the cleanest energy products the world has ever seen, especially knowing that through global turmoil, food insecurity and increased energy demands, the world's hydrocarbons will continue to be needed as a solution to humanity's woes and not, as ideologists would have us believe, as the cause of those woes.

To ensure that, should the world decide that its energy demands will be satisfied by strong environmental hydrocarbon-producing countries, we as Canadians will continue to be there to answer the call, but we will not be there if Canada's major economic driver is brought to its knees by the twisted ideology of the government and its anti-energy partners.

The Conservative leader has said that we will unleash the growth within our economy, that with our most powerful resources, produced in the most environmentally positive way, there will be benefits to our people and to the environment at the same time. We will not follow the Prime Minister, with the help of his NDP masters, to push production out of Canada and, thus, toward other countries that pollute more, burn more coal and put more greenhouse gases in the atmosphere with no remorse.

The Prime Minister would sooner drive production away from Canadians, who already have the cleanest electricity grid on planet Earth, toward other nations that, frankly, are incapable of change or just do not care.

Government Orders

By using the wealth generated by our essential hydrocarbon resources, we can protect the environment and prevent the loss of billions of dollars of stranded assets owned by provinces and first nations, and use our innovative skills to move the global needle of greenhouse gases to a level that would satisfy all but the most radical eco-activists.

At the natural resources committee, we have had much debate on the future of Canada's hydrocarbon industries. I find it unbelievable that the natural resources minister, along with his cohorts in cabinet, would actively pursue a framework to handcuff one of Canada's greatest assets. Of course, all of this discussion has been created because of the planned attack on resource development in Canada. Had Bill C-69, the anti-resource development law, never happened and if tens of billions of investment plans not been shelved, then the government would not have had to produce legislation to prop up the ghost towns that it is actively creating.

The Liberal just transition action plan is a dangerous government-mandated plan to kill off 170,000 Canadian jobs and to put at risk the livelihoods of 2.7 million Canadian workers. This is a plan that creates subsidized jobs, not sustainable jobs. Conservatives do not believe in a central-planning "Ottawa knows best" approach that tells private sector energy companies how to run their operations. The government cannot even track emissions properly.

As a member of the natural resources committee, I have asked multiple times for an analysis of the full life-cycle impact of all the projects we have, from the first shovel in the ground to the last shovel used to cover up those projects. The government has no clue, yet we are to trust it to dictate to industries how to best run their operations. I think not.

• (1215)

Oil and gas are still Canada's largest export sector, and it is so important in the development of renewable and alternative fuels of the future to have it strong and to keep it strong.

The Liberals and their NDP cohorts are ignoring cost, technology and infrastructure demands. Reports vary on how the federal government has underfunded its climate plans. RBC had a report that stated that the government needed to spend \$2 trillion to make it to net zero. It published a supplementary report saying Canada could capitalize on the global increase for oil and gas and still meet its net-zero targets with investments from the profits, but the government turned its back on our allies while peddling technology and alternative fuel sources that cannot be produced at a commercial rate.

A Conservative government would unleash the energy sector while fostering technology and innovation to protect our environment, so that more Canadian energy would get to the world to displace dictator energy and create jobs and powerful paycheques for Canadians.

Let us be clear. There is nothing just about this transition and tax plan the Liberals have. Chief Dale Swampy said, "There is nothing fair or equitable about what is happening today."

After eight years of anti-energy messages, delays, arbitrary and inconsistent regulatory conditions, an outright veto of an approved

export pipeline and the imposition of project-killing Bill C-69, despite universal provincial opposition, the Liberals have made no secret their intention to accelerate the phase-out of the oil and gas sector in Canada.

It is sad. First nations communities are begging the government to get out of the way and let them produce the resources on their land so that their communities can thrive. Our global allies are begging for our help to get off Putin's oil, so they can have a stable and ethical energy source. All the while, the government believes that if it cannot be produced, it cannot be shipped and, therefore, its ideological push will win.

The reality is that everyone loses, but the government is too self-absorbed to see that. Canada should be the world's go-to energy producer and supplier of choice, and be energy secure and self-sufficient as well. Instead, the Liberals put ideology and partisanship above reality and the economy.

Politicians should be honest about the outcomes of their policies. Too often with these Liberals we see them fall back on word-smithing and absolve themselves of any negative socio-economic consequences of the so-called just transition concept for Canada. This needs to stop.

Many times we hear about how the world is changing and how important it is for us to keep up with our European partners. Perhaps the government should be paying attention to what is happening in Europe. The mood has changed. Governments in Europe are starting to recognize the consequences of this blind action. They are listening to their people.

That is the problem: We do not have a government that is prepared to vary, in any way, from the path that it has set forward. It is not listening to the people. Here, it is understandable that they do not listen to opposition parties, but it had best be listening to the people in their ridings. The mood has changed, and it is important that all parliamentarians recognize that. If we do not, we will be left behind by a world that is looking for Canadian energy.

Government Orders

• (1220)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not quite understand why the Conservative Party is taking such an objection to having more workers and communities at the table. This legislation would create opportunities for connections and for providing annual advice to the ministers, ultimately leading to five-year plans.

I actually believe the Conservatives used AI in order to generate 20,000-plus amendments.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: That is false.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, the member opposite says that is false.

Maybe the member could tell me if the Conservative Party actually used AI to develop the 20,000-plus amendments that it introduced at the committee stage. Could we get a simple yes or no? Did Conservatives actually use AI?

Mr. Earl Dreeshen: Mr. Speaker, I have just gone through all of the amendments, and I agree with every one, especially the ones I put my name to that talk about making sure that we pay attention to indigenous groups and to our communities. Every one of those that I have put my name to has been researched and dealt with. That is the first part.

The second part is about our five-year plans and new deals. We are all banned from Russia right now, but I was there back in the eighties playing hockey. When I did that, and when we were there, we happened to be there during the two weeks the Soviet party in congress was coming together to talk about what the next five years were going to be. Do members think they were listening to their people or to themselves?

[Translation]

Ms. Christine Normandin (Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his speech and, especially, for the tone of his speech.

We may not agree on the content, but I appreciated the thoughtful way he presented his arguments, which is in stark contrast to what happened at the Standing Committee on Natural Resources in December, when the heckling actually prevented informed voting by some members and was a health hazard for the interpreters.

Does he agree with me that this was undeniably the wrong approach to take in committee? On behalf of his colleagues, does he regret that this happened? Should his colleagues have instead followed his example and presented their arguments thoughtfully and calmly, like he did today?

[English]

Mr. Earl Dreeshen: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for the compliment. I appreciate it.

There are times when people are provoked, and I think this is the part that one should be aware of. Not everybody hears all of the things that are said, and that can be a reason behind tempers getting hot. I prefer to make sure that we keep the temperature cooler, but I also think it is important that we speak to the strengths we have as a nation.

I have always stood up for Quebeckers, for their energy sources and for that type of thing. I get frustrated when people say, "That is fine, but we are just going to shut someone down". That is a bit of a problem I have; nevertheless, I think we have all of these strengths in every province. That is what we should be concentrating on.

• (1225)

Ms. Laurel Collins (Victoria, NDP): Mr. Speaker, in response to my question to the member's colleague, the colleague really said that we need to let industry regulate itself. When it comes to oil and gas CEOs, they are raking in record profits. The CEO of Suncor, Rich Kruger, said that he is no longer going to focus on emissions reduction and that he is just going to focus on profits. Suncor is already making record profits, and these companies are gouging Canadians at the pump while Canadians are struggling with the cost of living.

I am curious whether the member agrees with his colleagues that we need to let big polluters pollute for free and not be regulated, or whether he would stand up to say that these rich CEOs need to stop gouging Canadians and bring down their emissions.

Mr. Earl Dreeshen: Mr. Speaker, Suncor is an energy company. Many of the items it is dealing with, and what it is doing, are renewable energy projects, so there is a mix. There is money being made throughout it. Perhaps there is money being made in the investments they have in solar and wind, but some of that is perhaps coming from government and the policies we have. I think that is important, but it is also important that we recognize what that does for our communities and what it does to make sure we have a health care system and a solid structure throughout our communities.

Mr. Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is a privilege today to rise to speak to Bill C-50. I have spoken to it before. As well, I sit on the natural resources committee, and this is a bill that we studied. We heard a lot of testimony from different folks with all aspects of concern for and support of the bill. I plan to use my time this afternoon to make my case as to why this legislation is bad for Canadians and show the correlation between this bill and the carbon tax.

I will address the legislation directly, but I will take a bit of a roundabout way to get there, so I ask for the Chair's indulgence to do that.

Only the Liberal government would have the audacity to put forward this piece of legislation and call it a "sustainable jobs" plan. Bill C-50 is simply a rebranding of the Liberals' so-called "just transition", a plan that would shut down Canada's energy sector and move to what they claim will be a more green, sustainable and just economy.

Government Orders

The Liberals could not sell it under that name. Nobody was buying it. Now, just like a shifty used car salesman, they have slipped on a new coat of paint and jacked up the price. It seems that the Liberals' new approach to legislation is to title their bills to say the exact opposite of what they are actually going to do because, to date, the government has failed spectacularly at meeting one single environmental target.

The Liberals love to talk about the environment, but their first act in office was to authorize the City of Montreal to dump eight billion litres of raw sewage into the St. Lawrence River. I think most Canadians would call that making pollution free again. Their promise to plant two billion trees never materialized. The said it would be two billion tree over 10 years. They have now had eight years. The time is nearly up, yet how many have they managed to plant? What percentage of those trees are in the ground after eight years? It is 0.05 of 1%, which is not even 1%.

They keep talking about net zero, and it is all over this bill, but the government has yet to meet a single emissions reduction target. It keeps upping what it says it will achieve, when it has not met a single target of it should have achieved.

Again, the government talks a big game, but it does not execute. Across the board, whether it is the economy, immigration, getting a passport or something as simple as sticking a sapling in the ground, it just cannot get the job done.

If we are going to talk about the environment failures, we need look no further than the carbon tax. The Liberal, NDP, and now the Bloc, carbon tax continues to drive inflation and drive up the cost of living for struggling Canadians because the carbon tax is a tax on everything.

The only thing, it seems, that remains unaffected by the Prime Minister's beloved carbon tax is the environment. That the carbon tax has made little to no difference to the environment should not surprise us. The whole thing is a scam. It is another smoke-and-mirrors sales job, just like its "just transition" to cover up the government's actual goal, which is its real agenda, the one thing that it has so far been successful at achieving, which is the redistribution of wealth.

That is what the carbon tax is all about. It is what a significant portion of its COVID policies were all about, and that is what this legislation is about. It is a classical Marxist redistribution of wealth.

Members can remember that day a while back when the Minister of the Environment got up in the House to proudly proclaim that he was a socialist, and all the Liberals around him applauded.

It was shocking, not just because of the dark and bloody history associated with such regimes, but also because a Liberal minister actually got up and told the truth about what they were doing. That is what this legislation is about. It is about the government picking winners and losers based on a warped ideology and redistributing wealth and opportunity to those it deems worthy. As retired General Rick Hillier put it just this week, "Ideology masking as leadership killed the Canadian dream."

Before they start to claim that this is some far right MAGA conspiracy, I would point my colleagues to an excellent article written

by Dr. Vijay Kolinjivadi. He is a post-doctoral fellow at the Institute of Development Policy at the University of Antwerp, an expert in the social and economic ramifications of climate change. Dr. Kolinjivadi is a firm believer that climate change is an existential threat. He says that we western governments are "'greening' ourselves to extinction".

● (1230)

What Dr. Kolinjivadi means by that, and he makes a very convincing case for it, is that the so-called green policies of this and other western governments, or what he calls "fake" solutions, not only do nothing to stop climate change but are in fact a smoke-and-mirrors job to help governments and wealthy investors get even richer off the backs of the middle class and the poorest, most vulnerable, people on our planet. That is what he meant when he said that we are "'greening' ourselves to extinction."

He is not alone. There is a growing recognition across the political spectrum that what these governments are doing, what our government is doing with these policies, is about wealth redistribution and not the environment. How do they do it? They do it by destroying the middle class. How did they do that? Members can look no further than the effect its COVID and environmental policies have had on our economy in just the last three years.

Can Canadians, particularly those would be the most affected by this legislation, Bill C-50, trust the Liberal government to transition them in a just and sustainable way? I think not, but I like to judge a person by what they do and not what they say. That brings me back to the carbon tax.

Let us look at the three main government talking points about the carbon tax. The first is that the carbon tax is putting a price on pollution. This is false. Eight billion litres of raw sewage went into the St. Lawrence River, and there was no price on pollution there. The carbon tax has made no demonstrable change to emissions, and no targets have been met, nor will they be, at least not from the carbon tax.

Government Orders

Those on the political left say that the tax is too low to force people to modify their behaviour. They complain that it leaves exemptions for large emitters, which it does. Those on the right are equally correct that taxing carbon in Canada is virtue signalling at best as Canada accounts for a mere 1.5% of global greenhouse gas emissions. That means that, if we were to shut down every single carbon-producing thing here in Canada, shut our whole economy down, we would make a whopping difference of 1.5% globally. In questioning the sanity of ignoring actual pollution while taxing a life-enhancing element of the very air we breathe, now, with Bill C-50, Liberals want to spend billions more of taxpayers' dollars to shut down not only the largest private sector driver of our economy but also the largest private sector driver of green and renewable technology as well.

The second talking point is that eight out of 10 Canadian families will receive more money back in rebates than they paid into it. That is false. Rex Murphy pointed out, in his excellent piece in the *National Post*:

Name a tax that makes the taxpayer richer. What a strange incentive that would be. Half of Canada would be upping the thermostat, putting the air conditioner on in winter, and driving day and night to burn up oil and gas so that they could get more back than they put in.

As the PBO has made clear, one is not getting more money back, and hardly anyone is. In fact, by the time the tax is fully implemented in 2030, eight out of 10 households will pay exponentially more, which is a fact even our proud socialist environment minister has admitted to. No tax makes the taxpayer richer. It only makes the government richer, which leads to the third claim.

The third talking point the Liberals have about the carbon tax is that it is revenue-neutral. This is false. Even if we were to believe the principle that the taxes collected all go toward rebates, which makes no sense, the Liberals are charging GST on top of the carbon tax, and that goes directly into the government's coffers. We have learned recently that it is holding back billions of dollars collected by the GST on the carbon tax.

All three talking points are demonstrably false. By the way, the Liberals love to repeat their talking points, but one we have not heard in a while is that they are supporting the middle class and those working hard to join it. I guess that has changed.

However, what is true is that this tax, like so many others, is costing Canadians more money at a time when most cannot afford it, and despite its obvious failures, the Liberals continue to double down on this failed policy. Why is that? It is because it is successful in one metric, and one metric only, which is the redistribution of wealth.

It is to the destruction of the middle class to make more money for billionaires and Liberal insiders and to force more everyday Canadians into total reliance on government. This bill, Bill C-50, would do the exact same thing. It is just the next step in the plan. The Liberals' so-called sustainable jobs plan would actually kill 170,000 Canadian middle-class jobs, displace 450,000 middle-class workers and risk the livelihoods of 2.7 million Canadians.

In short, the Liberal government's just transition is anything but just, and its sustainable jobs plan is anything but sustainable. When those jobs have gone, as they were during COVID, when everyone

but the giant billionaire chains were shut down, where else will people turn to but the government?

• (1235)

Mr. Ken Hardie (Fleetwood—Port Kells, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, really, the most difficult output of fossil fuels is when they are burned for fuel. However, other things could be done with the things that we dig up out of the ground.

Could the hon. member talk about the innovation in the petrochemical industry? Has he heard from the industry about the sort of things that could be done that would certainly make for a very bright future for the petrochemical industry when we, at least, rely a lot less on burning it for energy?

Mr. Ted Falk: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what else we would do with fossil fuel energy other than burn it. I suppose plastics and rubber could be made out of it. That would be certainly useful and seems to be working. However, there is a ban on plastics.

I have said before, here and at committee, that when I go to McDonald's or Burger King, and try to slurp up their super thick strawberry milkshakes, their paper straws collapse. That frustrates me to no end, it is true.

The member raised a good point as it allows me to, again, indicate that Canada's oil and gas industry is the biggest contributor, the biggest researcher and developer of renewable energy. That has been proven. The industry has shown that. The industry is looking to green things up as much as it can as well and to be environmentally responsible.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Desilets (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, BQ): Mr. Speaker, there is one thing my colleague did not really focus on and did not say much about. That is, of course, economic growth in a so-called net-zero economy. That is part of the bill. It is an essential part of the bill.

How can this become a reality under a Conservative government, given the Conservatives' love of oil? Is it possible, conceivable and realistic to talk about a net-zero economy?

Government Orders

• (1240)

[English]

Mr. Ted Falk: Mr. Speaker, similar to how I answered the previous member's question, the oil and gas industry is doing lots of research and development into transitioning to other energy sources that contribute less CO. When we allow something to naturally transform, and when the economies actually make sense in terms of producing energy in an alternative method, it will happen. It should not require government influence.

This bill would require billions of federal taxpayer dollars to be successful, and we will have to subsidize those sustainable jobs. It really is what the government called it initially: At best, it is a transition bill.

Ms. Lori Idlout (Nunavut, NDP): *Uqaqtittiji*, a Calgary economic development study estimated that Alberta could see \$61 billion pumped into its economy through clean technology investments.

Does the member agree that transitioning to sustainable energy is the way to go, so provinces such as Alberta could continue to see their economies grow?

Mr. Ted Falk: Mr. Speaker, if the member is concerned about job growth and the economy growing in Calgary, the oil and gas industry in Alberta has proven that it has excellent corporate citizens. It has been the best thing that ever happened to the Alberta economy.

If the government were to wilfully shut that industry down, displace 450,000 workers and put 2.7 million people at risk, that would not be very prudent at all.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, to be clear, I agree with my friend from Provencher on one point. This bill should have been called the just transition act. The government and governments around the world, largely because of the work of Canadian trade unions, which were in Paris at COP21. They worked hard to ensure that climate action would not compromise the jobs of workers in the fossil fuel sector and that they would receive help and support.

As a Maritimer, I lived through what was called the “TAGS program” or the “groundfish strategy”. They told workers who had just lost all their work from the cod fishery to trade the fish net for the Internet; these were ridiculous notions.

We need to support the workers and communities that are going to be impacted by the climate crisis and by actions to address it. This bill is the result of the Liberals trying to talk out of both sides of their mouths, while accomplishing nothing.

Mr. Ted Falk: Mr. Speaker, I will reiterate what the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands said: This bill would accomplish absolutely nothing, and the Liberals are talking out of both sides of their mouths.

Hon. Jonathan Wilkinson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I rise to speak to a vital piece of legislation, the Canadian sustainable jobs act.

To set the context, climate change is altering our world's natural environment in numerous harmful ways. In fact, last summer,

Canadians experienced the worst wildfire season on record, destroying homes and livelihoods, blanketing cities and towns in smoke and putting brave first responders in harm's way. While some political leaders choose to deny, deflect and downplay such events, Canadians know the facts: Our planet is burning up, and climate change is the cause.

At the same time, climate change is also rapidly transforming the global economy and finance in ways that are creating enormous economic opportunities for those who approach the shift to a low-carbon world in a thoughtful, determined and strategic manner. The global energy transition that is already well under way is both an environmental imperative to protect the planet for our children and an economic opportunity on a scale similar to that of the Industrial Revolution.

In releasing “World Energy Outlook 2023”, Dr. Fatih Birol, the executive director of the International Energy Agency, stated, “The transition to clean energy is happening worldwide and it's unstoppable. It's not a question of ‘if’, it's just a matter of ‘how soon’”.

[Translation]

The majority of Canadians are indeed concerned about climate change, but they are also concerned about their economic situation, and they want good jobs and economic opportunities for themselves and their children in the future.

In order for Canada to seize the extraordinary opportunities offered by the transition to a net-zero economy, we must accept the scientific reality of climate change and ensure that it informs and shapes Canada's economic strategy.

• (1245)

[English]

Since 2015, the federal government has committed almost \$200 billion to the fight against climate change and to accelerating the development of a prosperous low-carbon economy. This includes the nearly \$86 billion that last year's budget committed for tools, including major investment tax credits, to accelerate clean growth and ensure Canadian competitiveness; we are seeing significant progress from these investments right across the country.

In Newfoundland, Braya Renewable Fuels is converting its refinery to renewable diesel. In Nova Scotia, EverWind Fuels recently received approval to build North America's first facility to produce hydrogen from renewables.

[Translation]

In Quebec, progress was made on new lithium mines and the announcement of TES Canada's \$4-billion hydrogen project.

*Government Orders**[English]*

In Ontario, we are seeing massive investments in the entirety of the electric vehicle value chain. In Saskatchewan, BHP is constructing the largest potash mine with the lowest emissions in the world. Companies in Alberta are developing net-zero and low-carbon industrial facilities, including Air Products' clean hydrogen facility and Dow's recently announced \$12-billion net-zero petrochemical facility. In B.C., the recently announced \$1-billion investment in the E-One Moli battery facility will create almost 500 jobs and will generate further employment in upstream activities.

To date, we have invested over \$1.5 billion in measures for skills programming, supporting communities and industries across the country. The sustainable jobs action plan and the sustainable jobs act are both about creating low-carbon economic opportunities in all regions of the country that will create jobs and opportunities for generations. They are about ensuring that we prepare workers and communities to fully seize these opportunities.

[Translation]

As far as this piece of legislation is concerned, there are five key elements.

Firstly, the bill establishes guiding principles that ensure workers are at the heart of building a net-zero future. The original bill was enhanced by an amendment to include additional considerations of environmental sustainability and equity. This amendment ensures alignment with commitments made under the Canadian Net-Zero Emissions Accountability Act and Canada's 2030 emissions reduction plan.

[English]

Secondly, the bill would create a sustainable jobs partnership council composed of Canadians from sectors involved in the shift to a net-zero economy. This part of the bill reflects a tripartite-plus approach, ensuring dialogue among industry, labour, indigenous and other experts in policy-making. Amendments to the original bill provide further clarity about the exact composition of the council, as well as the co-chair and member appointments. This council would provide valuable advice to the Government of Canada, sourced, in part, from dialogues engaged in across the country, ensuring diverse and well-informed perspectives to shape policy recommendations.

[Translation]

Thirdly, accountability is reinforced by the requirement to publish action plans every five years. Amendments to the original bill in this section will ensure that areas of federal-provincial co-operation are taken into account in the development of action plans. The amendments will also ensure that analyses are regularly conducted to assess how action plan measures interact with those of Canada's emissions reduction plan.

[English]

Fourthly, this bill would establish a sustainable jobs secretariat to coordinate intergovernmental efforts and enforce compliance with the acts.

[Translation]

Finally, the bill designates the ministers responsible for implementing the act and the plan.

[English]

Overall, the amendments being made to this bill are the product of work by committee members, very much including Liberal and NDP members, with some helpful assistance from the member for Jonquière. I would like to specifically thank my Liberal colleagues, the members for Toronto—Danforth, Calgary Skyview, Cloverdale—Langley City, Sudbury, Vaughan—Woodbridge, Nickel Belt and Labrador, for their hard work and dedication. I must also say it has been a pleasure working with the hon. member for Timmins—James Bay, whose passion for this work is a strong example of the dedication he has brought to two decades of service to his constituents. He will be missed in the House of Commons.

The amendments noted would enhance legislated transparency, ensure effective representation on the partnership council, secure strong linkage to the climate accountability legislation and emphasize the pivotal role of provinces, territories and other levels of government as key partners in advancing sustainable job opportunities. This bill has gained strong support on the part of the labour movement and civil society. I want to thank leaders in the labour movement, and Bea Bruske in particular, for their strong and active support.

This legislation underscores the government's commitment to working collaboratively and thoughtfully to advance the prosperity and well-being of all regions of Canada, of all communities and of all workers as we look to seize the massive economic opportunities before us.

The fact of the matter is that this legislation represents a thoughtful approach to the future. It has been supported by Clean Energy Canada, the Canadian Labour Congress, the Business Council of Alberta, the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, the Climate Action Network, Electricity Human Resources Canada, the United Steelworkers, Environmental Defence, the International Union of Operating Engineers, the Pembina Institute, the Power Workers' Union and many more.

Unfortunately, Conservatives' contempt for Canadian workers led them to engage in months of shenanigans in committee that I could only characterize as legislative vandalism. The fact is that not only has the opposition's obstructionism been a roadblock to environmental progress, but it also represents a direct attack on our economy and the livelihoods and prospects for generations of Canadian workers. In order to keep workers from the decision-making table, the Conservative Party submitted over 20,000 amendments on an 11-page bill.

Government Orders

• (1250)

[*Translation*]

I repeat, the Conservative Party of Canada submitted more than 20,000 amendments to an 11-page bill. Canadians expect better. They expect us to take this work seriously, to look at the bill first and to speak to the substance of the bill, even if we disagree. With their stunts, the Conservatives have proven that they have no interest in dialogue or serious governance issues.

[*English*]

They have been busy dog whistling about globalist plots and are increasingly denying the reality of climate change while they neglect their responsibility as parliamentarians, which is to act in the interest of the long-term prosperity of Canadians. For too long, the opposition has put the interests of an extreme climate-denying fringe above the well-being of our planet and of Canadian workers.

As we work to build a thriving, dynamic and prosperous low-carbon economy, we must ensure Canadian communities and Canadian workers remain at the centre of this critical work. That is precisely what this legislation would do. I implore all parliamentarians to stand with Canadian workers, who are calling on us to support Bill C-50.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, since the minister was not on the committee, I appreciate his commendation of his cohorts for colluding in the costly coalition cover-up. The Liberal members of his party rejected a Bloc Québécois motion that would have ensured that Bill C-50 supported “the decarbonization of workplaces while preserving existing jobs, minimizing job losses, and encouraging the involvement of workers and trade unions in the associated transition processes”. How can he possibly rationalize that?

This is an important question, because in the Canadian energy sector, more than 90% of energy companies are small businesses with fewer than 100 employees. In Bill C-50, the just transition actually does not contemplate those workers at all. We supported that Bloc amendment; the Bloc and the Green Party are the only parties being honest about the agenda that is actually included in Bill C-50, instead of pretending that it is about skills and jobs-training programs.

That amendment, as well as all the Conservative amendments, were the only measures that would have included provinces, territories and indigenous governance bodies for consultation and collaboration under the central plans by all the secret government committees that would stem from Bill C-50. How on earth can the minister defend Liberal members for rejecting these amendments?

Hon. Jonathan Wilkinson: Mr. Speaker, I will let the Bloc members speak to whether they want to be implicated by the globalist conspiracy-spouting Conservative rhetoric. However, I would say that type of amendment actually is already the whole thrust of the bill, which is about building a prosperous economy as we move through a transition to a low-carbon future that includes input from labour, industry, environmental organizations, indigenous communities and youth.

The Conservatives' 20,000 robo-amendments that actually would redo the same amendment many different times on each different

section were not thoughtful amendments; they were simply about blocking. This is not the way Parliament should work, and the Conservatives should know that.

• (1255)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to come back to those nearly 20,000 Conservative amendments.

I agree that our democracy should not be operated by robots that block our political and democratic institutions. The problem is that gag orders are also used as a tactic to block democratic and political processes that help improve bills.

Another problem arises in a democracy if provincial jurisdictions are not respected when a bill is drafted. Québec and the provinces were not consulted. The expertise of the Commission des partenaires du marché du travail was not taken into account.

My question is very simple. We are at report stage. If the minister could go back and rewrite his bill, would he give greater consideration to the reality and the needs of Québec and the provinces, especially by showing respect for the Commission des partenaires du marché du travail?

Hon. Jonathan Wilkinson: Mr. Speaker, we have done a lot of consultation since 2019.

We have certainly had conversations with industry, with provinces and territories, with indigenous groups and with environmentalists. The bill was introduced here in June of last year. It stayed here for eight months, which is a long time.

Having said that, we respect provincial jurisdiction. This bill focuses on areas of federal jurisdiction.

[*English*]

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, certainly what we have seen from the Conservatives is part of the pattern of toxic disinformation. The only way one can get away with standing up in the House and making ridiculous claims about some kind of international globalist conspiracy that will kill 170,000, 190,000 or millions of jobs is if they try to shut down the facts.

We saw at our committee that every time workers came to speak, the Conservatives shut them down. They shut down the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, whose members work in the oil patch. They shut down the carpenters union, whose members work on so many of the building projects. They shut down the Canadian Labour Congress. They shut down Unifor, which represents workers in the EV plants. They shut down the Alberta Federation of Labour.

Government Orders

What is it about the Conservatives that they are so angry and are ensuring that the workers who brought the bill forward are not allowed to speak, so the Conservatives can get their disinformation sock puppets to spread falsehoods? Why is it so important that we actually have the voice of labour at the table when we are talking about the transition that is under way?

Hon. Jonathan Wilkinson: Mr. Speaker, it is extremely important that we have the voices of workers at the table. The transition obviously would fundamentally affect them. It would create opportunities that would actually engage workers, their families and their communities in the development of whole new industries around hydrogen, critical minerals and critical minerals processing, biofuels, nuclear technology and a whole range of other things. It is enormously important that good public policy is informed by conversations with the stakeholders affected, and that very much includes the labour movement.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

ADVANCE DISCLOSURE OF BUDGET MEASURES

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am rising to respond to a question of privilege from the member for La Prairie with respect to announcing certain policy initiatives.

Page 899 of the third edition of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice* states, “Speakers have maintained that [budget] secrecy is a matter of parliamentary convention rather than one of privilege.” On November 18, 1981, in relation to budget secrecy, Speaker Sauvé noted, “[budget] secrecy has no impact on the privileges of a member”, and goes on to say, “but [further]...has nothing to do with [the] privilege.”

The House will have opportunities to consider the budget when it is properly before the House. The Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance has announced that she will be presenting the budget to the House at 4 p.m. on Tuesday, April 16. Following the presentation of the budget, the House will have four days of debate, and the opposition parties will be able to move an amendment and a subamendment to the budget motion. Following a vote on the main motion for the budget, the House will consider a ways and means motion, and, following its adoption, will see the introduction of the budget implementation bill.

Where privilege arises is the period between when notice is given of the budget bill and its subsequent introduction. However, if the measures to be contained in the budget implementation bill are tabled in the form of a notice of ways and means motion while the bill is on notice, members of the House will already have the contents of the budget implementation bill to consider, which by its very tabling in the House of Commons obviates the ability to raise an associated question of privilege.

Budget secrecy is a matter of convention. The executive has the right and the ability to communicate with Canadians about proposed budget measures in advance of the tabling of the budget. This represents the fundamental right of the duly elected government to

present its plan to Canadians about how it will help them, as is the case with the Speech from the Throne.

These are policy proposals, and their announcement does not, in any way, interfere with the rights of the members of the House. The matter in no way interferes with the rights and privileges of members, as has been established by precedent. Perhaps it is due to the popularity of the proposals with the public that the member may seem to be taking some offence.

* * *

● (1300)

CANADIAN SUSTAINABLE JOBS ACT

The House resumed consideration of 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, as reported (with amendments) from the committee.

Mr. Mike Morrice (Kitchener Centre, GP): Mr. Speaker, as every member of the House should know, we are in a climate crisis, with a closing window of opportunity to act. I will share the words of the UN Secretary General about this: “We are on a highway to climate hell with our foot still on the accelerator.” He also says, “We are in the fight of our lives. And we are losing....our planet is fast approaching tipping points that will make climate chaos irreversible....The global climate fight will be won or lost in this crucial decade – on our watch.”

In the face of this crisis, as Greens, we are deeply concerned that the so-called Canadian sustainable jobs act, Bill C-50, remains a massive missed opportunity and an example of checkbox politics rather than substance. This is about checking a partial box from the government’s supply and confidence agreement with the NDP. There are some members of the House who decry the bill as central planning and destroying the economy of Western Canada, but none of this is true.

I have the bill here and will share what it would actually do. In fact, it would do three things. First, it would create a group to give the minister advice, which would be called the sustainable jobs partnership council. Second, the bill would require a sustainable jobs action plan. As of the current version of the bill, this would be required by December 31, 2040. As Greens, we are glad the government has proposed amendments to bring the plan sooner. We have put forward an amendment to bring it forward as soon as possible; we have suggested December 31 of this year. Again, we are in a crisis that demands urgent action. Third, the bill would create a sustainable jobs secretariat to help the minister implement this act. That is it. In the words of public policy researcher and author Seth Klein, it is “a snoozer”.

Government Orders

There is actually nothing on the words “just transition”, which were long forgotten by the time we moved from the supply and confidence agreement to the bill. They are words that are a key principle of the Paris Agreement. Unions fought for the words “just transition” to be in the Paris Agreement; workers across this country advocated for that to be the case. There is nothing in the bill about meaningful investments in truly sustainable jobs, such as a just transition transfer that could be linked to climate infrastructure projects with training and apprenticeships, in the same way that we already have a Canada health transfer. There is nothing on provincial and territorial just transition agencies to ensure that the funds flow to affected workers.

There is nothing on a youth climate corps, a federally funded job training and placement program that already exists in other jurisdictions that could ensure that young people know there will be good, green jobs available to them in the economy in the years to come, as the MP for Victoria has proposed a motion for. There is nothing on investments in training and apprenticeships in the skilled trades, including the carpenters, electricians and plumbers we will need to support as we move to retrofit buildings across the country: homes, businesses and industrial buildings. These are good, well-paying jobs that the bill could have been investing in.

There is nothing in the bill that talks about the coal workers that the government consulted with in 2018, made promises to and has since provided no support to for things like job retraining that were promised to them. There is nothing in the bill with respect to Bloc and Green amendments at committee. Of course there were various partisan tactics that led to that not getting debated. However, when it came to the actual vote, none of those were accepted to be in the bill.

There is also nothing in the bill when it comes to actually investing in the economy of the future. As Greens, we have been putting forward that it is well past time that we put in place a windfall profit tax on the oil and gas industry. This is a measure that has already been taken by the government when it comes to banks and life insurance companies. It would be just a 15% tax on profits over \$1 billion.

● (1305)

The largest oil and gas companies in the country, the most recent year we have numbers for, made \$36 billion in profits. If we are going to put in place even a 15% windfall profit tax on profits over \$1 billion, we would have \$4.2 billion that could be invested in affordability measures for Canadians. It could be invested in workers who need that support, like some of the measures I mentioned earlier, or in apprenticeships and job retraining. Those are the investments we could be making. It is important that we point to revenue tools along with the measures that could have been in this bill, but none of it was.

Again, we are talking about three measures to put in place a council, an action plan and a secretariat. We are facing a climate emergency and are at a time when workers across the country, many of whom are anxious, recognize that they deserve supports. This was the moment to do it. This legislation was an opportunity to demonstrate to them that they were being listened to, unlike coal

workers from 2018, and to build trust with them. It is why we will continue to advocate for better.

I encourage Liberals to read *A Good War* by Mr. Klein. I would encourage them to act like they understand the crisis we are in. The fact is that this remains a unique moment in time, one where we can stand up and say it is possible for us to hold onto 1.5°C. It is possible to speak to young people today, recognizing the enormity of the challenge we face, and say that their government could take action at federal, provincial and municipal levels to invest in good jobs for them in the future and to take action while we still can, yet that is not what is here.

We will continue to advocate for better. We are going to work with all parties that are willing to do so. I will point out again that the Bloc proposed amendments that would have improved this bill, just as Greens did. We brought more forward at report stage to continue that advocacy. We will continue to do so, because we recognize that we are living in a unique moment, one where we still have this opportunity to act. We encourage the government to take it.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, could my colleague provide further thoughts regarding the benefits of the sustainable jobs action plan? We are talking about every five years, and there is a great deal of merit for that. I do not quite understand why the official opposition would see that as a bad thing. It is more of a longer-term plan that could have a positive outcome, when we start consulting with Canadian workers and others to ultimately come up with a plan.

What does he think?

● (1310)

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, the member for Winnipeg North is right in that an action plan is a good thing. The concern is that it does not meet the moment we are in. Talking about an action plan, whether it is December 31, 2040, or whatever it ends up getting moved up to as a result of votes this evening, is not recognizing that we need investments today. We need action today. We need to talk about a just transition transfer today and a youth climate corps today.

There is this idea of one day in the future writing an action plan that could have ideas in it that would have helped us if we had done it in 2024. That is the reality. Our kids are going to look back at this moment and ask what we were thinking. Yes, he is right that an action plan is a good thing. It is not nearly enough if it is some day far in the future, if we recognize we are in the midst of an emergency now.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge the Greens for being honest about this bill. I would invite the member to expand, if he wants, on his thoughts.

Government Orders

There was a previous just transition study, and the Liberals and the NDP changed the name of it at the last minute. However, as the member pointed out, the bill would not deliver any jobs or skills training programs, particularly.

The member brought up the issue of trust, which is paramount, and it is certainly what Conservatives tried to embed in the legislation through our amendments. The Liberals even rejected a Conservative amendment that called for a fair and equitable approach specifically to ensure social support.

The truth is that polls show that Conservatives do not know what the just transition is, but once they find out, they do not want it, they cannot afford it, they do not want new taxes to pay for it, and they want bigger polluters around the world to take action before Canadians are punished and it costs them even more.

It would be great if the member would also recognize the fact that on Bill C-50, the legislation itself, because of the procedural tactics from the Liberals and NDP, not a single Canadian impacted by it will actually be able to be heard by members of Parliament.

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, there were procedural games on all sides when it came to December and the discussion on amendments to the bill.

On the member's point about trust, that is a really important one. On that point, we can agree that we need to be doing more to be more honest with workers about what is actually in the bill.

The member mentioned the words “just transition”. This is a term that has been deeply turned into a partisan context. However, the reality is that the term just transition speaks of justice for workers. We need to centre the interests and rights of workers in the transition to a clean economy.

I am disappointed that the term has become as politicized as it has. I am disappointed that it is not in this legislation, because it is workers who fought for it to be in the Paris agreement.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I thank my Green Party colleague for his excellent speech. This has happened in politics before. Consider the Parti Québécois. Only three Parti Québécois members were elected in the last election. Now, less than a year later, it is leading in the polls.

There is going to be an election within a year and a half, so there is still time for Canadians to develop their environmental common sense. The Green Party could be leading in the polls before the next election.

I would like to know how the Green Party, if it were in power, would draft a genuine just transition bill. What measures would it include in its draft that could make things better? How would it guard against democracy being thwarted by artificial intelligence or a gag order?

• (1315)

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, what a nice question from my Bloc Québécois friend. If the Greens were in power, they would make the investments and, as I mentioned in my speech about what

experts and workers across the country are calling for, they would support a just transition.

The Deputy Speaker: Before we resume debate, I want to remind hon. members to keep their questions and comments short so that everyone gets a chance to participate in the debate.

Mr. Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to contribute to the debate on 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. I want to talk about something that is critically important, and that is the transition to a low-carbon economy.

We live in an era where climate change is an existential threat to our planet and to future generations. I would also like to talk about the fact that, during the study at the Standing Committee on Natural Resources, the Liberals opted to impose a gag order rather than vote on the Bloc Québécois amendments. The government chose to ignore Quebec, even though the Bloc Québécois was proposing a simple solution that would allow everyone to move forward toward a real just transition.

In Quebec, the transition toward a low-carbon economy has been a major concern for several years because of the importance of our natural resources and our energy industry, as well as our awareness of the need to protect the environment. Quebec can accomplish this green transition because it made choices that ensure a wealth of renewable energies and natural resources.

In Quebec, as in Canada, this green transition must take into account the rights and needs of indigenous peoples to ensure a fair and inclusive transition. To successfully carry out this huge transformation, the federal government needs to fully support Quebec's green expertise and innovation in such areas as the electrification of transportation, the production of carbon-free aluminum, forestry processing and environmentally responsible mining.

We are talking about a just transition. That is evident in how we operate mines in Abitibi-Témiscamingue, because things have changed. Mining companies are evolving. Our regional businesses are innovating. They are going above and beyond. Abitibi-Témiscamingue's expertise is being exported around the world. We even have a joke back home that may well be true. It is said that there is probably someone from Abitibi-Témiscamingue in every mine in the world, given how much the people from the region have contributed, through their expertise, to building those mines throughout history.

Our post-secondary educational institutions, like the Université du Québec en Abitibi-Témiscamingue and the Abitibi-Témiscamingue CEGEP, continue to conduct research in every area, including social licence, greener mining and better ore processing procedures. These are examples of jobs in a just transition.

Government Orders

Abitibi-Témiscamingue is ready, and so is Quebec. We have all the assets we need to become the green transition's North American hub. This is a fact that the federal government should recognize and actively support.

The amendments proposed by the Bloc Québécois at the Standing Committee on Natural Resources sought to ensure that the bill would create high-quality job opportunities in low-carbon, high-value-added industries by 2050—while respecting the Canada-Quebec agreements on workforce development and Quebec's legislative authority, of course.

However, with their gag order, the Liberals said no to the Bloc Québécois and to Quebec. What did they say no to, exactly? The Liberals refuse to recognize the Quebec government's leading role in workforce development and the key role of the network of labour market partners within the Commission des partenaires du marché du travail.

The Liberals refuse to have the minister use an adapted approach that takes into account the expertise and responsibilities of Quebec's Commission des partenaires du marché du travail. The Liberals refuse to have the bill apply in a manner consistent with the Canada-Quebec workforce development agreements.

By imposing a gag order, the government has also rejected all the Bloc Québécois's amendments that were based on suggestions by unions and environmental groups aimed at improving this bill. The Liberals refused to adopt a clear definition of net-zero economy that would be in line with Canada's international commitments and would make the Canadian Sustainable Jobs Act consistent with the Canadian Net-Zero Emissions Accountability Act.

The Liberals refused to adopt a clear definition of sustainable or green jobs, running the risk that the government's strategy will move Canada farther away from its climate objectives. The Liberals refused to recognize that transitioning to a net-zero economy does not rely solely on job creation by the federal government, but on the actions of all governments and on the mobilization of workers, communities, industries and civil society. They refuse to co-operate with all the partners to plan for sustainable jobs and for the transition to a zero-emissions economy. The Liberals refuse to adopt appropriate principles to effectively guide green job creation and the transition to a net-zero economy or to take into account objectives involving economic, social and climate factors.

● (1320)

In creating their sustainable jobs council, the Liberals are refusing to take account of such factors as scientific knowledge, expertise and experience in the climate field. The Liberals refuse to add substance to their sustainable jobs plan and ensure it articulates a vision and objectives for implementing the energy transition and helping achieve net-zero. They refuse to equip the secretariat they are creating with the necessary means to oversee the implementation of the energy transition and coordinate sustainable job creation efforts. Lastly, the Liberals have rejected a number of measures aimed at ensuring transparency and accountability within their future sustainable jobs council.

We could say that Bill C-50 was problematic from the time it was first drafted, because it does not respect Quebec's jurisdiction

or the expertise of the Commission des partenaires du marché du travail du Québec.

Moreover, like it or not, the international climate agreements set ambitious targets for achieving net-zero emissions to encourage governments and businesses to reduce their dependence on fossil fuels. The gradual shift away from conventional carbon-based energy sources is increasing demand for alternatives, such as solar, wind and geothermal energy and energy storage technologies. A just transition involves respecting indigenous peoples' right to manage their resources and territories. Free and informed consent is crucial for guaranteeing their informed participation in decision-making. Indigenous people are bearing the brunt of climate change, and their knowledge needs to be incorporated into climate change policies and legislation. It is too bad that, despite increased awareness of indigenous realities, we are still managing to ignore calls for action on the environment.

It is extremely important to recognize that the Earth does not belong to us. I want to remind every member of the House that we have a duty to protect the planet, preserve its biodiversity and reduce our environmental footprint. This also involves respecting the rights of the people who live in Quebec, including indigenous peoples, who have deep ancestral ties to their land. By adopting an attitude of respect and responsibility toward the Earth, we can contribute to building a sustainable future for all.

Last summer's forest fires raised serious concerns in my riding, so I am obviously worried about the people in the villages in my region and for the indigenous communities that were evacuated. I had hoped that the sheer extent of the forest fires and the forecast of another dry summer this year would get the members of the House to wake up. Unfortunately, that is not the case. I met with people who experienced tragedy last summer. I had hoped that my colleagues would support the Bloc Québécois, whose amendments were intended to recognize elements that would make it possible to take action while taking into account Quebec's specific characteristics and, more importantly, the need for greater coordination.

Paradoxically, Canada is moving in one direction while sabotaging its own efforts in another. On the one hand, it is flaunting its commitment to becoming a net-zero country, reducing its greenhouse gas emissions and fighting climate change. On the other, it is putting more money than ever into oil sands extraction, an activity known for having a large carbon footprint and disastrous environmental effects. This two-faced approach raises questions as to whether Canada's climate change policies are consistent with its actions and highlights the challenges facing this country in its transition to a greener, more environmentally responsible economy.

Government Orders

According to the Canada Energy Regulator, Canadian crude oil production has grown considerably over the last 30 years, from 1.7 million barrels per day in 1990 to 4.7 million barrels per day in 2019. In the span of 30 years, we have upped daily production by three million barrels. It is clear that Canada has failed to walk the talk. That is why Canada has one of the worst records in the world in combatting greenhouse gas emissions.

All of us here can support legislation announcing measures to mitigate the harmful effects of this increased oil production and to create a sustainable future for all. If we want to talk about a just transition, we must also talk about a paradigm shift in the transport sector. This involves the various regions but was not taken into account when this bill was drafted.

• (1325)

Mrs. Brenda Shanahan (Châteauguay—Lacolle, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I really appreciated my hon. colleague's speech. He did a great job describing the issues associated with climate change and the fight against climate change, as well as ways to approach decarbonization. Frankly, I wish today's debate were more focused on all these aspects.

I would like to ask a question because I too believe that the provinces' jurisdiction should be respected. At the very beginning, when the federal government proposed a price on pollution, it offered the other provinces the option to adopt a system similar to the one used by Quebec and British Columbia.

Would my colleague care to comment on this? Why did the other provinces not opt in to the carbon exchange?

Mr. Sébastien Lemire: Mr. Speaker, first of all, debates must be held at the appropriate time. Today's debate is not about the carbon tax.

We are currently studying the bill at report stage. At a time when there could have been real debate on the amendments, the government imposed a gag order in committee. That is why the debates could not take place. That is why we find ourselves taking up yet more of the House's time. We are caught up in procedure again this morning with another pointless vote to get back to the orders of the day. Why is this happening? It is to prevent these bills from being passed.

The fault therefore lies as much with the official opposition as with the government, which lacks the will to pass a just transition bill that is coherent and feasible to implement while respecting everyone, including indigenous communities and the provinces.

Ms. Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this bill is really a plan for having a plan.

When the Liberals chose their friends to be on the council to decide on the plan, the eyes of Parliament were not on the plan. I do not think that is in keeping with our democracy.

What does the member think?

Mr. Sébastien Lemire: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, when someone uses artificial intelligence to generate more than 20,000 amendments, as the Conservatives did in committee, I also worry about the impact this may have on democracy. They got robots to

think for them so they could filibuster in committee. That bothers me a little.

[*English*]

Mr. John Nater: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Just to clarify the record, artificial intelligence was mentioned. I want to clarify that it was Adam Church intelligence for those amendments.

The Deputy Speaker: It is a good clarification.

The hon. parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, for further clarification, that is confirmation that the Conservatives did use AI on those 20,000-plus amendments, I see.

The Deputy Speaker: The debate is between AI and AC.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Nanaimo—Ladysmith.

Ms. Lisa Marie Barron (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Mr. Speaker, as members who are elected to represent our constituents, we know this needs to be at the core of all of our decisions and discussions, to ensure that we have sound climate action that matches the emergency we are facing with a real jobs plan.

My colleague prior mentioned the Youth Climate Corps and the importance of this being implemented. It is a motion that has been put forward by my NDP colleague, the member for Victoria, to ensure that young people are part of the solutions, that they are trained, employed and part of the work in lowering greenhouse gas emissions.

Could the member share whether he is in support of this motion as well as share his thoughts on how this important work aligns with what we are talking about today?

• (1330)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Sébastien Lemire: Mr. Speaker, obviously, I will always be in favour of proposals that seek to improve conditions for young people, particularly proposals that take into account education, the possibility of getting better jobs that will bring them into harmony with the planet. Above all, I support the idea that young people should be able to enrol in regional educational institutions close to where they live and where we are witnessing the development of our energy sources and the extraction of minerals such as strategic critical minerals.

Yes, I do think we have to support this. There are some excellent initiatives under way, particularly at the Abitibi-Témiscamingue CEGEP and the Université du Québec, to reflect on issues such as social licence, the need to better harmonize these projects with our communities, greener mining, innovation and improved mineral processing.

Government Orders

I would like to quickly say that I saw a small box at the Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières that shows the consequences of soil degradation on a site over 50 years. This is made possible by research and employment. It is done through knowledge. We need to encourage this, and the federal government has a responsibility in this respect.

[*English*]

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today is an important day and a proud day. It is a day that we fulfill the promise to workers who came to us and said that they needed to have their voices heard in dealing with the biggest economic and environmental crisis of the last 300 years.

I think back seven years ago, in Edmonton, when I met with the incredible workers at Local 424 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. They had asked me to go to their plant and meet with them. They wanted to show me the incredible training they were doing for a clean-tech future. They said that the world was changing and they were not going to be left behind, that they had the skills to take on whatever. They also said, which I knew then and believe, that there was no place in the world that could move to a clean-energy economy quicker than Alberta, and these workers were at the front of the line in the training.

They asked me where the government was on this. They saw the future coming. That question has stayed with me ever since. In the seven years since, the climate crisis has become much more pronounced. We no longer talk about the summer, we talk about the fire season. Our national fire chiefs have talked about a ferocious fire season after last year, when 200,000 Canadians were forced from their homes because of the ongoing climate disaster due to increased burning of fossil fuels.

However, we also see how fast the transition is happening around the world. It is not a myth. It is not a lie. It is not, as the Conservatives claim, some kind of globalist woke conspiracy. It is a fact. When the market changes and we do not have a plan, it is heart-breaking.

I live in mining country. I remember when the market changed in iron ore prices. Kirkland Lake and my community of Cobalt were never the same again. I remember being on one of the last shifts underground at Stanleigh Mine in Elliot Lake when the uranium market fell. It did not matter how much one believed in disinformation or claimed there was a conspiracy, once it was gone, those jobs were gone forever.

We have lost 45,000 jobs in the oil sector, and those jobs are not coming back. We lost 1,500 jobs just this year. Richie Rich Kruger from Suncor told investors in his company, which was part of the group that made \$78 billion in profits, that he was going to target work as a way to be more efficient. The billions of dollars they are making they are putting into automation. They are not putting it into communities or jobs. We are seeing a reality where there will be a drop in oil and gas jobs, we figure from 171,000 down to 100,000 by 2030. Therefore, we have to be prepared.

When we lost our mining economies in the north, there was no plan. There was no place where people could go, and it was devastating. We talk about a just transition. I always say it is a transition

where I come from when we see U-Hauls on the lawns of our neighbours, who are leaving with no future.

The IBEW, the operating engineers, Unifor, the Canadian Labour Congress came to us and said that there had to be a plan in place, otherwise we would miss the boat. The transition is happening. China put \$890 billion into clean tech last year, more than the rest of the world combined. The result was that it pumped \$1.6 trillion into its economy and brought it up 30% in a single year. It is moving ahead.

South of the border, Joe Biden's IRA has created 170,000 jobs and over half a trillion dollars in new investments. What we hear from the Conservatives now is that this is some kind of George Soros woke conspiracy that is being planned, a planned Soviet economy to destroy jobs. It was the workers themselves who came to us and said that we needed plan in place, that they did not want all those jobs going stateside.

Where are we in Canada? Danielle Smith blew \$30 billion in clean-tech investments out of Alberta and said that they were not welcome. Why? It was just out of ideology. This is a province that was Canada's energy superpower and she cannot even keep the lights on in April. It is becoming Canada's banana republic for energy at a time when the climate crisis in Alberta is burning the fields. We are in fire season already and it does not have the water. We have never heard a single Alberta Conservative ever talk about the drought that is hitting due to the climate crisis. We need to take action.

It is a reasonable step that we are talking about. We need to ensure this transition happens, and, for my Liberal colleagues, that plan is not moving fast enough. We have to keep up and we have to be competitive, but we need to have workers at the table. They have a right to be at the table, because decisions will be made. It could be pork barrel, misspending or it could be a plan that ensures we build on the strengths of the workers we have and our incredible resources.

● (1335)

It is amazing. The other day the leader of the Conservative Party was asked about his opinion on the industrial carbon tax, and of course after having belittled the member for Victoria, which is very much in keeping with his style, he claimed there was no industrial carbon tax. It is a falsehood.

We have this funny tradition in Parliament. One can come into the House and lie all day long, but one can never be accused of being a liar because one is supposed to be an honourable member. The fact that the leader of the Conservative Party is making disinformation about the industrial price of carbon is a concern. Maybe he just does not know his file, but I do not think that is the case.

The Conservatives this morning, with some of the numbers they were talking about, were trying to claim that Bill C-50 is some kind of plot. They were saying that there were 1.4 million jobs, 170,000 jobs and 200-some thousand jobs that would immediately disappear if this happened. One can only make ridiculous claims like that if one deliberately shuts down the voices of the people who came to testify.

What happens when legislation is brought forward, and it can be good or bad and can be amended, is that we hear from the witnesses. Who were the witnesses who were not allowed to speak? The Conservatives did not allow the IBEW to speak. They did not let the carpenters union speak. They shut them down. It was the New Democrats who brought the people who have gone through the coal transition, and the Conservatives did not give a darn about those workers in the coal transition. They did not want to hear them. They did not want to hear anyone from Unifor. Those are the people who are working in the EV technologies. They shut them down and would not let them speak. They did not want the Alberta Federation of Labour to speak.

They did not want that, because if they let people speak who actually speak the truth, then disinformation falls by the side of the road. They cannot then walk around with claims of conspiracy and idiocy if there are people who say something is simply not true.

When one says to Conservatives something is simply not true, they really lose their minds. Look at the Conservative leader and his support from Alex Jones. Alex Jones is an absolute hate-monger. This is a man who taunted the families of 20 children who were murdered by an evil conspiracy hater. Alex Jones was on the John Birch Society podcast, which is another hate site, bragging about the member who lives in Stornoway. Does anyone think he was going to challenge that? Not a chance.

However, I challenged Alex Jones, and within an hour, photos of my daughters were online with their addresses. We know how the hate machine works. It is the politics of intimidation. When I take on the member for Carleton for not even bothering to show up for the election he is threatening to call, boy oh boy, within an hour their hate memes are going through my riding to call me and threaten me.

What Conservatives wanted to do was shut down Bill C-50. When they brought forward the amendments, most of which had to be generated by AI because I do not think the Conservatives were smart enough to actually bring them forward, we had to sit through hours with them screaming. They screamed for eight hours of intimidation. It was like gong-show Brownshirts. In all my career, I have never seen such deplorable and disgraceful behaviour.

• (1340)

The Deputy Speaker: We have a point of order from the hon. member for Lakeland.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Mr. Speaker, that member just likened duly elected members of Parliament on the Standing Committee on Natural Resources to Brownshirts.

Mr. Kyle Seeback: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order, everybody knows what the term “Brownshirts” refers to. It refers to Nazi Germany. This member is effectively calling Conservative mem-

Government Orders

bers on that committee Nazis. He needs to immediately apologize. It is a disgraceful remark.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member should retract that.

The hon. member for Timmins—James Bay.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Speaker, I am more than willing, because I think if you looked into the—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Mr. Speaker, for that exact member to be characterizing the actions of my duly elected colleagues, who are Conservative members on the natural resources committee, in the way that he has actually lines up perfectly given that he told me to “eff off” in the committee meeting—

The Deputy Speaker: That is descending into debate.

Let us go back to the issue of being judicious with the words we are using.

The hon. member for Timmins—James Bay has the floor.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Speaker, I was talking about the politics of intimidation. I was talking about how my daughter's photos were being posted online. I was talking about—

The Deputy Speaker: We have another point of order.

The hon. member for New Brunswick Southwest.

Mr. John Williamson: Mr. Speaker, I have neither heard a retraction nor an apology. You asked for it. It needs to be explicit. We need to hear it in this chamber, not just a running over of it like it did not happen.

The member should retract and apologize.

The Deputy Speaker: The usage of that term is not correct. Could the hon. member retract it and then move on?

The hon. member for Timmins—James Bay.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Speaker, I was pretty sure that I used it as a simile, that these were the tactics they were using—

The Deputy Speaker: Retract.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Speaker, I retract it, but I do know that they have met with neo-Nazis from Germany. That is a separate issue.

Mr. Mel Arnold: Mr. Speaker, the member has been here a long time and will hopefully not be here much longer, but he has been here long enough to know that one cannot say indirectly what one cannot say directly.

He knows that. He should know better. He needs to apologize or leave the chamber.

The Deputy Speaker: Would the hon. member for Timmins—James Bay please retract and apologize for the usage of that term?

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Speaker, yes, certainly, I retract it, but I will now go back to the point—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Deputy Speaker: I cannot hear anything, so I would not know.

The hon. member for Timmins—James Bay.

Government Orders

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Speaker, it is very telling because we did have to listen to eight hours of screaming, shouting and intimidation—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Saskatoon—University.

Mr. Corey Tochor: Mr. Speaker, you have asked for an apology and you have yet to receive it from the member. It is on his watch to deliver that apology and for you to enforce it or to eject the individual.

The Deputy Speaker: Still on the same point of order, I see the hon. House leader for the NDP.

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, the member retracted. I would ask members of the Conservative Party to actually listen to his speech and allow him to continue.

Mr. John Nater: Mr. Speaker, on that same point of order, I would draw your attention to the Debates from February 12, 1997, at page 8014, 8016 and 8017, in which the Speaker found that the unwillingness of the then member for Fraser Valley East to fully retract and apologize without conditions constituted a breach of the authority of the Chair and subsequently named the hon. member, pursuant to Standing Order 11.

I suggest that this is a similar case to that.

The Deputy Speaker: Let us try once again to retract it and apologize so that we can move on.

The hon. member for Timmins—James Bay, go ahead so that I can hear it.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Speaker, you did hear it before, so you will hear it again: I retract and I apologize.

I certainly apologize, as well, for anybody who had to watch the behaviour of the Conservatives who shut down our committee with screaming, shouting and intimidation for eight straight hours. The reason they did that was so the public would not hear these facts, which is why we have to deal with these constant interruptions. When we talk about facts with Conservatives, they are threatened by them.

I think I made a very clear—

The Deputy Speaker: We are saying not to have conditions to the apology and the retraction.

The hon. member for Timmins—James Bay.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Speaker, I will say this for the third time: I retract it. I apologize.

Can I continue?

• (1345)

The Deputy Speaker: You may continue.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry that we had to witness the abuse at that committee—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Speaker, that is within my purview—

The Deputy Speaker: This will be number three.

The hon. member for Lakeland.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Mr. Speaker, the member is fully displaying his contempt for democracy and for the duly elected members of Parliament who represent our constituents in this place who may have different views and opinions from him. He actually did not apologize. He retracted and defended himself. The end of his comments were actually to further reinforce the truth of the assertion that he made.

This entire thing is such a charade. I do not know why we have rules in this place, at committees or in this chamber, if they are not going to be applied equally and fairly all the time.

The Deputy Speaker: We are getting into debate a bit.

The hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby.

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, when you rise in the chair, I hope Conservatives will respect that and sit down. When you rise, that is a signal for Conservatives to sit down.

I very clearly heard the member for Timmins—James Bay. He retracted and apologized—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Deputy Speaker: Members should stop yelling. Do that first so that I can hear what is happening on the floor. I cannot hear a darn thing because everyone is yelling.

The hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby.

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, if you, with order in the House, allow the member for Timmins—James Bay to continue, he has information. It is true that Conservatives disagree, but they are just going to have to listen respectfully, in the same way that we listened to their speeches respectfully a few hours ago.

The Deputy Speaker: When I ask someone to retract, they are to retract or apologize but not to provide any other comments. Let us just move on to the next thing. There will be no “buts”, no “ands” or anything like that. Let us just have a straight-out apology.

Let us try it, for the fourth time, without the “but”.

The hon. member for Timmins—James Bay.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to challenge you, but I think it will be the fifth time I have retracted and apologized.

I can do it a sixth time: I retract and apologize.

Can I continue?

The Deputy Speaker: You may continue.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Speaker, we dealt with 20,000 bogus amendments from a party that did not want any worker representation at the table. There were 20,000 bogus amendments and we were shouted at when we tried to talk about how none of these were actually generated by real people. That is the nature of democracy in our House. Then the Conservatives said they were going to make us vote all weekend.

Government Orders

In my final moments, I will say that we have the Conservative leader, who has refused to apologize for his connections with Alex Jones and has refused to distance himself. We are now dealing with the politics of disinformation. I certainly hope I see the Conservative leader today; it is an important issue.

If Conservatives are going to make us vote all weekend long, I will be here. I made a promise to workers in Alberta, I made a promise to miners and I made a promise to people working in the auto sector that we were going to make sure that they had a voice at the table, no matter what the Conservatives did to try to interrupt us.

Mr. Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we just saw a demonstration from the member of Parliament for Timmins—James Bay of why he will not run for re-election. He does not represent any of the views of his constituents.

The reason he said he will be here all weekend is that—

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, those were absolutely inappropriate, disingenuous comments.

This is questions and comments on the bill, not personal attacks. The member should know better, and he should retract and apologize.

The Deputy Speaker: Not that I am supposed to comment on the debate that is happening, but it is coming from all sides at the moment.

The hon. member for Regina—Lewvan.

Mr. Warren Steinley: Mr. Speaker, I will take no lessons in honour from the NDP House leader, who has no lessons to give.

I would ask the member for Timmins—James Bay if he could put it on the record today and talk about some of the oil workers he has talked to in his riding and share their comments on the unjust transition bill. Has the member had conversations with some of the people who work hard? He talked about the Alberta Federation of Labour. I am sure the members of the natural resources committee talked to them as well.

I believe our natural resources committee members on the Conservative side have canvassed far and wide to hear how people feel about the unjust transition act. Has the member? If he is so confident, maybe he should decide to re-offer and run again in Timmins—James Bay.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Speaker, who have I spoken to? I have spoken with the carpenters union. I met with them in Edmonton. I have spoken with operating engineers. I visited the IBEW in western Canada multiple times. I have worked with Unifor in western Canada. I have worked with the Canadian Labour Congress. I have worked with United Steelworkers District 6, who represent the mining communities, and United Steelworkers District 3.

Does the member know what they all said to me? They all asked why the Conservatives were running this relentless gong show to try to stop their members from being heard on issues related to their futures and their jobs. That is who I hear from. I do not hear from Alex Jones. I do not hear from the far-right extremists. I hear from people who work and who have a right to be heard and who are be-

ing denied their right by the constant interference and undermining of basic legislation by the Conservatives.

• (1350)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the majority of members inside this chamber recognize the importance of Bill C-50 to Canadians as a whole.

What we have witnessed, once again, is the obstructive, destructive behaviour coming from the official opposition. We can highlight what took place in committee, where AI was used to generate 20,000-plus amendments. I am wondering if my colleague could share with me what he thinks about AI being used to generate a filibuster for the official opposition.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Speaker, that is a very unfair question because if the member asks me what I think of having to bring in artificial intelligence to deal with the Conservatives, they might light their hair on fire even more.

The fact is that the Conservatives can only get away with the kind of junk talk that they get away with if they shut down people who actually have facts. That is why they intimidate, shout, have the hate machine, and get up and scream every time I speak. That is why they tried to shut down all the proper witnesses at committee, and then screamed and shouted in the most deplorable, ignorant manner I had ever seen during votes. While the democratic work of Parliament was attempting to go ahead, they were trying to stop Parliament from doing its job.

They are trying to stop it today. I will be here until midnight. I hope the member who lives in Stornoway will be here to represent his people.

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I always appreciate hearing from the member for Timmins—James Bay. He speaks the real truth, and this is something I know Conservative members object to because facts are something they oppose. However, the reality is that the sustainable jobs act would lead to thousands and thousands of jobs, including new jobs in the energy sector. Coming from the energy sector, as a former refinery worker, I can say how important that is for Canadians.

The member for Timmins—James Bay has been a champion for sustainable jobs. He has met with a wide variety of workers right across the energy sector. At any point in all those meetings, did my colleague ever see a single Conservative MP actually consulting energy workers or actually speaking with energy workers? I know the Conservatives love to hobnob with oil and gas CEO's, but were they ever there with the workers?

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Speaker, that is a really interesting question because certainly every time people who were workers from the energy sector came to speak, the Conservatives shut them down and refused to speak. When we went out to Alberta to meet with and to learn from the coal workers who had been damaged in the transition, the Conservatives were not there, and the Conservatives did not let them speak at our committee.

Statements by Members

The Conservatives also do not want people speaking to the facts that clean energy jobs are taking place and that we have 209,000 clean energy jobs now in Canada, and we are looking at another 190,000. In fact, Alberta alone would have been the world centre for new jobs if it had not been for Danielle Smith and the disinformation team, like the Tucker Carlsons, who believe in the globalist agenda; the Alex Joneses, who believe in the globalist agenda; and the member for Lakeland, who believes that standing up for workers is somehow part of a globalist conspiracy. That is false. That needs to be called out as false. That is disinformation. It is conspiracy, and Canadian workers deserve a lot better than that.

[Translation]

Hon. Seamus O'Regan (Minister of Labour and Seniors, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to a common-sense piece of legislation, the Canadian sustainable jobs act. This is legislation that will enable Canadian workers to succeed. That is what it is all about.

• (1355)

[English]

I will be honest, and I think I am just going to riff a bit here. Honestly, I could not stay in the House for very long. I needed to find a wall to bang my head against while I heard what I heard from the other side of the House, or what little we could hear with their heads in the sand.

Let me be very clear about the context in which we are discussing this proposed legislation. Green energy is happening. Renewables are happening. Biofuels are happening. Hydrogen is happening. Lowering emissions in the oil and gas industry in Alberta, in British Columbia, in Saskatchewan and in Newfoundland and Labrador is happening.

One thing I learned as minister of natural resources is that workers want to know, want to understand and want to have a say in what is happening. If members were to blame anybody for the shenanigans of what we have heard over these past few months, I guess they will have to blame me because I am the one who thought maybe it was a good idea to set up a committee that would involve workers so that we could take their advice on the big issues facing the fourth biggest producer of oil and gas in the world, which is Canada. We are very good at doing what we do, but all these things that I am talking about and all the investments, prosperity and the jobs that come with those things are happening, and we have to make the most of them.

When we came up with this legislation, we did get a reaction from workers. We got a reaction from the International Union of Operating Engineers who said that the act “puts the interests of energy workers at the forefront of a low-carbon economy.” We heard from the president of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers who said that this act shows the government’s “commitment to protecting good-paying, highly skilled jobs.” Canada’s Building Trades Unions welcomed the bill, saying that the consultation built into this process would “ensure workers are front and centre during this transition”.

Just to be clear for the Leader of the Opposition, these are the workers who actually wear steel-toed boots every day.

I could go on, but I know that the party opposite does not put much stock in what workers want. Why would they, when their leader has spent his entire career trying to bust unions and the workers who were in them? If they will not listen to workers, maybe they will listen to industry.

The president of the Business Council of Alberta 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”. He also said that the act would help “equip [Canada] with the skills for the jobs of our future economy”.

From Clean Energy Canada: “deliverables and measurements for success while coordinating across the many federal departments... [a] commitment to centring indigenous voices”.

I could quote more leaders from industry, but then the Leader of the Opposition also has no respect for the people spearheading our resource industries after he said, “I meet with resource companies when they come to Ottawa, and all they do is suck up to the [Liberal] government. They have no backbone and no courage”.

I could list a slew of support that this legislation has from leaders in the climate and environmental sector, but I think I will go out on a limb and say that the party opposite probably does not hold much for them either, which begs the questions then: Who are they listening to? If it is not unions, if it is not workers, if it is not industry, if it is not business, Lord knows it is not science, and it is not environmentalists, then who are they listening to?

I will commend their efforts though. When the opposition decides to fight for something for no good reason, they will do it with so much conviction and creativity that we might think they have an actual cause.

After question period, I look forward to getting into the 14 pages of this piece of legislation, which, in effect, says that workers should be heard. What are the opposition members afraid of? Workers in the oil and gas sector in my riding, in my province, have told me time and time again that they will no longer be left out. They will not longer be marginalized. They will no longer be rage farms. On my watch, they will be included.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

• (1400)

[English]

GEORGE GARRETT

Mr. Ken Hardie (Fleetwood—Port Kells, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, metro Vancouver has lost yet another media legend, George Garrett. Known far and wide as the intrepid reporter, George passed away on March 18 at the age of 89.

George was legendary for many reasons, not the least of which was his incredible Rolodex of contacts with personal phone numbers for police, prosecutors and politicians, including mine.

He was legendary for his disarmingly friendly and gentlemanly demeanour. George could charm his way into gathering new scoops that kept CKNW, his radio home for 43 years, way out in front of the pack of press and broadcast reporters. He had a unique balance. He was tough, but as I experienced personally, one could always trust that one would get a fair shake from George, which is why people would answer when he called.

George received many awards, but I think the biggest one was the respect and admiration of his peers and of his community leaders alike. Now, when news reporting is more important than ever, we should all hope to see more like him.

* * *

COST OF LIVING

Mr. Dean Allison (Niagara West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, last weekend, I was out door knocking in my riding of Niagara West, and next door, in the riding of Hamilton East—Stoney Creek was our Conservative candidate Ned Kuruc.

The topic that came up most was the cost of living. Folks at the doors said that the basics are getting too expensive and that things are getting worse. Many cannot pay their monthly bills. They are getting further and further behind. It is difficult to pay the mortgage. It is difficult to pay the rent. Grocery prices are through the roof. Gas prices continue to go up. Utility bills for home heating are getting ridiculous. When all is said and done, paycheques do not cover the bills at the end of the month.

Most people said that the policies of the Liberal government and the Prime Minister have put them in the financial position they are in. Higher carbon taxes, inflation caused by reckless spending and high interest rates all create the perfect storm to drain the family budget. However, if we were to ask those guys across the aisle, they would deny causing any of it. It is mind-boggling. They have been in government for more than eight years, and they are responsible for all of it.

For my constituents of Niagara West, the Liberals are just not worth the cost.

* * *

ORAL HEALTH MONTH

Ms. Lisa Hepfner (Hamilton Mountain, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last week, for Oral Health Month, I went to the Gleam Smile Centre in my riding of Hamilton Mountain. I met with owner Julie DiNardo and her daughter Victoria, who operate the clinic as independent dental hygienists.

Treatments at Gleam help patients manage mouth bacteria and avoid trips to the dentist for expensive fillings, replacement crowns, implants and gum surgery. Less harmful bacteria in the mouth means better outcomes and lower health care costs.

Perhaps, even more importantly, healthy mouths improve general health. Good dental hygiene means lower risks for adverse preg-

Statements by Members

nancy outcomes, unstable diabetes, Alzheimer's, cardiovascular diseases and some cancers, just to name a few. Our Canada dental care plan is making it easier for people of Hamilton Mountain and people across the country to get access to this life-changing care.

I send a huge shout-out, massive props and effusive thanks to all oral health professionals across the country.

* * *

[Translation]

COMPREHENSIVE AND PROGRESSIVE AGREEMENT FOR TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Montarville, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this year, Canada will be chairing the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership, or CPTPP.

Among the goals it has set for its mandate is the development of a path forward on accession that involves considering whether applicant economies meet the standards set out in the agreement, comply with their trade commitments and have the consensus of all signatory nations.

Taiwan, which applied in September 2021, clearly meets the criteria for becoming a member of the CPTPP. Taiwan is a reliable trade partner with which Canada has signed an investment promotion and protection arrangement, and it is a robust democracy that shares many of our values.

In our opinion, Taiwan deserves a place in the CPTPP as well as in other international organizations, such as the International Civil Aviation Organization and the World Health Organization, and adding it as a member would benefit these organizations and the world in general.

Canada must insist that accession to the CPTPP be approved based on the established criteria, not on pressure exerted by some applicant economies, such as the People's Republic of China, on certain member nations.

* * *

[English]

ORGAN AND TISSUE DONATION

Mr. Marc Serré (Nickel Belt, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, April is Be a Donor Month. Communities and advocates across Ontario are encouraging people to register for organ and tissue donation.

There are more than four million people across the province who have already registered, starting in my riding of Nickel Belt. One organ donor can save eight lives, enhancing the lives of up to 75 people through tissue donation. Currently, about 1,300 people in Ontario are waiting for a life-saving organ transplant.

Statements by Members

● (1405)

[Translation]

On April 7, we marked Green Shirt Day in order to pay tribute to Logan Boulet, who became an organ donor following the tragic Humboldt Broncos bus accident in 2018.

I would like to thank Logan and all those who have given the gift of life. I would also like to thank the volunteers and staff at the Trillium Gift of Life Network for their work, as well as Canadian Blood Services of Greater Sudbury for its ongoing awareness activities.

* * *

[English]

SIKH HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan (Calgary Forest Lawn, CPC): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of common-sense Conservatives, we wish all Sikhs across Canada a happy Sikh Heritage Month and a very happy Vaisakhi.

To be a Sikh is to always courageously stand up for justice and humbly serve society's most vulnerable. It is to be a beacon of hope and to be uplifting, like a lighthouse, to help others to safety. It is to selflessly serve others above all else by the grace of God. Canada hosts the largest Sikh diaspora in the world, and we recognize the immense contributions of Sikhs to Canada through their seva.

Organizations such as the Dashmesh Culture Centre in Calgary, the Guru Nanak Food Bank in Surrey and Khalsa Aid truly embody the teachings of the Khalsa. For generations, Sikhs have added the wealth of their history and traditions to our communities, strengthening the bonds of freedom and prosperity that have made Canada so great. Conservatives share the deep-rooted values of faith, family and freedom with the Sikh community.

I wish all members a happy Sikh Heritage Month.

Vaisakhi diyan lakh lakh vadhaiyan.

* * *

JAY WILLIAMS

Ms. Jean Yip (Scarborough—Agincourt, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, recently, Scarborough faced the loss of a beloved educator and community leader. The news of Jay Williams' death at the age of 40 is a tragic loss for the community.

Jay Williams was an educator with the Toronto District School Board, most recently working with the TDSB's Centre of Excellence for Black Student Achievement to develop strategies to dismantle anti-Black racism in schools. He grew up in the Malvern area and will be remembered as a beloved teacher at several middle schools across Scarborough. As a teacher, he focused on making the classroom experience more culturally relevant to Black students. He started clubs, coached sports and served as a role model to thousands of teenagers in Scarborough.

My condolences go out to Jay's family, including his mother, Senator Paulette Senior, and his father, Ron Williams. He will truly be missed.

WORLD PARKINSON'S DAY

Mr. Ben Carr (Winnipeg South Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today marks World Parkinson's Day. In Canada alone, more than 100,000 people live with the disease, and there are hundreds of thousands more Canadians who are friends, family and caregivers of those living with Parkinson's. They are deeply impacted, too.

Recently, my own family suffered a great loss with the passing of my uncle Robert, my dad's brother, following a 20-year courageous battle with Parkinson's.

Last week, my colleague, the member for Milton, and I joined his dad Joe, my cousin David, Tim Hague of U-Turn Parkinson's, Kyle Connor of the Winnipeg Jets and others to raise awareness as the Jets played in front of a sold-out home crowd. Thanks in large part to the leadership of Kevin Donnelly and Mark Chipman from the Jets' organization, nearly \$100,000 was raised at that game to help U-Turn Parkinson's deliver services with a focus on physical activity to support those impacted.

I am proud that U-Turn Parkinson's operates in my riding of Winnipeg South Centre. I am incredibly grateful to the Winnipeg Jets, and people such as the member for Milton's dad, Joe, and my uncle Robert, for their courage and commitment to ensuring more Canadians learn about this debilitating disease.

* * *

MALCOLM MONTGOMERY

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as members of the House, we are all given the remarkable gift of having our words etched in time. I believe the highest honour we can bestow upon someone is to say their name in the House.

I rise today to speak of my dear friend and longest-serving staff member Malcolm Montgomery, who passed away in November after 31 years of service to Parliament. He was my first campaign chair and a big reason a riding held by Liberals for over 80 years fell to the upstart of the Canadian Alliance.

Malcolm put in long hours and put up with a demanding boss because he was filled with passion. He was passionate about politics, policy and Parliament. He was passionate about Canada, Canadians and our history. He was passionate about his community, his friends and above all his family: his wife Debbie and his children, Gord, Cameron and Neil.

To meet Malcolm was to experience the full force of his enthusiasm for life. While Malcolm is no longer with us, the House will remember him eternally.

Statements by Members

● (1410)

[English]

WORLD PARKINSON'S DAY

Mr. Adam van Koeverden (Milton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, ever since my dad Joe's Parkinson's diagnosis, he has made it his personal mission to improve the lives of Canadians living with Parkinson's disease.

When he moved to Winnipeg, he met the legendary Tim Hague from U-Turn Parkinson's. It uses physical activity programs to improve the daily lives of people living with Parkinson's disease. My dad is also a huge Winnipeg Jets fan, and it turns out that the Jets' top scorer, Kyle Connor, also has a family connection to Parkinson's disease.

Through the leadership of Kyle, Kevin Donnelly, Mark Chipman and everyone at True North Sports and Entertainment, the Winnipeg Jets supported U-Turn Parkinson's with its fifty-fifty raffle draw last week. I was able to join with my colleague, the MP for Winnipeg South Centre, to watch the Jets clinch their playoff spot. My buddy even leant me his favourite Teemu Selanne jersey, and we participated in the cheque presentation of almost \$100,000 to U-Turn Parkinson's.

Today, I am wishing everybody in the PD community a productive and happy World Parkinson's Day, and I hope the advocacy continues throughout April. I thank Tim Hague and U-Turn Parkinson's for everything they do for people living with Parkinson's, and I thank the Jets for being awesome corporate sport citizens. I wish them luck in the playoffs.

* * *

[Translation]

CARBON TAX

Mr. Richard Lehoux (Beauce, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after eight years, the costly Bloc-Liberal coalition is not worth the cost. This coalition continues to display contempt for farmers by radically increasing the carbon tax and voting to amend our common-sense Bill C-234.

From the outset, this government has shown Canadians that it simply does not see farming as a priority. In my opinion, it is simple: no farmers, no food.

Farmers are being ignored in favour of a higher and higher carbon tax on heating their buildings, drying their grain and feeding our cities. I am talking about government regulations and taxes. As the Journal de Montréal reported this morning, carbon pricing in Quebec is adding to the cost burden faced by farmers. Unfortunately, the carbon tax is not the only thing that is crushing our farmers. The government's failure to enhance support programs for farmers is also taking a toll.

The Conservatives will continue to fight and support farmers, starting with passing Bill C-234 in its original form in order to lower the cost of food and help our farmers stay afloat.

CARBON TAX

Mr. Kevin Waugh (Saskatoon—Grasswood, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the government just slapped Canadians with a 23% carbon tax increase on April 1. It did this while food banks are servicing a record number of hungry Canadians and farmers are struggling to keep up with crippling taxes. The government needs to pass Bill C-234 in its original form to remove the carbon tax on farmers and help bring down the cost of food for all Canadians.

Conservatives have sent a letter to the Prime Minister with three demands to fix the budget. Common-sense Conservatives will not agree to support the budget unless Liberals axe the tax, build homes and cap spending with a dollar-for-dollar rule to bring down interest rates and inflation. The government must find a dollar of savings for every dollar of spending.

The Prime Minister is not worth the cost.

* * *

LABRADOR

Ms. Yvonne Jones (Labrador, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as members know, I am a proud Labradorian and Canadian. This year marks a significant milestone as we pay tribute to the Labrador flag and its 50-year legacy, a testament to our shared identity and resilience as Labradorians.

It is with deep appreciation that we commend Michael and Patricia Martin of Cartwright, Labrador, who, 50 years ago, had the innovation and foresight to create the enduring symbol of Labrador pride. Since its inception, the Labrador flag has transcended boundaries, embodying unity, remembrance and celebration of Labradorians across the globe. Its iconic design and vibrant colours serve as a constant reminder of our collective heritage and the unwavering spirit of Labradorians.

Today, we rejoice in 50 years of the Labrador flag. Labradorians join me in thanking Pat and Mike Martin for this wonderful gift and to say: fly the Labrador flag with pride.

* * *

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Ms. Niki Ashton (Churchill—Keewatinook Aski, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the nightmare in Gaza continues.

Over 33,000 Palestinians have been killed, including over 14,500 children. Families have gathered for Eid. They have gathered in the rubble, hungry, and mourning their loved ones who have been killed.

Oral Questions

Just last week, we were horrified by Israel's killing of seven workers with World Central Kitchen, including one Canadian. More than 200 aid workers have been killed by Israel. It is clear that the Netanyahu far right government will continue the killing, in large part because of the complicity and the empty words of countries like ours.

We are witnessing a dystopian nightmare that is all too real, with AI drones and cold-blooded calculations of how many innocent civilians it is okay to kill at one time. We now hear that former prime minister Stephen Harper heads up one of the AI firms used by Israel.

We are also hearing about Canadian tax-deductible charities that are fuelling the war on Gaza. Canada must end its complicity on all fronts. It starts with recognizing Palestine as a state, including full membership at the UN, bringing in a real two-way arms embargo. It means taking a stand against genocide and standing up for peace and justice.

* * *

• (1415)

[Translation]

TAIWAN

Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Quebec cares about its relations with Taiwan.

We announced last December the opening of an office in Montreal, which will undoubtedly facilitate exchanges between this fascinating, technologically advanced nation—particularly in the field of semiconductors—and our city, which a great sovereignist premier, Bernard Landry, once saw as a leader in this same field.

The Bloc Québécois unreservedly supports Taiwan's entry into the Trans-Pacific Partnership. While we had and continue to have reservations about the substance of this massive trade deal, any nation wishing to take part in such a pact should be able to do so as long as it meets the admission criteria.

Another of Quebec's great sovereignist premiers, Jacques Parizeau, was fond of saying that a country's size mattered little as long as the country belonged to a large marketplace. This small island will prove an invaluable asset in the global supply chain, and the entire world will be the better for it.

* * *

[English]

FINANCE

Mr. Mel Arnold (North Okanagan—Shuswap, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after eight years, the Prime Minister has shamelessly delivered record high deficits, driving up inflation and causing sky-high interest rates. His government has doubled rent, mortgage payments and down payments. Food banks received a record 2 million visits in a single month last year, and a million more are expected to use food banks this year. He has added more to the national debt than all previous prime ministers combined.

While life has gotten worse for Canadians, the PM is spending more than ever. Now, a leading economist says that rate cuts may be delayed because of high government spending. We saw that this week, when the Bank of Canada held its rate in efforts to maintain its policy of quantitative tightening.

Canadians are seeing that the Prime Minister is not worth the cost. Will the Prime Minister cap his spending with a dollar-for-dollar rule and bring down interest rates and inflation, or will he continue to make Canadians pay for his failures?

* * *

[Translation]

TWO LEBANESE PHILANTHROPISTS

Mr. Fayçal El-Khoury (Laval—Les Îles, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Bishop Ibrahim Ibrahim and Abou Fayssal, a Lebanese businessman who helms an association industrialists from Zahlé and the Beqaa, are leading humanitarians in their country. These men care about the environment. They have planted 128,000 trees for the sole purpose of protecting the environment, and they will continue to do so.

Philanthropists dedicated to providing humanitarian assistance, Bishop Ibrahim Ibrahim and Mr. Fayssal offer support to widows and orphans. They pay hospital bills for the poor and offer medical equipment to their regional hospital that treats people in need free of charge. They are recognized for their creativity.

[English]

As I am a chair for the Canada-Lebanon Friendship Group, I thank both of them.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[English]

CARBON PRICING

Ms. Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we already know that the Prime Minister is not worth the cost, and after eight years, the Prime Minister is no longer even listening to Canadians. There is a 23% carbon tax hike when Canadians cannot afford to eat. Yesterday, the House passed a Conservative common-sense motion calling on the Prime Minister to convene an emergency televised carbon tax meeting with all 14 premiers. The Prime Minister is hiding, but maybe someone over there can tell us this: What day will the televised carbon tax meeting be?

Oral Questions

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today, we are debating Bill C-50, the sustainable jobs act. The Royal Bank of Canada says there are 400,000 jobs that would come to Canadians if we were just to unlock the kind of prosperity envisaged in this very progressive piece of legislation. Instead, the Conservatives put forward 20,000 amendments generated by artificial intelligence. The robo-caucus needs to stop its robo-work with its robo-amendments and stop gatekeeping the opportunities that are coming to Canadians.

• (1420)

Ms. Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this is false, and that was not an answer.

Canadians need relief, not more Liberal taxes. Seventy per cent of Canadians are now saying so. One in 10 people in Toronto is now relying on a food bank, and more than half of Canadians are \$200 away from missing their bills. If the Liberals are not going to listen to Canadians and if they are not going to give us a date, can the member tell us what channel the carbon tax meeting will be on?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the channel is that they should be plugged into, but it is the reality channel. Back here in the real world, there are real jobs at stake; there are real opportunities at stake, and there is affordability at stake. These members of the robo-caucus with its robo-amendments are in the way of opportunity and the way of progress and clean technology in this country. They need to get out of the way, stop the gatekeeping and let Canadians create the wealth that we need to succeed.

Ms. Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, once again, the member did not answer the question. I am not really sure what that was. He will not listen to Canadians; the Liberals will not listen to their NDP caucus. The Prime Minister will not listen to his successor, Mark Carney, who also wants him to meet with premiers. They will not give us a date, they will not give us a time, and they will not tell us what channel to watch. The Prime Minister will not even show up here in answer to this motion. The Prime Minister is being defiant when Canadians are lining up at food banks in record numbers. What are they covering for?

Hon. Anita Anand (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has repeatedly said he is all ears and, if there is a better plan, to put it on the table. Premier Moe himself said that this is the most cost-effective plan, and that is why our government will keep going with it while maintaining our AAA credit rating, while maintaining the lowest deb-to-GDP ratio in the G7 and while maintaining historically low unemployment. On this side of the House, we will always vote with Canadians and support them along the way.

* * *

[Translation]

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mrs. Dominique Vien (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after eight years of this Prime Minister, we have a passport crisis on our hands, violent crime is on the rise, the cost of housing has doubled, millions of people are using food

banks, and criminals are cozy at home. What a fabulous record. Quebeckers are suffering because of his mismanagement. What is more, he is interfering in provincial jurisdictions.

Will he listen to the Premier of Quebec, who is asking him to mind his own business?

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Public Services and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, during his entire tenure, six affordable housing units were built for the entire country when the opposition leader was the minister responsible for housing.

With the collaboration of the Government of Quebec and the leadership of Quebec's municipalities, 8,000 affordable housing units will be built over the next few months. I would like to invite my colleague, the member for Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, to join me for a visit to the Bois  des Fillion project being carried out by L vis' municipal housing office. This project alone involves 23 affordable housing units, three times more than were built when her leader was the minister responsible for housing.

Mrs. Dominique Vien (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—L vis, CPC): Mr. Speaker, to the already overly long list of this Liberal government's failures, we can add extravagant use of public funds and squandering of Quebeckers' dollars. This government spends Canadians' money like water. For the past eight years, it has had no budgetary discipline, causing the debt to double. It has not balanced a single budget, yet it wants to handle provincial issues. Quebec Premier Fran ois Legault has made it clear that this government needs to mind its own business.

Will it listen, yes or no?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let us talk about a former premier of Quebec, Mr. Charest, with whom this member served and voted in favour of a price on pollution.

I think the hypocrisy coming from the other side of the House is quite striking, especially in a context where, today, we are talking about the 400,000 jobs that could be created in Canada thanks to green technologies and the new economy. This member is against these opportunities in battery plants in Quebec.

Be that as it may, on our side of the House, we support opportunities for Quebeckers.

Oral Questions

● (1425)

HOUSING

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille (Salaberry—Suroît, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the housing issue proves that we must prevent the federal government from meddling in Quebec's areas of jurisdiction. When the federal level decides where the money goes, Quebecers get ripped off, and the numbers from CMHC prove that without a doubt. Since the national housing strategy was created in 2019, what share of the funding has Quebec received when the federal government is choosing the projects? Do members know? The answer is 6.7%. That is not even a third of our fair share.

Will the government stop shortchanging Quebecers and transfer housing money to Quebec, no strings attached?

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Public Services and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have already talked about the Conservative leader's six housing units. Now I want to talk about the 8,000 housing units that will be built with the leadership and partnership of the Quebec government and Quebec municipalities.

The member for Salaberry—Suroît is surely already familiar with the Maison Péladeau project in her riding, with 48 affordable, accessible housing units that are also adapted to climate change. Those units will greatly improve the lives of dozens of people in her riding.

I would love to go visit this housing project with her and highlight how important our collaboration with the Quebec government is for these people in her riding.

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille (Salaberry—Suroît, BQ): Mr. Speaker, although Quebecers make up 22% of the population, we received 6.7% of federal housing investments when the projects were chosen by Ottawa. It does not take a math genius to realize that we are getting ripped off.

Since 2019, the money has gone mostly to funding projects outside Quebec. We are in the midst of a full-on housing crisis and our tax dollars are being spent to house Ontarians, when we can no longer even pay rent here at home.

Is it clear now why we need to keep Ottawa as far away as possible from our exclusive jurisdiction over housing?

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Public Services and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Bloc Québécois may not like the idea of co-operating with the Quebec government. However, a scant few weeks ago we signed an agreement to build 8,000 affordable housing units, which represents the largest investment in affordable housing ever seen in the history of Quebec.

That is because the Quebec and federal governments are working together to invest two times \$900 million to give Quebecers and all other Canadians the affordable housing they need.

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Montreal has experienced its largest rent increase in 30 years. This is a true crisis, and it is making it difficult for Montrealers to put a roof over their heads. What is the Liberal government's solution? It is to set aside a mere 35% of the Well-

ington Basin project's units for affordable public housing, meaning that two-thirds of the housing units built will be unaffordable.

Here is a simple question: Why use public land to build housing units that Quebecers cannot afford?

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Public Services and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to hear my colleague's question, which once again shows the contrast between this government and the previous one.

In 2017, we put in place the first national housing strategy in this country's history, which stands in stark contrast with what the Conservative leader did when he was housing minister. During his entire mandate, he built six affordable housing units for the entire country.

* * *

[English]

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Ms. Lindsay Mathyssen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the women and men in the Canadian Armed Forces have faced a military housing shortage for decades. Under both the Liberals and Conservatives, military housing has not been built; existing units are falling into disrepair. Now the Liberals want our armed forces to wait another two years before they even start building homes. This delay is unacceptable.

Why is the minister delaying building urgently needed homes for the men and women who serve our country?

Hon. Bill Blair (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, making sure that we provide adequate supports, particularly for housing and child care, is absolutely essential for us to support the men and women who serve in the Canadian Armed Forces.

That is why, in our recently released defence policy, we have included a substantial investment of over \$300 million to build housing. That work has begun and will continue apace.

I look forward to working with all members of the defence committee as we bring forward important new initiatives to support the men and women of the Canadian Armed Forces.

* * *

● (1430)

CARBON PRICING

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Regina—Qu'Appelle, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is just not worth the cost. Now his carbon tax scheme is completely falling apart.

Oral Questions

First, his own budget watchdog proved conclusively that most Canadians are worse off, even with the rebate. Then he was humiliated into granting a partial carve-out, because his Liberal MPs were sick of the backlash they were getting from their voters. Now a majority of premiers are demanding an emergency carbon tax conference to put forward better ideas than his punishing tax.

If the Prime Minister is so sure that his carbon tax is good, then why does he not just sit down and listen to the premiers?

Hon. Jonathan Wilkinson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, later today we will be voting to advance the sustainable jobs bill. It is a critically important bill in the context of growing an economy that will thrive in a low-carbon future. It will ensure that workers and environmental organizations have a seat at the table when we are discussing Canada's green economic plan.

The Conservatives have obstructed at every turn, including by introducing 20,000 robo-amendments. We are building a strong economy for the future. The Conservatives, by contrast, are engaging in legislative vandalism.

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Regina—Qu'Appelle, CPC): Mr. Speaker, none of that is true.

What is true is that yesterday, in a historic vote, a majority of MPs demanded that the Prime Minister sit down and just listen to the premiers. It baffles understanding that he is so afraid of meeting with them. It is not as though they are going to ask him to put together Ikea furniture or help them move. They just want to put forward better ideas than hiking prices on everything.

What is he so afraid of? Is it Doug? Is it Blaine? I know Scott Moe. He is a really nice guy. Why does the Prime Minister not just meet with him?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Scott Moe said that he sat down and pored over the data and could not possibly find a more effective way to combat GHG emissions than our Liberal government's policy on pricing pollution.

Right now, today, in the House, we are discussing untold employment and economic opportunity for Canadians, including the people of Regina—Qu'Appelle. If the member will not stand up for the workers of Regina—Qu'Appelle, we will.

Mr. Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I invite the government House leader to come out to Regina. Scott Moe and I could have a beer with him, and we could figure out what Scott really said about the carbon tax.

Just last week, the Prime Minister raised the carbon tax by 23%. That increased the price of gas, groceries and home heating for all Canadians. I am unsure of why the Prime Minister is so scared to meet with all the premiers. Six, seven, eight premiers want to meet with the Prime Minister to see what he has to say about his flagship carbon tax policy.

Why will he not listen? Does he just not care?

Hon. Marci Ien (Minister for Women and Gender Equality and Youth, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let us talk about caring, young people and affordability, if we may.

Young people said they needed a break on interest and student loans. We did that. Kids getting out of school can save towards their first home with the home savings account, which 500,000 young people now have. Now rent payments will build credit history, because when people pay rent, it should count.

Young people have asked, and we have answered. What do you have to say? What are you going to cut? Are you going to cut these measures?

The Speaker: I will remind members that all questions should come through the Chair and not go directly to other members.

The hon. member for Regina—Lewvan.

Mr. Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, one of the first things we are going to cut is about 70 or 80 Liberal MPs in the next election.

Second, nine out of 10 young Canadians believe they will never own a home under the Liberal government. It is embarrassing. Canadians used to be able to pay off a home in 25 years, and now it takes 25 years to save for a down payment.

The Prime Minister refuses to listen to our premiers. If he is so proud of his carbon tax, will the *Coward of the County* come out of his house and actually meet with premiers?

• (1435)

The Speaker: I would like to remind all members, as the Speaker has made this point before, that it is important not to call into question any member's courage.

The hon. Minister of Labour and Seniors.

Hon. Seamus O'Regan (Minister of Labour and Seniors, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on this issue, it is very important to listen to constituents.

I would like to quote Danielle from Foothills. She said, "I do my family's taxes, so I know we got \$808.50. We get an extra little bump for me and my husband because we live in a rural environment. When I go back and look at what I spent last year in carbon taxes, because I was working from home, I wasn't commuting, my gas bills were way down, and even the amount of tax that I paid on my home heating [bills]... we're principally natural gas where I live, I would say that I probably ended up better off with that transfer."

Oral Questions

We should listen to constituents, like Danielle of Foothills, Alberta.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has spent the last two weeks reminding Canadians of the disasters he has caused over the past eight years, including passports, immigration, EI backlogs, inflation, interest rates, doubling of rents and more.

Yesterday, his Liberal MPs voted unanimously against the common-sense Conservative motion that the House adopted, calling on him to convene a first ministers meeting. The last meeting was all the way back in 2016.

Will he organize this meeting, or would he rather continue interfering in every domain without meeting with the provinces? What is he afraid of?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians who are tuning in, and we here on this side of the House, hear the voice of inaction.

What the people at home understand is that inaction does not a strategy make. Inaction is not a plan, nor is it an option.

On this side of the House, we have proposed a plan for Canadians: invest in more housing, invest in day care, invest in jobs, invest in growth.

We will let the Conservatives keep sloganeering. On our side of the House, we are focused on the issues that matter to Canadians.

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after eight years of this government, let us examine its record.

Housing costs have doubled. Immigration wait times are interminable. Over 800,000 Quebecers are using food banks every month. Our streets are less and less safe. Violent crime is on the rise.

The kicker is that the Prime Minister now wants to impose his incompetence on the provinces. That is like handing our front-door key to the crooks who just burgled our home.

Will the Prime Minister admit that he is not even competent enough to manage his own government and that he should just mind his own business?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if my colleague wants to talk about crooks, how about we talk about the climate crooks on the other side of the House?

If the Conservative member wants to know the benefits of putting a price on carbon, he can easily find out. All he has to do is turn around and talk to the member behind him. She was part of the first government in North America to put a price on pollution, because that is the right thing to do. It is the right thing for the economy. It is the right thing for fighting climate change. It is the right thing for Canadians.

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Ms. Christine Normandin (Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, immigration minister Christine Fréchette reiterated the Quebec government's modest demands.

There is nothing spectacular or over-the-top about them. The minister is not asking for full powers over immigration; she is asking for the bare minimum. What she is asking for is a fair distribution of asylum seekers among the provinces, reimbursement of the costs associated with taking in asylum seekers, and adequate funding for French integration classes. I do not think that is too much to ask for.

Is the government going to agree to Quebec's requests, or are we about to end up with another of the squabbles the Liberals are so fond of?

Hon. Marc Miller (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what I agreed on with Minister Fréchette, when I met with her two weeks ago, was that we would exercise our full powers in our respective areas of jurisdiction under the Canada-Quebec agreement, in a reasonable and reasoned manner. This is what I intend to do with her in the months to come.

Canadians and Quebecers will be well served as a result.

Ms. Christine Normandin (Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, their discussions are going so well that the Government of Quebec is thinking of holding a referendum on immigration.

The truth is that Quebec is so fed up with having the government laugh in its face that it is thinking of reaching out to the people. Considering the federal government's incompetence when it comes to managing its responsibilities, we all know that things would work a lot better if Quebec had full powers.

Is the minister going to respond to Minister Fréchette's highly reasonable requests, or would he rather wait for Quebec's entire population to vote on the federal government's immigration incompetence?

• (1440)

Hon. Marc Miller (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, obviously, no country in the world would hand over all its powers to someone else. I agreed with Minister Fréchette that we would exercise our respective responsibilities in our areas of jurisdiction in order to serve Quebecers effectively. That is what I intend to do. That is what the minister intends to do as well.

* * *

JUSTICE

Mr. Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the French prime minister is visiting Canada and Quebec. We all know the special ties Quebec has with that great country, the cradle of human rights and secularism. While monarchists here proudly sing *God Save the King* and the tragic history of the Acadians is trampled underfoot, I believe there is an opportunity to remind France that we still share some of the same democratic values.

Will the government pledge not to contribute in any way, directly or indirectly, to the challenge to Bill 21 on Quebec state secularism?

Hon. Arif Virani (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have mentioned on several occasions, and as the Prime Minister himself has already mentioned, when Bill 21 goes to the Supreme Court, if it goes there, we will be there to intervene to defend the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and to defend rights like freedom of expression, the right to equality and freedom of religion.

* * *

[English]

CARBON PRICING

Mrs. Laila Goodridge (Fort McMurray—Cold Lake, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after eight years of the NDP-Liberal government, the Prime Minister is not worth the cost, but do not take my word for it.

Heather from Newbury writes, “People need the cost of living brought under control now.” Carol from Strathroy says, “One more tax will take us down. We’re already struggling.” To the average Canadian, the cost of the carbon tax on gas, groceries, home heating, farmers and families is punishing, not progress.

Will the Prime Minister axe the tax on farmers and help make food cheaper by passing Bill C-234 in its original form?

Hon. Seamus O’Regan (Minister of Labour and Seniors, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would allow Danielle from Foothills to continue with her comments. She also added, “I would say that I probably ended up better off with that transfer.” She also said, “[so] I think a lot of people would be of the view that if you are going to implement some kind of revenue-neutral carbon pricing, that’s probably not a bad way of doing it.” These are the words of Danielle from Foothills.

I am happy to inform Danielle that two and a half years later since she made that comment, it is now up to \$1,800 for a family of four in Alberta.

Mrs. Laila Goodridge (Fort McMurray—Cold Lake, CPC): Mr. Speaker, even the NDP-Liberal environment chair admitted that the carbon tax has no impact on climate change, yet just last week, the Prime Minister increased the carbon tax by 23%, driving up the cost of gas, groceries and home heating. If farmers cannot afford to grow food, the government has failed. Let me remind everyone that if there are no farms, there is no food.

Will the Prime Minister help bring the cost of food down for Canadians, axe the tax on farmers and pass Bill C-234 in its original form?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, instead of opposing battery plants, instead of standing up against sustainable jobs, that member and her caucus should remember that the vast majority of the fuels farmers use are tax exempt under the pollution pricing strategy. Farmers in the country are supported big time by adjustment policies, because they know, more than anyone, that climate change is a reality.

Oral Questions

With respect to Bill C-234, that member should walk down to the front bench and tell her opposition House leader that he should call Bill C-234 and we will resolve it.

Mr. Dan Mazier (Dauphin—Swan River—Neepawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the NDP-Liberal government is just not worth the cost.

Last week, the Prime Minister increased the carbon tax by 23%, driving up the cost of gas, groceries and home heating. However, on Tuesday, the Liberal environment chair revealed that there was no proof that the carbon tax reduced emissions, saying “there is no data specifically stating that the price on carbon resulted in an x amount of reduction in greenhouse gas emissions.”

Now that the carbon tax scam has been exposed by a Liberal, will the Prime Minister finally axe the tax?

• (1445)

Hon. Jonathan Wilkinson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House are focused on making life more affordable for Canadians, but also on fighting climate change. The PBO and 200 economists across the country have been very clear that eight out of 10 Canadian families get more money back. It works disproportionate to income.

Even the Conservatives actually used to know this before they got collective amnesia. Every one of the members on that side of the House ran in 2021 on a promise to put in place a price on carbon pollution. The hypocrisy that comes from that side of the House is unbelievable.

* * *

INFRASTRUCTURE

Ms. Lori Idlout (Nunavut, NDP): *Uqaqtittiji*, first nations and Inuit have been neglected by successive Liberal and Conservative governments for years. They have underfunded infrastructure for first nations by \$350 billion. For Inuit, the gap is \$75 billion.

The Liberals committed to closing this gap by 2030, but they are nowhere near their target. This means more mouldy homes, more crumbling schools and more contaminated water.

When will the Liberals fulfill their obligations to first nations and Inuit by closing this infrastructure gap?

Mrs. Jenica Atwin (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indigenous Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for her advocacy in the House.

Oral Questions

We thank the Assembly of First Nations for its partnership. We actually worked together with it on this report, and we welcome the important recommendations it brought forward.

We know decades of underinvestment and discrimination have led to this infrastructure deficit, which is indeed a crisis for indigenous peoples across this country.

Our government has put a stop to this, with record investments, by dramatically increasing up to 1,100% since 2016. We are taking action to close the infrastructure gap and we will not stop until it is done.

* * *

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Mr. Taylor Bachrach (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Mr. Speaker, there are many residential school survivors and family members of murdered and missing indigenous women and girls in British Columbia who are non-status. This week, they are learning that their access to counselling is being cut-off because the Liberals, like the Conservatives before them, are underfunding first nations' health. These are community members who have experienced serious trauma and for whom counselling is a key part of their healing journey.

Why is the government denying survivors access to critical counselling?

Hon. Gary Anandasangaree (Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, violence against indigenous women, girls, two-spirit and gender-diverse people must be put to an end. After the previous government dragged its feet for years, we called a national inquiry. We have an action plan that was co-developed with indigenous partners. We made progress.

For example, we built 12 new cell towers along the Highway of Tears in British Columbia and new shelters for indigenous women. We are supporting frontline indigenous victims services and 36 indigenous-led policing services. We will continue to do more.

* * *

INNOVATION, SCIENCE AND INDUSTRY

Ms. Valerie Bradford (Kitchener South—Hespeler, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians know better than to trust the Conservatives' failed policies. On this side of the House, our government is focused on creating more good jobs, including in innovation and technology.

Last week, in my riding of Kitchener South—Hespeler, I was pleased to be with our government when we announced new measures from the upcoming budget 2024 to secure Canada's AI advantage.

Could the President of the Treasury Board please update the House on our government's announcement on AI?

Hon. Anita Anand (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for her hard work.

Last week, our government announced \$2.4 billion to support artificial intelligence across the country. That means more infrastructure for AI researchers, that means more innovative AI solutions for

small and medium-sized businesses, that means the creation of an AI institute and that means the responsible use of AI across the country.

Unlike the Conservatives who deny science, we will always support an innovative economy.

* * *

[Translation]

INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Bernard Généreux (Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after eight years of this Liberal government, life is more expensive and Quebecers are paying the price. The cost of housing has doubled. The lineups at food banks are longer than ever.

While Quebecers struggle to put food on the table because of his incompetence, the Prime Minister insists on interfering in provincial jurisdictions. Clearly this government is not worth the cost.

Will this Prime Minister steer clear of provincial jurisdictions and allow Quebec to repair the damage?

• (1450)

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have no lessons to learn from the Conservatives.

We have a plan to create more housing in the country. We have a plan to create more jobs in the country. We have a plan to create prosperity in the country. What they have across the way are slogans. People at home know that slogans do not create housing. Slogans do not create jobs. Slogans do not create prosperity.

On this side of the House, we are going to focus on issues that matter to Canadians and we will leave the Conservatives to come up with more slogans. Canadians know which side we are on. We are with them.

Mr. Bernard Généreux (Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, CPC): Mr. Speaker, eight years of this Liberal government have yielded a broken immigration system, an unsustainable cost of living, extremely high crime rates and millions of suffering Canadians. Not only is this Prime Minister causing problems in every aspect of Canadians' lives, he is increasingly encroaching on provincial jurisdictions too. Quebecers understand that this Prime Minister is not worth the cost.

Can the Prime Minister please stop spreading his incompetence around and just mind his own business?

Oral Questions

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Public Services and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, minding our own business means investing in child care, investing in housing, investing in high-speed Internet. It also means investing to make sure that children in my colleague's riding go to school on a full stomach.

That is why, last week, we announced an investment that will help 400,000 children, including several hundred in my colleague's riding, go to school on a full stomach so that they can learn and reach their full potential.

Unfortunately, the Conservatives will vote against that when it comes time to vote on the budget.

Mr. Richard Martel (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after eight long years, the Prime Minister is not worth the cost. Food banks can no longer keep up with demand. The cost of rent and mortgages has doubled. The dream of buying a first home is almost unattainable for young Canadians. After eight years of federal encroachment on provincial jurisdictions, Quebecers' quality of life has declined.

Can the Prime Minister please stop imposing his incompetence on the provinces and mind his own business?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like the member and all Quebec Conservative members to talk to their leader, because their leader is standing in the way of the 400,000 jobs that could be created across Canada thanks to green technologies. For example, the battery industry will create tens of thousands of jobs in Quebec.

The member knows very well that Quebec will prosper in a green economy. He should tell his leader to stop standing in the way of progress.

Mr. Richard Martel (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we have only to think of ArriveCAN, the borders, passports, EI, the deficit. The list is a long one. Everything is broken. After eight years, the Prime Minister has failed on every level. Everything the Prime Minister touches fails, and now he is adding insult to injury by encroaching on Quebec's jurisdictions.

Can the Prime Minister please mind his own business and let Quebec make its own decisions?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think my colleague must have had amnesia for a while. It was our government that arranged the largest private investment in the history of Quebec. Let us not forget Northvolt, an investment that will support economic development for this and future generations.

While we are doing that, we are also investing in child care. We are investing in housing. We are investing in mental health. We are investing in prosperity. We are investing in Canada. We are investing in Canadians, and we will continue to invest in Canadians.

* * *

HOUSING

Mr. Xavier Barsalou-Duval (Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the federal government is not

helping solve the housing crisis; it is simply stretching it out over time.

Ottawa could just transfer the housing money to Quebec. That would be simple enough. Instead, the Liberals have chosen to attach conditions to the infrastructure program, supposedly to force the provinces to build housing faster. As a result, not only is housing construction slowing down, Ottawa is paralyzing the construction of infrastructure such as water systems. It wants to see door-knobs first, running water later.

Does the minister realize that his plan is putting the cart before the horse?

• (1455)

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Public Services and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member is correct to raise the importance of investing in drinking water infrastructure, waste water treatment and many other things. That is why, just a few days ago, we announced an investment of an additional \$6 billion to support municipalities in building the infrastructure that will help us in Quebec, for one, to build the 8,000 housing units that we have already planned with the Quebec government. Its partnership and leadership are absolutely essential.

This is obviously a contrast to the six housing units the Conservative leader created when he was minister responsible for housing.

Mr. Xavier Barsalou-Duval (Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals have a lot of nerve. Instead of being helpful, they decided to be contemptuous and blackmail us with our own money, just like the Conservatives proposed.

Quebec's housing minister was clear this week. She said it was out of the question for Quebec to agree to any conditions to get its fair share of a community funding envelope. Quebec cities do not fall under Ottawa's jurisdiction.

Will the minister commit to guaranteeing Quebec its right to opt out with full compensation?

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Public Services and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member is quite right to refer to the Conservative leader as an insulting leader. It is true that he insulted all Quebec municipalities, including the people of Quebec City.

It is also true that just a few weeks ago, with the leadership of Quebec City, we announced the construction of 324 affordable housing units. That number of 324 units is 54 times more than all the affordable housing created by the Conservative leader when he was housing minister.

*Oral Questions**[English]***CARBON PRICING**

Mrs. Laila Goodridge (Fort McMurray—Cold Lake, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after eight years, Canadians are struggling to make ends meet due to the Liberal-NDP's crippling carbon taxes. They are all economic pain and no environmental gain. Just last week, the Prime Minister increased the carbon tax by 23%, further driving up the cost of gas, groceries and home heating.

The least the Liberals could do is take the carbon tax off the farmers who feed us, which would in turn lower the cost of food.

Will the Prime Minister axe the tax on farmers and make food cheaper for Canadians by passing Bill C-234 in its original form?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-234 was here, then it went to the Senate. Conservative senators threatened a bunch of other senators who wanted to debate the bill. The bill is now back in this House, and it is completely up to the leader—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order.

The hon. government House leader.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, it is rather impolite to interrupt the people answering questions, as the members across the way know.

Bill C-234, put very simply, can be brought to the floor of the House on the simple whim of the Leader of the Opposition. The member should actually talk to him.

* * *

DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS

Mr. Kyle Seeback (Dufferin—Caledon, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after eight years of the NDP-Liberal government, Canadians are well versed in its corruption.

Sadly, it is worse: bombshell testimony on Beijing's interference in Canadian elections. A senior Liberal disclosed top secret information to the then-Liberal MP for Don Valley North, that he was being watched by CSIS. This was a despicable breach of national security for Liberal partisan gain, and only very high-ranking Liberals would have access to this information, a cabinet minister or a senior Liberal.

Who is the person? They must give us the Liberal name.

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Minister of Public Safety, Democratic Institutions and Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we worked collaboratively with all of the opposition parties last summer to set up an independent judicial inquiry into foreign interference. There have been a number of weeks of public testimony, including this week.

We did not think that, in the terms of reference, we had to put a line that would say that we should have basic respect for the integrity and independence of the commission process, not to comment on every day's appearances but to let the justice do her work. We look forward to her report on this important issue.

Mr. Kyle Seeback (Dufferin—Caledon, CPC): Mr. Speaker, there is no decency or respect, when a senior Liberal, either a cabinet minister or a senior Liberal staffer, disclosed top secret CSIS information for Liberal gain. It is despicable. It gets worse. It compromised CSIS work and put Liberal partisan gain over national security, and the Prime Minister must have known.

When did the Prime Minister find out, and when did he call in the RCMP to investigate, or were the briefing documents just a bit too long so he did not read them?

● (1500)

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Minister of Public Safety, Democratic Institutions and Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again, my colleague can repeat a series of allegations. We do not think that this is particularly constructive, when a senior court of appeal justice is seized with this very matter. She is hearing evidence from witnesses, interviewing in camera all of the relevant officials, and receiving all of the most classified documents.

Why does my hon. friend not allow her to do the work and not continually repeat and interfere in the middle of her hearings?

* * *

[Translation]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Ms. Viviane Lapointe (Sudbury, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada has been standing by Ukraine since the start of Putin's illegal invasion. We have provided military support and aid to Ukraine. We are working with our allies and our partners around the world, but we must not forget that this is not the first time Russia has been the aggressor against Ukraine.

Can the Minister of Foreign Affairs reaffirm our long-term commitment to Ukraine?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for her important question. Ukraine is Europe's front line. The Ukrainians have been fighting for our freedom and, of course, for their own. We know that Putin does not have a red line. If he wins in Ukraine, he will keep going. That is why we must support Ukraine. It is about our security and global security.

That is why we concluded a new \$3-billion agreement with Ukraine for its long-term security. We have stood with them from the start and we will continue to stand with them, even after Ukraine's victory.

[English]

PUBLIC SERVICES AND PROCUREMENT

Mrs. Kelly Block (Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after eight years of the NDP-Liberal government, we see historic levels of corruption. Conservatives have uncovered a tangled web of chaos, collusion and cover-ups in the arrive scam scandal, just the latest example of Liberal insiders' getting rich.

GC Strategies opened its doors when the current Prime Minister took office. This place will make history when it summons GC Strategies to the bar to answer our questions.

Why did the Prime Minister make these scamsters multi-millionaires?

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Minister of Public Safety, Democratic Institutions and Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again, our colleague's repeating something does not make it factual. She knows very well that the Auditor General has looked into these matters. We have welcomed parliamentary committee reviews. People have been available, including senior government officials, to go before a parliamentary committee—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: I am going to ask all members to please restrain themselves. There were a couple of very loud interventions while the minister was speaking. It is hard for me to hear the answer. Sometimes it is difficult to hear the question.

I know I could identify the members, but they are hon. members. I ask them to please hold their comments back.

The hon. minister.

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, the Canada Border Services Agency is conducting internal reviews on the matter. The RCMP is also looking into the questions. We have said that anybody who has misused or abused taxpayers' funds will be held accountable, and we look forward to the processes' coming to their conclusion.

Mr. Larry Brock (Brantford—Brant, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is not worth the cost or corruption. In the past year, the government has spent over \$21 billion on outside consultants. Rather than helping struggling Canadians, he is focused on making Liberal insiders richer. It is no shock that the Liberal-favoured GC Strategies, which pocketed \$20 million for doing nothing on arrive scam, was founded in the same year he took office.

Will the Prime Minister commit to cutting all waste and corruption in the upcoming budget, or will he continue to make more Liberal insiders rich?

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Minister of Public Safety, Democratic Institutions and Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as my colleague knows, the Minister of Public Services and Procurement, the President of the Treasury Board and I, as the minister responsible for the Canada Border Services Agency, have already taken steps to reduce reliance on outside consultants. We have reviewed and changed the process for approving these kinds of contracts.

Oral Questions

We will continue to look at everything necessary to ensure that taxpayers' money is well spent. The people who are responsible for these decisions know they will be held accountable in the case of misuse or abuse.

• (1505)

Mr. Larry Brock (Brantford—Brant, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I hope the government holds itself accountable.

The arrive scam merely scratches the surface of the rot and corruption in the NDP-Liberal government. Its procurement system is seriously flawed and broken. For example, it paid KPMG, a consulting company, almost 700,000 taxpayer dollars to learn how to cut back on consultants. One cannot make up this lunacy. It has learned nothing.

The question is simple: In the budget next week, will we see a cut to all of the corruption?

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Public Services and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as our colleague, the Minister of Public Safety, has said repeatedly, repeating falsehoods does not make those falsehoods true. What the members opposite should know, however, is that the Auditor General tabled an important report just a few weeks ago, which found that rules were not followed by a few public servants. Fortunately, many of these rules have been updated, and regulations and expectations around the use of those rules have been clearly communicated to all relevant public servants.

* * *

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Francesco Sorbara (Vaughan—Woodbridge, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, workers in Vaughan—Woodbridge and across the country have been clear that the sustainable jobs act is critical to ensuring they have the tools and skills they need to build up our net-zero future, from greener buildings to electric vehicles and clean energy. The tens of thousands of Conservative amendments on this legislation are designed to block this bill and block workers from getting a seat at the table.

Can the Minister of Energy tell the House why we are here fighting for workers today?

Speaker's Ruling

Hon. Jonathan Wilkinson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today we are in the House fighting for workers and communities in Canada, so we can create sustainable jobs moving forward. We will grow the economy and we will fight climate change. Standing in the way of workers is the Conservative leader, a proud supporter of notorious anti-worker legislation, including Bill C-377 and Bill C-525. His plan for Canada is to cut investments, to let our economy fall behind and to let the planet burn.

Our plan will ensure we are building an economy in which Canadian workers and Canadian communities will win, and we will vote as many times as it takes to get it done.

* * *

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Ms. Heather McPherson (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today I met with Mansour Shouman, a Palestinian Canadian who risked his life to report on the devastation and horror of the war in Gaza. Weeks ago, the Liberals promised to stop selling military goods to Netanyahu and to sanction extremists. As innocent children continue to die, the Liberals have not issued export notices or announced sanctions. This is a betrayal of the hundreds of thousands of Canadians who want peace for Palestinians and Israelis.

We need a two-way arms embargo and sanctions. How many more people will die before the government acts?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first and foremost I would like to say that I have talked to the mother of Mansour Shouman many times, as he was obviously struggling in Gaza, and we made sure that he could come safely back home, working with the Minister of Immigration on this very issue.

Second, on the question of Israel, Hamas and the war, of course we know that the situation in Gaza is completely catastrophic and the violence must stop. We need a ceasefire now. We need to make sure that hostages are released. We need humanitarian aid to go in, and my colleague already knows that when it comes to arms, we have not sent arms—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Kitchener Centre has the floor.

* * *

HOUSING

Mr. Mike Morrice (Kitchener Centre, GP): Mr. Speaker, it has been two years since the government committed \$1.5 billion to build co-op housing across the country, yet two years later, instead of returning to annual predictable investments in deeply affordable co-op housing, this one-time program has not even launched. Instead, last week we heard more announcements while thousands of shovel-ready co-op projects are still waiting.

What is the point of making announcements, if they are not going to spend the money, and when will the minister commit to these much-needed co-op homes being built?

• (1510)

Mr. Peter Fragiskatos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, whether it is co-op housing, missing middle housing, duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes or mid-rise apartments, the focus of the government is building more and dealing with that crisis in supply. This is what the government is seized with.

In fact, I recently met with the federation responsible for co-op housing and its advocacy in this country. They remarked how happy they were with the progress that has been made. Of course, there is more to do, but lifting the GST off that type of construction is something that I point out to the member as well. There is a larger context here, as well, to pay attention to. We are getting it done. We are getting that work done. We are going to see more building.

* * *

PRIVILEGE**ALLEGED PREMATURE DISCLOSURE OF BILL C-63—SPEAKER'S RULING**

The Speaker: I am now ready to rule on the question of privilege raised on February 26, 2024, by the House leader of the official opposition, concerning the alleged premature disclosure of Bill C-63, an act to enact the online harms act, to amend the Criminal Code, the Canadian Human Rights Act and an act respecting the mandatory reporting of Internet child pornography by persons who provide an Internet service and to make consequential and related amendments to other acts.

The opposition House leader claimed that the bill's contents had been leaked to the media, as evidenced in two separate reports from CBC and CTV News. Pointing to the anonymous quotes in the news reports, he concluded his remarks by positing that the information was leaked intentionally, knowing that it was wrong. In doing so, it breached the rights of members of Parliament and the House.

For his part, the parliamentary secretary to the government House leader countered that the envisioned legislation's objectives were widely known and already in the public domain long before the bill was placed on notice and introduced, given the government's prior commitments and extensive public consultations. Furthermore, the parliamentary secretary emphatically rejected the allegations that the government had shared the bill before it was introduced.

[*Translation*]

The House leader of the official opposition is correct in asserting that there are abundant precedents that once a bill is placed on notice, its contents are not to be disclosed prior to introduction, thus ensuring that members have the first opportunity to take note of the bill. The premature disclosure of bills has usually been seen as a contempt of the House.

[*English*]

I will invite MPs to please take their conversations outside of the House, including the member for Scarborough—Guildwood.

[Translation]

In a ruling on October 4, 2010, which can be found at page 4711 of the Debates, Speaker Milliken stated, and I quote:

It is indisputable that it is a well-established practice and accepted convention that this House has the right of first access to the text of bills it will consider.

[English]

On the substantive matter raised in this question of privilege, as members know, the policy direction leading to a government bill is not typically developed in the strict isolation of a government department. Prior to the putting on notice and introduction of most modern legislation, extensive consultations and public debate frequently occur for months or even years. Past precedents from the Chair address this reality, and Bill C-63 seems to be another example of that pattern.

On June 8, 2017, Speaker Regan emphasized the need for balance between members' right to have the first opportunity to see the bill and the need for prior public consultation. He said, at page 12320 of the Debates:

The right of the House to first access to legislation is one of our oldest conventions. It does and must, however, coexist with the need of governments to consult widely, with the public and stakeholders alike, on issues and policies in the preparation of legislation.

[Translation]

In the same ruling, Speaker Regan indicated that the denial of a premature disclosure of the bill by the government, and the absence of evidence that members were impeded in the performance of their parliamentary duties, had led him to find that the matter was not a prima facie case of privilege.

Having reviewed the contents of the bill against what was reported in the media, and considering the assurance given by the parliamentary secretary that the government did not share the text of the bill between its placement on notice and its introduction, it cannot be determined that the information that appeared in the news media necessarily came from a premature disclosure of the bill by so-called senior government sources.

• (1515)

[English]

The title of the bill, combined with the various sources of information mentioned above, such as background information provided during the consultation process, could have easily informed as to the specific objectives of the bill. There is a plausible argument to be made that the scope, objectives and targets of the bill were known prior to its being placed on notice and introduced.

Not being able to say with certainty that the information in the media reports came from the bill itself, I cannot determine that any member was impeded in the carrying out of their parliamentary duties, or that the dignity of the House was transgressed. As such, the Chair cannot find that there is a prima facie question of privilege.

[Translation]

That being said, the Chair shares the members' concerns when detailed information on proposed legislation, whether accurate or not, appears in media stories prior to their introduction.

Business of the House

It casts doubt on the role and predominance of Parliament in the legislative process and may lead to—

[English]

Order. I am going to remind all members that one of the fundamental rules of being a member and being a Speaker in this House is that members are not to question or to insult the Speaker, unless they are doing it through a motion which would call into question the Speaker's role. I would like to remind all members about this fundamental rule. I know that I have had some conversations with members in the past about this.

[Translation]

I will continue.

It casts doubt on the role and predominance of Parliament in the legislative process and may lead to understandable frustration.

I thank all members for their attention.

* * *

[English]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Regina—Qu'Appelle, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure there is any point in asking the Thursday question, because the calendar seems to change at a moment's notice, but if the government House leader would like to give us something we can hope for next week, I will let him do so now.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, with whom we have, of course, ongoing co-operation and good work.

I can assure the hon. member that we will continue today with the report stage of Bill C-50, the sustainable jobs act, despite the 20,000 automated, AI-generated robo-amendments that the Conservatives put up to obstruct this bill. We will take up third reading debate on that bill on Monday.

On Tuesday, we will commence second reading debate on Bill C-64, an act respecting pharmacare.

The budget presentation will take place later that afternoon, at 4 p.m., with the first day of debate on the budget taking place on Thursday of next week.

[Translation]

On Wednesday, we hope to resume debate on second reading of Bill C-61, an act respecting water, source water, drinking water, wastewater and related infrastructure on first nation lands.

Government Orders

Lastly, on Friday, we will resume debate on the motion in relation to the amendments made by the Senate to Bill C-29, an act to provide for the establishment of a national council for reconciliation.

I thank all members for their co-operation.

* * *

[English]

PRIVILEGE

GOVERNMENT RESPONSES TO ORDER PAPER QUESTIONS

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): I am rising on the question of privilege with respect to the government's response to my question on the Order Paper.

On February 14, I submitted an Order Paper question, Question No. 2340, seeking an answer to the following:

With regard to federal investments in Canada's grocery sector since January 1, 2006: how much federal funding has been provided to (i) Loblaws, (ii) Metro, (iii) Walmart, (iv) Sobeys, (v) Costco, broken down by company, year, and type of funding?

On Monday, the government tabled its response to my written question stating that "with regard to federal investments in Canada's grocery sector since January 1, 2006, no federal funding has been provided to" those companies I listed above.

That answer was provided by the Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, and it contains his signature. However, we know that this answer is disingenuous.

On April 9, 2019, it was reported that Loblaws received \$12 million to install new energy-efficient refrigerators. That money was doled out as a part of the low-carbon economy challenge champion stream, a part of the low-carbon economy leadership fund. That certainly sounds like a type of federal funding to which my question very specifically sought an answer about. Catherine McKenna, the Liberal environment minister at the time, was even quoted in the media defending the government's decision to award this enormous sum of money to Loblaws.

In light of this, it is abundantly clear that the government's response provided by the Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry is inaccurate and misleading to Parliament. The spirit of my written question was to find out how many federal tax dollars had been doled out to some of the wealthiest corporations in the country, companies that have been price-gouging Canadians when they shop for food to feed themselves. I should note that this was my second attempt at seeking an answer to this important question. The earlier attempt, having been in the form of a written question, was submitted back on December 12, 2023, to which I received the exact same disingenuous response.

Clearly, this is evidence of a problem. Why does the government believe it can mislead parliamentarians with impunity?

A lot of my work, and indeed the work of all members of Parliament, in this place very much depends on truthful and accurate answers to our questions. It is what allows us to be able to do our jobs not only to hold the government to account but also to appropriately represent our constituents.

I hope, in light of this intervention, that the Chair will review this serious matter and will make the appropriate ruling to prevent this from happening in the future.

• (1520)

The Speaker: I thank the member for Cowichan—Malahat—Langford for his intervention on this question of privilege. The Chair has duly noted his question of privilege and will come back to the House in due time.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

CANADIAN SUSTAINABLE JOBS ACT

The House resumed consideration of 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, as reported (with amendments) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

Hon. Seamus O'Regan (Minister of Labour and Seniors, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have to say that, when I proposed this bill back when I was the minister of natural resources, the objective being that workers should have a seat at the table when major issues are being discussed like the transitions that are occurring within our economy, most especially the energy economy, I had no idea that Conservatives would have their staff put up some 20,000 amendments to the bill.

That is 20,000 amendments on a 14-page bill. I do not know what AI or CPC GPT they are using, but it is astounding to me that the Conservatives would go through this much trouble to stop something that I think is so astonishingly simple. When they were forced to admit that this stunt perhaps went a little too far even for them, they settled on a mere 200 amendments, which I understand is going to keep us occupied for some time.

What are these very serious and meaningful changes? The Conservatives have created and inserted dozens of random and conflicting dates into the legislation. They amend the same lines repeatedly. They delete entire clauses. As if to prove that they favour slogans over substance, they have even included some of their leader's favourite slogans into the legal text.

I am sure that these 200 amendments are very important, so important that they could not have been done at committee, by picking up the phone or by working with us over the months preceding this. I am sure these changes to the bill will help the member for Provencher finally enjoy his strawberry milkshakes again, as he testified at committee. I hear that the renewable energy industry, the one that employs 430,000 Canadians and has brought in tens of billions of dollars in investments for our country, is starting to make his strawberry milkshakes not as tasty.

Government Orders

I doubt these amendments will do what the party opposite really wants, that they will somehow reverse climate change and erase this booming, multi-trillion dollar renewable energy industry that is frankly an inconvenient truth to the opposition. They are meant to keep workers out of this conversation, out of this important dialogue that we are having about the future of our economy.

I am a member of Parliament from Newfoundland and Labrador. We are a proud oil-producing province that depends on our oil revenues for some 50% of our provincial budget. It is important to me and it is important to people out my way that we get this right, because we have skin in the game.

For those who may have missed it, I am happy to say that the provincial legislature of Newfoundland and Labrador, our House of Assembly, is the only jurisdiction in North America to unanimously vote for net zero. It made business sense. It sent the right signals to the business community. It sent the right signal to investors, and it is working. It did that unanimously.

I am proud of my province's offshore industry. I am prouder still to say that representatives of oil companies and their suppliers rebranded their association from the Newfoundland and Labrador Oil and Gas Industries Association, NOIA, to become Energy NL. That is so it can talk not just about oil and gas, which is so tremendously important to our province, but also about hydrogen, renewables and hydroelectricity and how they mix together.

The expertise that workers have gained from any one of these industries lends itself so well to so many of these other industries. It is indeed our competitive advantage. During COVID and during a time when we also suffered an oil price war, which occurred because of Saudi Arabia and Russia, so many workers in my riding and jurisdiction said they wanted to have a seat at the table. They wanted to have some say in their future.

In these 14 pages, we would create a table, put them at the head of it and say we will listen to their advice, and that is it. Why does this warrant 20,000 amendments? Even whittled down to 200, why does this occupy the productivity and precious time of members of the House? It is utter and complete nonsense. It is malarkey. It is important that this bill go through. There is nothing, I say to members of the House, to be afraid of. Listen to workers and include them.

• (1525)

Mr. Clifford Small (Coast of Bays—Central—Notre Dame, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I listened to my hon. colleague across the way from Newfoundland and Labrador who was once the minister of natural resources. Since 2015, we have already had 5,000 jobs transition out of our offshore oil and gas industry under that minister's watch. Studies show that peak oil will not happen until well beyond 2030, yet the Liberal government invested over \$30 billion in battery plants that will use lithium that will have to come from China.

Are those battery plants going to bring back the Newfoundlanders and Labradorians who have had to travel to Borneo, Brazil and the Ivory Coast? Will those battery plants bring those Newfoundlanders and Labradorians back from foreign countries, workers who the government has forced to become international rotational workers?

Hon. Seamus O'Regan: Mr. Speaker, I would never speak in such a disparaging tone about the proud Newfoundland and Labrador energy and oil and gas workers who travel the world because they are the best at what they do. They often get paid more money and have greater opportunities. They have, because of this industry, the ability to live at home in Newfoundland and Labrador and travel the world to where they are paid the best and where they are attracted. There is nothing wrong with that. In fact, I am proud of it.

It employs many Newfoundlanders and Labradorians right now. When I go to Argentia and Placentia Bay in Newfoundland and look out at a gravity-based structure that is being built by Newfoundlanders and Labradorians right now, as it stands proudly right next to the biggest monopile marshalling port on the eastern seaboard, do not tell me we cannot have our cake and eat it too. I will take opportunity everywhere I can find it.

• (1530)

Mrs. Laila Goodridge (Fort McMurray—Cold Lake, CPC): Madam Speaker, what is malarkey is the fact that the government thinks it knows best and that it should be able to turn off the taps to oil and gas in this country.

What I do not understand is the fact that in the eighties, when the federal government decided to shut down the Atlantic fisheries and do that transition, those workers came right to my home province of Alberta. We welcomed them with open arms. The fact that the minister now wants to shut down those jobs is absolutely shameful.

What does he say to the Newfoundlanders and Labradorians who came to Fort McMurray to work in the oil sands in the eighties when the Liberal government shut down the fisheries?

Hon. Seamus O'Regan: Madam Speaker, it did not happen in the 1980s. I can tell that member that some of us remember exactly where we were in July 1992 when that happened.

Let me add something else, first and foremost, we have developed an expertise in Newfoundland and Labrador in the offshore that not only this government but every Newfoundlander and Labradorian is extremely proud of. We will continue to grow that industry as we welcome new and better opportunities. We will not stand in its way. We will listen to workers.

I ask this member to please tell me where in the bill some dictum comes down from on high. We are creating a table, we are putting workers at the head of that table, and we are saying that we will listen to their advice, full stop.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Christine Normandin (Saint-Jean, BQ): Madam Speaker, in its initial version, the bill would have been a huge encroachment on Quebec's jurisdictions.

Government Orders

The Bloc Québécois gave them the benefit of the doubt and thought it might have been a mistake. We therefore proposed amendments to make adjustments and achieve a certain level of asymmetry in the bill. However, we soon realized that it was not a mistake, because the Liberals blocked our proposals to make the bill more fair to Quebec.

Is this simply a prelude to the budget and a teaser of intrusive budgetary measures we are seeing?

[English]

Hon. Seamus O'Regan: Madam Speaker, I would also add that while I am very proud of the fact that Quebec has such a low-emitting and predominantly hydroelectric economy, there are workers in other parts of this country, predominately in my province and the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, who worry about the future.

They worry about the future of an industry that is changing internationally. I would say to hon. members to not stand in the way of jobs and prosperity, because regardless of what we think in the House, the world of energy is changing. We need to grasp the opportunities that are there. There is nothing that any of us can say or do that will stand in its way. What will make a difference is the number of jobs and the prosperity that we create in an international phenomenon that is called net zero.

Mrs. Laila Goodridge (Fort McMurray—Cold Lake, CPC): Madam Speaker, my family has called Fort McMurray home for over 50 years. My dad's family moved to Fort McMurray in the 1970s to make a better life for themselves, and shortly after moving to Fort McMurray, my grandfather got a job at a place called Syncrude, working to build the extraction plant in anticipation of first oil. My dad, Gord, proudly worked at Syncrude, securing Canada's energy future, for 42 years. He started in 1978 right after graduation and right before first oil, and he stayed until his retirement. He had three careers within that time: first as a machinist, as a process operator, and, finally, he found his passion in operations integrity and safety.

I eventually followed in my dad's footsteps. Through university, I took summer student jobs at Syncrude, learning about extraction, maintenance, health and safety, governance, oil sands and so much more. After university, I started working at North American Construction Group in the mining division within the health and safety department. It was such a wonderful experience. I was able to work on so many different job sites throughout the region, wearing steel-toed boots and having dirty fingernails. I absolutely loved my time there.

I had a first-hand opportunity to see how seriously this industry took health and safety, environmental responsibilities and to see the role it played in not only Fort McMurray's and Alberta's economy but also the Canadian economy. I had the opportunity to meet thousands of hard-working, wonderful people from all across Canada and the world who decided to come to my hometown, to make it their hometown, to work in the oil sands and to make a better life for their families.

My community and the industry that drives it have been a beacon of hope for so many people for so long. In the eighties and the nineties, thousands of Atlantic Canadians flocked to Fort McMur-

ray after the coal mines were shut down in Cape Breton and after the fisheries collapsed. Thousands of people came. They became my friends, my family and my neighbours. They are some of the most amazing people. However, they came to Fort McMurray not by choice, but because some government thought it knew best.

Now, after eight years of the Liberal-NDP government, my community is struggling. Eco-radicals now sit around a cabinet table and advocate against Canada's world-class energy industry at every turn. They have made no attempt to even hide their distaste for oil and gas. The Prime Minister has stated on three separate occasions now that there is no business case for Canadian LNG. That is shameful.

The anti-energy agenda of the government has been consistent and punishing over the last eight years: anti-energy messaging, delays, arbitrary and inconsistent regulatory conditions and, frankly, an outright veto of approved export pipelines. It has pushed forward with anti-energy legislation at every turn, including the "no more pipelines" bill, Bill C-69. Despite universal provincial opposition, it decided it was going to go ahead with it. Despite the fact that it did not have jurisdiction, it decided it was going to go ahead with it. Frankly, the part that really hurts with that bill, particularly, is the Liberal government knew that if the oil could not be moved and was landlocked, it could not be produced. That was its sneaky way of shutting down oil without shutting down oil.

Canada should and could be the world's energy producer and supplier of choice and could be the place of energy security and self-sufficiency. Canada could be completely energy self-sufficient if government could get out of the way. However, ut time and time again, the Liberals continue to put ideology and partisanship above supporting our economy or even reality. They have failed to understand that these are hard-working people. These are our neighbours, our friends, and they work hard every single day.

● (1535)

Politicians in this chamber do not mince their words when it comes to speaking in disdain of this industry. In fact, the member for Timmins—James Bay even went so far as to table legislation to make it illegal to say anything supportive of the oil and gas industry, including true and verifiable facts, which would be punishable by massive fines and up to and including jail time. In fact, if his bill were to pass, saying something that is true and verifiable, such as that natural gas is cleaner burning than coal, would be illegal.

That is insane, yet the NDP-Liberal coalition continues pushing its agenda and continues pushing forward with this bill. I have not heard any members from the Liberals or the NDP denounce this insane bill, Bill C-50, because they probably support it, and that is why we are so fearful of everything the government does when it comes to energy.

Government Orders

I wish politicians could simply be honest about the outcomes of their policies, not wordsmithing, not negotiating, and not transition while calling it somehow “just”. We need to accept in this chamber and across the country that Canadian oil and gas jobs are sustainable jobs.

The Liberal just transition is a dangerous government-mandated plan to kill 170,000 Canadian jobs and risks the livelihood of 2.7 million Canadians.

This bill, Bill C-50, is a step, actually more like a leap, toward Soviet-style government-central planning. That is exactly what this is going toward. The NDP-Liberal government claims to value Canadian oil and gas, and yet it wants to increase exports. However, after eight years, it has interfered to kill four pipelines, two of which were specifically designed to export off the west and the east coasts.

Do not worry; hope is on the horizon. Conservatives are going to do everything we can to push back against this legislation. The real solution is electing the leader of the official opposition, the member for Carleton, as our next Prime Minister.

Conservatives would make traditional energy and the development of fuels of the future more affordable and accessible to Canadians. Conservatives would fix what the Liberals broke and would keep westerners, and all provinces, in control of their natural resources. We would respect provincial jurisdiction.

• (1540)

[*Translation*]

We will respect provincial jurisdiction over natural resources and in all other cases. It is absolutely essential that provincial jurisdiction over natural resources be respected.

[*English*]

Conservatives would bring approvals up and would bring costs and timelines down to ensure Canadian energy security and self-sufficiency and to increase exports to the world. We need technology, not taxes. We need to support an industry that supports this country.

As I described earlier, to so many Canadians, Fort McMurray was, at one point in time, a beacon of hope, prosperity and a fresh start. To the world's leading oil producers, we are a tough competitor that refuses to lie down, but for far too many elected officials across this country, we are simply a cash cow they can abuse.

To the fringe eco-activists, we are unfortunately the enemy, but to me, Fort McMurray has been, and always will be, home. I was born and raised here, and Conservatives of every stripe, federal, provincial and municipal, have always had our backs. They understand that when Fort McMurray works, Alberta works, and when Alberta works, Canada works.

I will not back down from all the politicians in this chamber who seek to land-lock and firewall our oil sands. Pipelines and energy corridors are items of critical national importance and interest for the long-term viability not only of northeastern Alberta but also of Canada and the world. I urge every member of this chamber to vote against this disastrous bill, Bill C-50.

Ms. Yvonne Jones (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Northern Affairs and to the Minister of National Defence (Northern Defence), Lib.): Madam Speaker, Bill C-50 would really open up the potential of Canada's clean energy agenda. Those who cannot see that are stifling progress in this country. That is what I heard in the speech by the hon. member. Maybe she will agree with the president of the Alberta Federation of Labour or with the president of the Business Council of Alberta, who said that in order to “shape our future and create jobs by providing the resources that the world needs”, we need to have the sustainable jobs act.

People in her province are supporting this proposed act. Many companies are already transitioning. They are giving their workers the skills they need, and I ask the member—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member for Calgary Centre is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Greg McLean: Madam Speaker, I know of the Business Council of Alberta, and I have questioned it on that very stat that the member and her colleagues have brought forward to this floor—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member is questioning a quote that was made. I have no possibility of determining if it is a true quote or not.

The hon. member for Kingston and the Islands is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, the Conservative member who just interrupted, did it knowing full well that it was a debate. He has interrupted the question. I would encourage you to dial the clock back and to allow the member to ask her question from the beginning again.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I will not restart the question, but I will allow the hon. member to finish the question.

Ms. Yvonne Jones: Madam Speaker, just for the record, I would like to quote the president of the Business Council of Alberta and ask the member for Fort McMurray—Cold Lake if she supports the work they are doing when they say, “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”. Everyone in this world sees that there is an opportunity with the clean energy agenda, except the Conservatives, and they offer no alternatives, as the member has just indicated.

Government Orders

• (1545)

Mrs. Laila Goodridge: Madam Speaker, actually, Alberta is the leader when it comes to clean energy in the country, and earlier in her question, before she was interrupted, the member was asking about, and quoting, the AFL president, who is ironically now running for Alberta's NDP, a party that has been very clear about its distaste and dislike of Alberta's oil sands and oil and gas industry. In fact, the Alberta NDP, when it was in government, created an oil sands task force where it appointed Tzeporah Berman, who called my hometown "Mordor", so frankly, I am not going to take a single piece of advice, when it comes to supporting what the AFL is saying, from that side of the House.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Sylvie Bérubé (Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou, BQ): Madam Speaker, my colleague talked about clean energy in Alberta. I do not understand what she means, exactly, because that is not what it looks like when you see the oil flowing in Alberta. Also, it is clear to us, with this bill, that if the Conservatives were in power, there is no guarantee that they would immediately stop increasing fossil fuel production.

I would like my colleague to address these two issues.

Mrs. Laila Goodridge: Madam Speaker, I will say it again. Alberta is a leader when it comes to clean energy here in Canada. We will continue to be a leader if we are allowed to, if the government stops meddling in our provincial affairs and lets us develop our natural resources, which are developed in a truly environmentally friendly way. We will do our best.

However, if the government encroaches on provincial jurisdictions, as suggested in this bill, we will continue to have problems.

[*English*]

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, the only thing that could possibly make a climate activist think this bill was worth more than the paper it was written on is the overreaction from the Conservative benches. Therefore, I would suggest to my Conservative friends that if they would just look at the bill and honestly say that they think it is a nothing burger, then that would also help our side, which wants to see real climate action. We would then ask why we do not go back to the report of the task force on coal sector workers, and bring in really meaningful measures, such as when a coal sector worker or fossil fuel worker is going to lose a job, to make sure they are supported so that they do not have a problem paying the mortgage on their houses and to make sure they get their pensions earlier, and all the principles that were adopted in the work that took place in 2018.

Mrs. Laila Goodridge: Madam Speaker, that is part of the problem. Government should not be deciding which jobs should and should not exist. That should be left to a space where the economy and industry get to work collaboratively to do that, but this is part of the problem. When the Green Party is trying to say to trust it that this is a nothing burger, that raises huge red flags to me because we have heard very clearly that this is a problem.

One of the big problems with Bill C-50, on top of every other big problem in the bill, is the fact that we have not heard from a single witness at committee, because they would just say that they had already studied this, possibly, so they are not going to bring in any

witnesses. As such, we do not even know what the eco-activists think, and we do not know what the industry thinks because they have not actually had an opportunity to come before committee. That becomes a serious problem. As the Liberal government has done, time and time again, it has shirked its responsibility and has stepped on provincial jurisdiction, which means that, when and if the bill gets challenged to the Supreme Court, the Supreme Court justices will not have expert witness testimony to help figure out what the intent of the government was, costing taxpayers valuable money and doing nothing.

Ms. Yvonne Jones (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Northern Affairs and to the Minister of National Defence (Northern Defence), Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to finally rise in the House of Commons to speak to Bill C-50, after eight months of dealing with the bill in committee. I can tell the House that I have never seen such antics being played out by any opposition party on any legislation in my entire life as I have with the Conservatives on the sustainable jobs act, a bill that would do so much to help transition workers in this country at a time when they need it.

One would think that the Conservatives want no Canadians to have opportunities, nor for this country to be a leader in clean energy at home and around the world. We have potential here that very few countries have, which is to be able to develop a clean energy transition and a country that is allowing itself to provide for sustainable jobs today and into the future.

The member opposite talked about the cod moratorium. I lived through the cod moratorium; in fact, I was an employment counsellor who worked with people displaced in the fishing industry. One of the major setbacks was that there was no transition in jobs at that time. There was no plan by the Government of Canada, Progressive Conservative government, to help the thousands of people, including the 20,000 families in my own province, who were affected by the moratorium. They were left to their own devices. They were left to figure out where the next job was going to come from, where the next field of training was going to come from, their next career, and how they were going to feed their families.

Is that what the Conservatives are saying, that we should just let it happen in Canada, let everyone just figure this out and fend for themselves? I do not support that concept, because I have lived through it already once in my life. Let me tell the House this: In the absence of a transition plan for employment opportunities for workers in this country, many will fall through the cracks.

As for every labour union that came before the committee over the course of those months, as the member for Timmins—James Bay said best today, there were representatives of at least six unions who sat before us in the committee, where Conservative members did not allow them to present or speak, nor for the committee to question them.

Conservative members used every possible tactic they could, including bringing in 20,000 amendments to the bill, an 11-page bill, most of it containing standard clauses. The 20,000 amendments were generated not by the intelligence of Canadians but by AI, from a robotic system. That will tell us how connected they are to Canadians who are asking for the legislation and the transition to sustainable jobs.

The Conservatives know it well. They did not even take the time to actually do the research themselves to come up with amendments that would help strengthen the legislation, the opportunity for Canadians and the opportunities for workers. No, they pushed a few buttons on a computer and generated 20,000 amendments so they could stall the bill altogether at the committee stage. That will give us the level of intellect, interest and responsibility that they take—

An hon member: Oh, oh!

● (1550)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): We do not question the intellect or other qualities of members in the House.

The hon. parliamentary secretary.

Ms. Yvonne Jones: Madam Speaker, my apologies, but it is really hard to explain why any political party of the House of Commons today that is elected to represent people would choose to go to a robotic system to generate amendments to important legislation that would govern hundreds of thousands of people in this country, rather than actually do the heavy lifting themselves to meet with people, to actually sit down in a thoughtful way to write amendments that would strengthen the legislation and ensure that Canadians have jobs into the future.

That was not the only thing. The Conservatives also used every opportunity they possible could to stall debate with amendments they were bringing forward. The amendments were not substantial in any way but were to do only thing: hold up the real debate of legislation and disallow many unionized organizations in this country from having the opportunity to sit before committee and give their testimony, answer questions and give their insight into what the legislation would mean.

When workers are transitioning in any industry, whether it is the fishery, oil and gas, manufacturing or technology industry, there has to be a focus for how that transition would work for it to be successful. There have to be real people, not robots, at the table, who would determine what that looks like going forward: how people would be trained, whether programs are available, and how they could find and secure new job opportunities that would pay them well and sustain their family.

We did not see any of that at our committee from the Conservatives, by the way. In fact, all we saw from them were the attempts to bring in robot-generated amendments to bill. To me, that is not a responsible way to deal with the lives of Canadians. I am sorry, but I just do not see how it would do anything to help people in Alberta, Newfoundland and Labrador, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Ontario, Saskatchewan, British Columbia or any of the territories.

Government Orders

It is like phantom policy; that is what they were doing. They were bringing in phantom policies and trying to say they were doing something substantial. All we hear about is what they are going to cut or, the word they like to use, “axe”. They talk about axing taxes. They do not like to talk publicly about the other things they would like to axe, but we see it as they stand to vote against policies in the House of Commons every single day. Policies designed to serve Canadians in times of financial needs, programs like the Canada child benefit, dental, pharmacy and disability benefits and raises for the Canadian Armed Forces members, are all things the Conservatives have voted against. It is no wonder that the Conservatives are not supportive of workers' transitioning in the energy sector in Canada.

When technology came in, when we got computers, we did not get rid of every secretary in every office. They learned how to use the technology. They learned how to grow into the modern-day expectations of the workforce. It is also like when we launch drones in cyberwarfare. The soldiers being trained to use the drones are not the same soldiers being trained for on-the-ground combat. There is a level of transition in every single sector, every single career opportunity that arises, whether it is in the mining sector, the oil and gas sector or the technology sector. There will always be advancements and changes.

Why would someone be against working with Canadian workers to ensure that they have secure employment into the future? It makes absolutely zero sense and has zero logic to me. In fact, all I have seen from the Conservatives on the bill before us has been the fact that they are looking at phantom policies that would do absolutely nothing for workers, and they have been voting down all of the important concepts that would protect workers in the energy sector in Canada.

● (1555)

I live in Newfoundland and Labrador, which is one of the largest areas of oil production and mining production in this country. I can tell the House that producers are transitioning already, with more energy-efficient equipment, by changing out different technologies within their operations, by training workers to use the new technology they are installing to able to become experts in it so they can transfer their skills across a multitude of industry and resource development sectors. Of course Conservatives do not see any of this as being important for Canadians, and that is wrong.

The bill before us would show real accountability and engagement to support Canadians in a low-carbon economy and to seize the opportunities they have available to them. That is the important piece in the legislation. If members support workers in this country, support the unions that represent them and support the resource development sectors, then they will support the legislation.

● (1600)

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC): Madam Speaker, is the member not concerned about, or has she not been able to see, the government's internal memo during the discussions and consultations on the concept of the just transition? However, they are not on Bill C-50, because of course no Canadian will be heard on that.

Government Orders

Is she not concerned about the fact the government's own internal memo said that the result of Bill C-50 and the just transition would be the immediate elimination of 170,000 oil and gas jobs and the disruption of the livelihoods of 2.7 million other Canadians in energy, agriculture, manufacturing, construction and transportation? She is saying to me that is not what it would do, but the government's own internal memo says it would. The Liberals know that already. Is she not concerned about that?

The people of Newfoundland and Labrador should be deeply concerned, since it is the province where oil and gas contributes the most to provincial GDP. Atlantic Canadians and Albertans sure are proud of having built each other's provinces together for the benefit of all Canadians.

Ms. Yvonne Jones: Madam Speaker, what I do know is that Canadian jobs are going to transition whether we bring in the legislation or not, because that is the way the world is. Bringing forward the legislation would allow more stability and security for the workers. That is what the member is missing.

If we go back to the cod moratorium, the Conservative government of the day did not bring in a transition plan, and thousands of families were left without a way to put food on the table or a job to go to. We are not going to gamble on this in the oil and gas industry; we are going to have a firm energy transition so workers will have those jobs and the skills they need to do the work.

What I can tell the member is that the new transition to a greener economy, whether it is transitioning in mining, oil and gas, or whatever sector, would be creating new, high-paying jobs, and the member knows that.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Denis Trudel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, BQ): Madam Speaker, it is always a bit sad when we debate bills that are in any way related to the fight against climate change. We are always witnessing some sort of battle between the Conservatives and the Liberals to see who does the least to fight climate change in this country. It makes absolutely no sense.

I can hear my colleague bragging a bit about her government and how well things are going. However, Canada is the worst country in the G20 when it comes to average greenhouse gas emissions per capita. The Liberals have been in power for eight years. We are the only country in the G20 whose greenhouse gas emissions have increased since the Paris Agreement. I did say that they have increased. We are not even talking about stabilizing them. Canada ranks second in the G20 for public investment in fossil fuels. In short, Canada is a disaster for the environment.

Is my colleague not a little ashamed of the speech she made here today?

[*English*]

Ms. Yvonne Jones: Madam Speaker, I am very proud of the government's record and what we have done. I am very proud of the fact that we have done more to reduce carbon in this country than anyone else. We have invested more in a clean energy transition. We are looking out for workers while we do that. We have invested more in infrastructure to support clean energy in Canada, and we will continue to do that.

For the record, I want to say to the member opposite that many companies, industries and communities have signed on to the environmental plan and are looking for continued investments to ensure that we have a cleaner environment, a greener economy and more opportunity for Canada in the future.

Ms. Lindsay Mathyssen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Madam Speaker, of course, we know this is a small step. It is not the biggest step, but it is a good step in the right direction. The United States has made quite big strides, especially in clean tech. Biden's IRA has created about 170,000 jobs in clean tech, yet in the Canadian clean-tech sector, investment tax credits that have been promised for quite some time have still not been delivered.

The credits will be a step in continuing the work we need to do to support jobs in this new industry, as well as the sustainable jobs that we are talking about today. When will the hon. member's government deliver on the promise of those clean-tech investment tax credits?

• (1605)

Ms. Yvonne Jones: Madam Speaker, I want to remind the member that, before we came into government, there was not even a line item in terms of investment in clean tech. We created that as a government. It is the focus of our economy.

We can see companies such as Braya fuels converting their refinery to renewable diesel, while companies in Nova Scotia and Quebec are doing so much work around clean energy and transitioning to produce other renewables. In Ontario, we can see massive investments in the entirety of the electric vehicle value chain. We are seeing investments in—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Resuming debate, the hon. member for Kelowna—Lake Country.

Mrs. Tracy Gray (Kelowna—Lake Country, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is always a pleasure to rise and speak on behalf of the residents of Kelowna—Lake Country.

This unjust just transition bill is the NDP-Liberal coalition's attack on jobs and Canada's economy. This is important legislation that would drastically affect Canada's economy from coast to coast to coast, and I am glad to have the opportunity to speak for my community and hard-working Canadians.

If the NDP-Liberal government truly cares about expanding the alternative energy sector, then it must realize the vast impact this bill would have on every Canadian when prices continue to rise and jobs disappear. It has provided no data, no details and no proof otherwise.

Government Orders

If this legislation passes, it would accelerate the shutdown of Canada's energy sector, which would result in the loss of 170,000 direct jobs and the displacement of up to 450,000 direct and indirect jobs. It would create a significant disruption to the manufacturing, agricultural, transportation, energy and construction sectors, affecting 2.7 million Canadian jobs. These numbers come right from a document from the Liberal government itself. The document also states that these jobs would be replaced by other jobs. However, there is no proof and no plan as to what they are or if they would have the same pay and benefits as people have now.

We know what the government wants, because the government wrote it down. This is an ideological attack on well-paying jobs. When a manufacturing company cannot buy plastic solvents, lubricants, waxes or other products needed because there is a lack of domestic product from Canada, it will have to import. We need to bring home the good jobs that are leaving the country.

Even before this just transition legislation, the government's actions have already caused mass job losses and billions of dollars of investment leaving Canada. We only have to look at the Supreme Court of Canada calling the anti-energy bill, Bill C-69, unconstitutional. How poorly the government thinks through its legislation.

This unjust bill is causing my community and people across the country to worry about whether their small business will close or whether they will have a paycheque and where it will come from. As such, how can the Liberal-NDP coalition say it cares about Canadians?

I remember, not long ago, when many families living in Kelowna—Lake Country had family members commuting to and from Fort Mac on flights. Both the flights and the jobs are gone. I spoke to a mom, who told me she reluctantly had to go back to work because her husband lost his well-paying job in a senior management position in a resource company. She said they reluctantly had to find child care, and she was not able to volunteer at her kids' school anymore, which broke her heart. Even with both of them working, they were making less than he had made in his one former position.

Leaving workers behind and ending responsible and clean Canadian energy jobs will not improve the world environment. It will only result in our allies buying more dirty oil from foreign dictators. Not only is the Liberal-NDP government supporting Canada having to buy energy from other countries, but it is also supporting countries and dictators that have poor environmental standards, concerning human rights issues and a lack of transparency standards. In 2020, Canada imported \$11.5 billion worth of crude oil, with Saudi Arabia being the top country we imported from. The Liberal government keeps giving away our energy security. We need to bring it home.

This just transition bill is elitist, anti-energy, anti-worker, anti-private sector and anti-free market. It would cause widespread losses of good jobs, as outlined in a government document: 2.7 million jobs. We cannot afford a higher cost of living, especially because Canadians are already suffering under the Prime Minister's government. After eight years of the Liberal government, Canadians are realizing the Prime Minister is just not worth the cost.

Alberta, Canada's largest energy province, has the fear that this just transition bill would dismantle the oil and gas industry. The office of Alberta's energy minister reported that it was not consulted on this. Germany, Japan and Greece all asked for Canada's LNG, yet the Prime Minister turned them down. He said there is no business case. This is absolutely not true.

● (1610)

Business 101 starts with having a need, and the U.S. knows this. In the last five years, it has become one of the largest exporters of LNG. Canada could be supplying our allies around the world rather than having to turn to other countries that do not have the strong environmental, worker rights or human rights standards we do.

Canadians need Canadian energy, and workers are ready to provide it; however, the Prime Minister will not let them. Canada's own energy security is at risk. Canada is at risk of energy poverty. What does the Prime Minister truly think will happen to Canada's economy when one of Canada's main exports is reduced substantially or no longer being exported?

The government is forcing Canada to rely on other countries for energy when we could be self-sufficient, surviving and thriving on our own resources as we find ways to support and expand alternative energy development to make Canada more resilient. We know the radical, career activist Liberal environment minister is all for the just transition. In a shocking move, the minister travelled to Beijing, where there is no carbon tax, to sit as the executive vice-chairman on a body established and controlled by Beijing's Communist Party. The minister should be focused on promoting Canada's energy sector, reducing red tape to ensure that Canada's clean energy, clean LNG, can help countries such as China, which are dependent on coal, to drastically reduce emissions.

At a time when we have had inflation at a 40-year high and continue to have high interest rates, families need the security of a well-paying job. Instead, the NDP-Liberal coalition is guaranteeing the destruction of a powerful paycheque. We are already in an economic crisis, a mental health crisis, an addiction crisis and a housing crisis. Food bank usage is at a record high, and families are struggling to keep food on the table. Like many Conservatives, I will not stand for the Liberals' true goal of shutting down the energy sector and getting to claim positive action from their destruction of Canadian livelihoods and Canada's economy.

Government Orders

Conservatives support the development of Canada's clean energy and support focusing on technological advances. This bill does not mention training or retraining workers for whatever hypothetical jobs the Liberals are alluding to after disrupting 2.7 million jobs. That number is not just about the number of jobs; it is about people and families.

As we are debating this just transition legislation, the Liberal MPs want Canadians not to worry and have them think everything will work out and be just fine, to just trust them on the 2.7 million jobs that will be lost or disrupted. However, Canadians have lost trust in the Liberals.

This is the same government that, through Environment and Climate Change Canada, is implementing single-use plastics prohibition regulations. An up-and-coming Canadian company out of Calgary, Leaf Environmental Products, produces biodegradable, compostable grocery bags. They are banned through the single-use plastics ban, even though they have no plastic in them. They just look like plastic. How ridiculous is that?

Clearly, the government's focus is to bring in legislation and policies that have a nice title but do not consider the ramifications. For the government's just transition plan, the labour minister said at the human resources committee, which I sit on, that he does not like the name "just transition". This legislation has a new term. It is now called the "sustainable jobs act", even though a government document states that there will be 2.7 million Canadian jobs affected, creating significant disruption in multiple industries. Today, in debate, the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands said that it should be called the just transition act because globalist groups call it that, and that is what it is. Putting millions of people out of work while providing no information on the size and scale of the supposed new jobs, making Canada less energy secure, and creating red tape and bureaucratic inefficiencies are not things Canadians need right now. Canadians need hope.

We need to bring home powerful paycheques, investment and development.

• (1615)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the Conservative caucus has come up with this new regime of research called "AI". That was well demonstrated at committee. They actually came up with 20,000-plus amendments to the legislation.

Could the member provide her thoughts on the Conservative Party using that new tool to filibuster good legislation that, ultimately, is going to have a positive impact for the people of Canada and our environment?

Mrs. Tracy Gray: Madam Speaker, I have a number of the amendments here that were proposed. With my limited time, I will list a few of them. The amendments proposed were to ensure access to affordable and reliable energy, ensure a strong export-orientated energy, avoid regulatory duplication and unnecessary delays, and achieve a fair and equitable net zero with a strong social consensus. Those are examples of some of the amendments, brought forth by Conservatives, that were voted down.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Christine Normandin (Saint-Jean, BQ): Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for her remarks and the tone of her speech.

As I mentioned to one of her colleagues earlier today, we appreciate the tone—although we do reserve the right to disagree with the content. We appreciate the tone, especially since it strikes such a sharp contrast with what happened at the Standing Committee on Natural Resources. It was a hapless circus until the wee hours of the morning. The Conservatives were shouting over each other on points of order, to the point where the votes that were taken happened without anyone really understanding what was being voted on. The interpreters' ears must have been hurting for an entire day. It was totally disrespectful.

I would like to know if her colleagues' tone in committee was acceptable to her. It is a stark contrast to what we saw from her today as she spoke to us in the House. She was an exemplary model of calm and composure. That should be the norm for debate in the House.

[*English*]

Mrs. Tracy Gray: Madam Speaker, this is an important piece of legislation. There are a lot of people who are extremely concerned, so it is really important that we get it right. I can appreciate the work my colleagues did at the committee to bring forth recommendations that make sense. I read a number of them here today that absolutely make sense, and they unfortunately were not voted in favour of.

Committee work is very important. It is where the hard work takes place. Sometimes committees take a lot longer, and sometimes we need to make sure that the voices from our communities are heard. It is really important that committees do the hard work. That committee did sit, and I know the members from the Conservative Party were—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): We will continue with questions and comments.

The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): Madam Speaker, when the free trade agreement was signed, Canada's auto sector went from number two in the world to basically 10th or 12th at different points in time. The U.S. has moved forward with the Inflation Reduction Act, through which it is investing billions of dollars over multiple years in battery and electric energy efficiencies for its auto sector.

Government Orders

My concern is with the Conservatives cancelling the projects we have, such as those at the Stellantis project in Windsor, at the Volkswagen plant and others. What is their plan for the auto sector in responding to the United States? They are clearly looking at trying to recapture even more of auto assembly manufacturing for the future, and we need a response to that. What is the Conservative plan? I ask because we are going to lose hundreds of thousands of jobs.

Mrs. Tracy Gray: Madam Speaker, in Canada we have lost hundreds of thousands of jobs in the resource sector. One example is in forestry. Canada has not had a softwood lumber agreement since 2015. We have lost a lot of forestry workers.

We are talking about people transitioning into other jobs, and I am listening to the Liberal representatives talk about that. In my riding, a mill closed and was trying to “transition” people into different jobs. I was talking to mill workers who were saying that mill work was what they wanted to do. It is where their love is, and they do not want to be training for another job. We have to hear those voices when we are talking—

• (1620)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): We have other voices to hear.

Resuming debate, the hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader has the floor.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is interesting that, in the process of passing legislation, we have consistently seen a certain behaviour pattern from the official opposition. That behaviour is dictated by the leader of the Conservative Party. It really is a destructive force. The Conservatives try to, as much as possible, make the House of Commons a dysfunctional place. We see that.

The member just finished saying how a lot of hard work is done at the committee stage. For this particular legislation, and I asked the member about this in a question, there were 20,000-plus amendments to an 11-page bill.

That is not Conservative hard work at play. That is artificial intelligence, AI, being utilized as a weapon of destruction, if I can put it that way, to try to prevent legislation from passing.

I do not quite understand why the Conservative Party does not recognize that climate change is real. At the end of the day, on the legislation the Conservatives are trying to prevent from passing, they should be talking a little more to Gen Z and Gen X. These are the types of jobs that are going to be there in the future.

Members can take a look at what the legislation actually does. What is wrong with forming a council that would provide advice on policy for the government and, ultimately, a five-year action plan? This is such an important issue. It is about transitioning and being able to see those jobs of the future, in multiples of hundreds of thousands. What is wrong with ensuring that there would be a secretariat there to coordinate?

The Conservative Party will pop in to say something, whether here or in committee. Conservatives will filibuster. They will do

whatever they can to prevent legislation from passing. It is interesting.

I invite members to think of Bill C-49. Bill C-49 was the Atlantic accord legislation. The committee just finished it earlier this afternoon, maybe half an hour ago, or however long it was. Do members know how many days and weeks ago we passed this in the House, and how we had to drag the Conservative Party to get the bill out of second reading? The Conservative Party opposed the legislation. Conservatives oppose it because, at the end of the day, they want to be able to prevent legislation, good, sound legislation, so they come up with all sorts of excuses.

Bill C-49, from my perspective, is a prosperity piece of legislation that would help Newfoundland and Labrador, as well as the province of Nova Scotia. It is mirror legislation for those provinces, which are waiting for Ottawa to ultimately pass this bill so they can get on board with moving forward on renewable energy. It seems this is something that the Conservative Party just does not understand. Conservatives want to be stuck in the past and not recognize the future opportunities for hundreds of thousands of jobs in the renewable energy sector.

It is not just Liberals who are saying this. Bill C-49, which they opposed, involves two premiers, and one of them is a Progressive Conservative premier. I will highlight the fact that I put the word “progressive” ahead of the word “conservative” because, as Brian Mulroney, former prime minister, said, the current Conservative Party has amputated any sense of being progressive from its name.

• (1625)

Former prime minister Joe Clark has said that he never left the Conservative Party, but that the Conservative Party had left him because it had gone so far to the right. Kim Campbell's remarks reinforced what Joe Clark said, and more.

We just cannot trust the Conservative Party when it comes to the important issues of jobs, our environment and being there for Canadians in a very real way. We want an economy that works for everyone and a sense of fairness. We want Gen Z and Gen X to be engaged in a very proactive way. By voting against this legislation, members are not thinking of future generations of workers. The Conservative Party is turning its back on green jobs, and its members are demonstrating that by voting against this legislation and voting against Bill C-49. These are opportunities for us to grow.

Members can take a look at the legislation itself and ask why the Conservative Party of Canada would oppose it. It would create a sustainable jobs partnership council, which is, in essence, what the legislation is primarily there for. The minister would have an advisory group that would help set policy and be there to do some research and support Canadians, all so we would be in a better position to capitalize on renewable energy jobs. What is wrong with that? Why would the Conservatives feel so compelled to not only vote against the legislation, but also propose 20,000 amendments at the committee stage?

Government Orders

When I asked that question, a member said, “Well, I had a few of those amendments”. Let us look at the amendments, which the member actually knew a few of. I can guarantee members that there is not one Conservative who knows all 20,000-plus amendments because the Conservative Party did not come up with them. Rather, it was computerized artificial intelligence that ultimately produced that number of amendments so that the Conservative Party of Canada, in its official opposition role, could prevent this legislation from passing. Why is that? It is because it does not want workers, community members or indigenous communities to be engaged in providing ideas on how we can produce government policy. Why not?

This is not just about these two pieces of legislation. We can take a look at some of the budgetary measures we have to support renewable jobs. I think one of the largest and most significant announcements that was made was on the Volkswagen plant. We are talking about thousands of direct jobs, and even more indirect jobs. It is not just going to be for one area for the country, as a plant of this magnitude is going to require all sorts of materials.

Whether it is legislative measures or budgetary measures, members of the Conservative Party of Canada continues to stand up and want to filibuster to prevent good, sound policy. This is done at a substantial cost, which is the cost of future renewable energy jobs and the substantial cost to our environment. I say shame on them for not recognizing that. At the end of the day, they are there not to oppose and prevent things from passing, but to take policy positions for the betterment of Canadians. I am still waiting to see evidence of that.

• (1630)

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, I made this point earlier to the member for Fort McMurray—Cold Lake, and I just want to reiterate it.

Not to be insulting or disparaging to my Liberal friends but, really and truly, the only thing that encouraged people to support the previous environmental assessment legislation that was brought forward as Bill C-69 was that the Premier of Alberta said it was the anti-pipeline act. I could not vote for it, because it just as easily could have been the pro-pipeline act. It was a pile of discretion untethered from federal jurisdiction, which is why the Supreme Court, in its reference case, said that part of the bill that was the designated project list was unconstitutional. It was not that the federal government did too much for climate or too much for the environment. It did so little, but it was aided by over-reaction from Conservative benches.

I want to plead with my colleague, let us be honest about this bill. It sets up a secretariat that says it might talk about doing something for sustainable jobs. It does not actually help workers. It does not do what was promised in numerous Liberal political platforms. I lament that. If we oversell on each side of the House, the citizens of Canada are left disappointed and without a climate plan.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I have a lot of respect for the leader of the Green Party. Having said that, I disagree with her conclusions.

At the end of the day, when this legislation passes and is ultimately put into place, it would assist the government, whatever po-

litical stripe it might be, to be in a better position to not only transition but to generate and create opportunities in a coordinated fashion for future renewable energy jobs. There is absolutely no denying that.

When the consultations are done and there is an effective advisory committee that would bring the evidence to the minister, the minister would be better able to make the decisions that would ultimately provide the types of policy necessary to have a positive impact. When we think of the environment, we need to take a look at it with a 30,000-foot, holistic approach, incorporating legislation such as this, the net-zero legislation, budgetary measures and other policy statements regarding single-use plastics or trees. There are all sorts of initiatives.

If we look at what we have been able to put together, it speaks volumes in terms of future jobs, a future healthier environment and a stronger leadership role for Canada to play in the world in dealing with the climate crisis that we have.

Mr. Damien Kurek (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC): Madam Speaker, I hope the member will listen very closely to the question. He is great at political spin.

This bill talks about creating a framework that would leave upwards of 10,000 of my constituents without work. I want him to hear that again, up to 10,000 of my constituents both directly and indirectly depend on our world-class energy sector of oil and gas. There is a growing renewable sector, but we cannot be ignorant of the fact that oil and gas can and will play a significant role in the global economy for decades to come.

I want the member to answer this. What would he say to the close to 10,000 constituents who could see job losses or pay cuts because of a radical environmental agenda that refuses to inject an element of realism into the global energy conversation? What would he say to those 10,000 of my constituents that he wants to put out of work?

• (1635)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, the first thing I would say is that they should not listen to Conservative facts because they are most often misleading. Following that, I would remind the member and others that if they want to talk about job numbers, it took 10 years for Stephen Harper to create just about a million jobs. In eight years, the Liberals have created over two million jobs.

At the end of the day, we have taken budgetary and legislative measures that would ensure there is a higher sense of fairness for Canadians, whether they are generation Z, the middle class as a whole or those who are aspiring to become a part of the middle class. We understand the needs of generation Z and generation X, and we are going to be there with—

Government Orders

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): It is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 38 to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Kitchener Centre, Oil and Gas Industry; the hon. member for Peterborough—Kawartha, Carbon Pricing; the hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands, Emergency Preparedness.

Mrs. Kelly Block (Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek, CPC): Madam Speaker, while it is a privilege to stand in this place and participate in debates, it has become commonplace that we have to deal with bills put forward by the Liberal government that are typically ideologically driven, deeply flawed and divisive in nature.

Yesterday evening the government changed today's agenda and advised the House that we would be debating Bill C-50, dubbed "the Canadian sustainable jobs act", at report stage today. For those watching, this means that the bill was tabled in the House and then debated at second reading, where it passed and was referred to the Standing Committee on Natural Resources to be studied and amended, if necessary. It was necessary. More than 200 amendments were put forward.

First, the Liberals understood that their just transition bill needed to be rebranded so they renamed it, a rose by any other name.

This so-called sustainable jobs plan is just a renamed version of the Liberals' just transition plan, a plan mandated by the government to shut down the most productive sector of Canada's economy and a plan that Canadians opposed. It is just the latest attack, in a long line of attacks, on Canada's energy sector. For years, the government and its anti-energy policies and agenda have been driving investment away from Canada in both traditional and alternative energy.

Let us look at some facts. Canada's largest export sector is oil and gas extraction: 18.3%, or \$116.8 billion, in 2021. The energy sector provides 10% of Canada's GDP and pays over \$20 billion in taxes to all levels of government every year. In 2021 alone, the energy sector generated \$48 billion in taxes and royalties to all levels of government. Of all private sector investment in clean technology, 75% comes from the oil and gas sector. Of Canadian-owned energy companies, 92.9% have fewer than 100 employees, and nearly two-thirds of those have fewer than five. As well, 2.7 million jobs across the energy, manufacturing, construction, transportation and agriculture sectors, for an estimated average of \$219 billion in average annual salaries, will face "significant labour market disruptions."

If the bill passes, it would have a devastating effect on energy sector workers. It is beyond the pale that the government continues to introduce legislation that is divisive and disproportionately impacts certain regions. In my province of Saskatchewan alone, the bill would directly impact over 10,000 jobs and indirectly impact over 130,000 jobs. At a time when Canadians are struggling to put food on their tables, the government is threatening their livelihoods.

The cross-Canada benefits of the oil and gas industry should not be overlooked, and the impact on Canadian workers will be devastating. Staggering job losses were outlined in a memo for the Minister of Natural Resources on their just transition plan: 292,000 jobs in agriculture; 202,000 jobs in the energy sector; 193,000 jobs in

manufacturing; 1,400,000 jobs in building; and 642,000 jobs in transportation. This is a grand total of 2,729,000 Canadian jobs, or 13.5% of Canada's employment.

After eight years of the Prime Minister, life has never been so difficult for Canadians. His inflationary spending and ideologically driven taxes have created a broken economy, where businesses cannot survive and Canadians cannot find jobs. In its recently published labour force survey, Statistics Canada reported that Canada lost 2,200 jobs in March, as Canada's unemployment rate grew to 6.1% and as more Canadians competed for fewer jobs. At a time of high inflation and a cost-of-living crisis, there is no relief from this NDP-Liberal coalition for struggling Canadians, and this is proof of that. There are just more ideologically driven, half-baked ideas to make Canadians poorer.

● (1640)

Instead of capitalizing on Canada's greatest strength, our natural resources, the government seems intent to smother the oil and gas industry, ensuring it dies a slow death. The destruction of the oil and gas sector will cause significant damage to the economy. Despite the damage caused by the government over the last eight years, the oil and gas sector remains the largest private sector investor in Canada. This will lead to energy poverty for Canadians. As we will continue to need oil and gas for many years to come, we will need to import oil and gas from dictatorships around the world to meet the demands in Canada, driving up prices for Canadians.

We have watched as other countries have attempted to switch to solar or wind-based energy economies prematurely and have had to go back to importing oil, gas and coal because they shut down their other sources of energy when making the switch. The top-down plans of shutting down one of the largest, if not the largest, sectors of the Canadian economy will be a disaster for Canadians and will drive up the cost of everything, compounding the difficulties Canadians already face.

This bill, much like the carbon tax, is misguided. The government's stated goal is to reduce emissions in Canada, which it asserts will reduce the number of extreme weather events. However, much like the bubble the government lives in here in Ottawa, ignorant of the struggles that Canadians across the country are facing due to its disastrous policies, it also believes that Canada operates in a bubble. It thinks that all we must do is reduce our emissions and the wildfires would disappear; there would be no more floods or any other adverse weather events. This kind of small thinking is why the government continues to put forward short-sighted and ham-fisted legislation that does more damage than good.

Government Orders

Canada can play a primary role on the world stage helping other countries to lower emissions, whether it be through providing new technology or Canadian oil and gas that is produced with fewer emissions and more ethically. Instead of trying to tax Canadians into submission, the government should be capitalizing on our unique circumstances, with our plentiful natural resources and state-of-the-art technology.

While the bill is foolhardy, it is not surprising that it is coming out of the most anti-energy government Canada has ever had. The Liberals are intent on suppressing the natural resources of Canada, one of our greatest strengths, and forcing Canadians out of the energy sector. The government would rather funnel billions of dollars to dictators to fund their authoritarian regimes than employ Canadians in a major sector of our economy with good-paying jobs that will boost the prosperity of our country and help all Canadians. It should be utilizing the brilliance of Canadians and their ingenuity.

Canadians deserve a government that understands the value of the natural resources that Canada has been blessed with and how to utilize them to increase the prosperity of our country and benefit all Canadians. Conservatives know that environmental stewardship must be addressed with realistic, concrete and effective measures. We believe in transformation, not transition; technology, not taxes; led by the private sector, not government. Conservatives will bring home affordable, accessible traditional and alternative energy, accelerate approvals and put Canadian resources, innovation and workers first to ensure Canadian energy security and self-sufficiency.

I, together with my colleagues, cannot support a bill that will put hundreds of thousands of Canadians out of work in the midst of a cost of living crisis the government has created. Canadians can be assured that the next Conservative government will support our energy sector and its workers, who do so much for the Canadian economy.

• (1645)

Mrs. Jenica Atwin (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indigenous Services, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am going to bring it back to the points made by the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands. I really feel that there is a significant overreaction. We heard previously, for example, from the member for Kelowna—Lake Country that 2.7 million jobs would be lost. We heard from the member for Battle River—Crowfoot that it would be 10,000 in his specific riding. We heard from the member for Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek that hundreds of thousands of jobs would be lost. Which is it?

In addition, where is it in this legislation? I see an introduction of guiding principles, creating a sustainable jobs partnership council, publishing action plans, creating a secretariat and then designating responsible and specific ministers. Where exactly are the job losses going to come from?

Mrs. Kelly Block: Madam Speaker, certainly my hon. colleague understands math. When we say there will be 10,000 jobs lost in a riding or 100,000 jobs lost in a province, that can translate to almost two million or more across the country.

Mrs. Jenica Atwin: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, I take significant offence to the idea that I do not understand math. I take

that as a comment on my intelligence, which you previously ruled on.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Members are not to make comments such as that. I cannot comment on answers given to questions, but they should not comment on people's abilities.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: On the same point of order, Madam Speaker, I have the government's own internal briefing document that outlines—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): We are not going to debate the issue. It is done. It is taken care of.

An hon. member: I am asking for unanimous consent to table the document.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Is there consent?

Some hon. members: No.

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant: Madam Speaker, I want to ask my colleague whether she is—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member was rising on a point of order; I have to allow the Bloc Québécois to ask a question.

The hon. member for Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Sylvie Bérubé (Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou, BQ): Madam Speaker, does my Conservative colleague really believe in the transformation of the oil industry to reduce greenhouse gases? Is she prepared to set explicit policy objectives based on Canada's international climate commitments, responsibilities toward indigenous peoples and just transition obligations?

[*English*]

Mrs. Kelly Block: Madam Speaker, under the previous government, the natural resources committee did a study called “The Cross-Canada Benefits of the Oil and Gas Industry”. We understood that this is not an either-or situation; it is both-and.

Of course, Conservatives support investments in green technology. We continue to support the oil and gas industry. It is going to be around, as my colleague said, for decades to come.

• (1650)

Ms. Lindsay Mathysen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Madam Speaker, this bill would create an independent body with members from indigenous organizations, industry and labour, who would advise the government on moving toward the clean net-zero economy. That is sustainable. In her speech, the hon. member referenced the number of jobs; that would keep these jobs, support these families, engage with all the organizations on this advisory board and move forward in a responsible way.

The International Energy Agency has talked about the fact that, within the next decade, there will be a surging demand for electric vehicles and clean energy technologies. If Canada does not get on board with that, we will be left behind. I do not understand how the member could possibly believe that the Canadian economy should be left behind.

Mrs. Kelly Block: Madam Speaker, I will address the first point about this body that would be creating a framework or making decisions. Ninety-three per cent of Canadian oil and gas jobs are small businesses with fewer than 100 employees. I mentioned that in my comments. Bill C-50 does not include or contemplate those businesses at all. I would ask the member to reconsider that.

The other thing I would point out to her about being left behind is that the NDP-Liberal coalition does not have an environmental plan. It has a tax plan. It continues to miss every target for reducing emissions, and that has been reported on by the environment commissioner. Under the government, which New Democrats support, Canada ranked 58th out of 63 countries in terms of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. If the member is really concerned about being left behind, she will stop supporting the current Liberal government.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

GOVERNMENT RESPONSES TO ORDER PAPER QUESTIONS

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am rising to respond to a question of privilege raised by the member for Cowichan—Malahat—Langford respecting the government response to Order Paper Question No. 2340.

I wanted to acknowledge that, in this matter, the government has reviewed the response and the process used to produce the response in question. What was discovered is that there was an administrative error in the tasking of the response; this led to inaccurate information being provided to the member and to the House. I unreservedly apologize for that error.

The response was tasked to the Department of Innovation, Science and Economic Development when it should have been tasked across all departments and agencies.

In addition, it has come to light that this error extends to include Order Paper Question No. 2142.

The government will produce supplemental responses to these OPQs by tasking all government departments and agencies on an urgent basis to ensure that this question is responded to in a timely and accurate manner. In the course of our review, should it be deter-

Privilege

mined that this could involve other OPQs, the government will include those as well.

Again, this is an unfortunate administrative error, but I can assure the member and the House that it was not the government's intention to provide inaccurate information with respect to this matter.

A compilation of supplemental responses to these questions will be produced on a priority basis.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I believe the hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby is rising on the same point of order.

ADVANCE DISCLOSURE OF BUDGET MEASURES

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Madam Speaker, it is not on the same point of order, but I am glad the government is making amends. The member for Cowichan—Malahat—Langford submitted those questions in good faith, and I am glad we will be getting the information Canadians require. I thank the parliamentary secretary for doing the right thing, making amends and apologizing for the lack of information around subsidies going to Loblaws and some of the other grocery chains that have been guilty of food price gouging.

I am actually rising on another point of order, and that is the matter of privilege brought forward by the member for La Prairie concerning the convention of budgetary secrecy. The principle of budgetary secrecy is an important one, as leaks and premature disclosure sometimes have unintended and, in some cases, market-moving impacts.

Despite this, we know that governments of all stripes, both Conservative and Liberal, have been known to use selected and targeted pre-budget leaks to their advantage as a way to control the narrative leading up to the budget. They love to point fingers at each other, but they both do this. There is no doubt that this is done for their political advantage; otherwise, they would not do it.

While a number of Speaker's rulings have found no breach and, to date, no Speaker has wanted to put an end to this practice, the fact that it has been raised as a matter continuously for many years means that it merits review on the Speaker's behalf.

Let us not forget the time former Conservative finance minister Jim Flaherty decided to give a fiscal update not to the House of Commons but to a private audience of financial professionals. The House of Commons is the purview of elected members, who have been chosen by Canadians to represent them; however, he did not present the update here.

The Speaker of the House at the time was the member for Regina—Qu'Appelle, who found in favour of the government. In his ruling, he cited as precedent a decision by Speaker Milliken, which was also made as a consequence of the Conservative finance minister's actions. The example at that time was the government's decision to release a report on the economic action plan at a media event in Saint John rather than here in Parliament.

Privilege

The Speaker's ruling of October 5, 2009, included the following:

It is very difficult for the Chair to intervene in a situation where a minister has chosen to have a press conference or a briefing or a meeting and release material when the Speaker has nothing to do with the organization of that [event].

Speaker Milliken was also asked to judge an incident where specific information about the main estimates was published in a newspaper article, as well as a blog and Twitter. On March 22, 2011, he ruled:

• (1655)

[Translation]

The member argued that the Speaker had ruled on a number of occasions that the House had an absolute right to expect the government to provide information, whether on a bill or on the estimates, to the House before it was disclosed elsewhere.

For him, it was a matter of being able to respond, as a member of Parliament, to enquiries in a meaningful and intelligent way.

[English]

In his response, the President of the Treasury Board admitted that the untimely release of the material in question was improper and not in keeping with past procedures and practices of this House. Furthermore, he committed to taking steps to prevent it from happening again. The minister went on to cite House of Commons Procedure and Practice, second edition, at page 894, thus quite rightly pointing out that, in the past, similar matters, namely of budget secrecy, have been treated more as matters of parliamentary convention rather than matters of privilege.

[Translation]

The member for Windsor—Tecumseh is certainly not misguided in his expectation that members of the House, individually and collectively, must receive from the government particular types of information required for the fulfillment of their parliamentary duties before it is shared elsewhere.

However, in such instances when there is a transgression of this well-established practice, the Chair must ascertain whether, as a result, the member was impeded in the performance of parliamentary duties.

Simply put, I agree with the member for La Prairie. These practices that we saw under the Conservatives and are now seeing under the Liberals have to change. This practice of disclosing all the budget information must change. We should align these budget practices more and more with House of Commons procedure and privilege.

I hope that my intervention will help the Chair make a ruling on the intervention of the member for La Prairie.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I thank the hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby for his intervention. It will obviously be taken under advisement.

The hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands.

[English]

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, I have been looking for my moment to also comment on the question of privilege raised by the hon. member for La Prairie.

[Translation]

I think the Bloc Québécois member's argument was very strong. When he presented his question of privilege, I thought it was solid and clear.

• (1700)

[English]

I thought it was a violation of privilege to start seeing budgetary information shared in advance. In the last while, in digging into my own research, I have come to the view that it is less clear than that. The hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby has also pointed this out, and we have heard this from a number of other presenters in this place, including the hon. Liberal House leader.

I agree with the hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby that it is troubling to see that there is not a clear set of rules around protecting budgetary information from early leak. It appears to me now that, as much as I was convinced by the argument from the hon. member for La Prairie, we probably do not have a convincing argument for a point of privilege here. We do have a clear need for more work to be done, perhaps at PROC or elsewhere.

We have a very clear tradition. Over the years, people have faced criminal sanction for leaking budgetary information. However, now it appears we can differentiate between the kind of information that could be used in the sense of insider trading, to create a financial benefit for someone who leaked the information, and public policy, which the government can of course discuss in advance.

We have seen, more than one time, information released in an attempt to create some razzle-dazzle effect in advance of the budget. We are seeing more public relations material than we are seeing a budget. In the Harper years, I started calling it the “big, thick spring brochure” as opposed to a budget, because it very rarely actually had a budget in it. We could not compare this year's spending to last year's spending. We could not work through the work tables at the back of the budget department by department and compare what was happening.

That tradition of big fat brochures has been continuing without access to an actual budget. Canadians need to know that, and they need clarity around how much of this is now promotional materials, with governments explaining what they want to do. There is less and less rigour around whether the money has been spent, whether it can be tracked, whether it can be compared to previous years, and whether we are comparing apples to apples or apples to oranges.

In other words, my advice to the Speaker, for what it is worth, would be that this is not a point of privilege. However, there is an issue here of substance for which greater clarity would be helpful and to which I would urge the Minister of Finance to actually bring some rigour to the budgetary process and make sure that Canadians who pick up the budget can actually find, in the big fat spring brochure, an actual budget.

CANADIAN SUSTAINABLE JOBS ACT

The House resumed consideration of 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, as reported (with amendments) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara (Vaughan—Woodbridge, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is always a pleasure to see my hon. colleagues in this most honourable House.

As we continue the debate at report stage of Bill C-50, it is imperative to note that what we are seeing across the world is being driven by technology in response to the climate crisis, what is happening in our environment and the weather: droughts, floods and temperatures increasing, attributable, obviously, to man-made causes. It is an economic opportunity for all Canadians, for all provinces, from coast to coast, that is being seized today by companies here in Canada, whether Cameco, BHP or, in Ontario, with nuclear. There is just so much innovation happening.

We know right now that the lowest cost to generate electricity is actually through solar and wind. It is true. We also know that we need to be able to store the electricity that is generated, and we are getting there. In my years in the private sector, I was learning quite well about the generation, transmission and distribution of electrical energy. We are now adding a fourth dimension, which is storage. That is going to help us to decarbonize Canada and our electrical system. Bill C-50 is a part of this process, to ensure that the workers in Canada would have the tools, the skills and the resources to participate in this. It is an economic opportunity.

As we gather here today, it is crucial that we recognize the evolving nature of the global economy, driven, yes, by the need to address the climate crisis but also by the technological innovation that is occurring across the world. We can look at companies like Brookfield Asset Management, which was on the Hill this week. It has 33,000 megawatts of generating capacity, almost entirely renewable; it has solar, wind, hydro and nuclear being done right now. That capital is being deployed. As someone who loves the private sector, capital, wealth creation and all of that, I am excited by this. It ensures that we will have a profitable and successful future for our kids. The IEA estimated that in 2022, \$2.4 trillion globally would need to be invested as we continue this.

We know that climate change and the actions required to fight it are fundamental economic opportunities for Canada's workforce. The world is rapidly moving toward a future powered by clean energy and sustainable technology. This global shift is not just about reducing emissions; it is also about unlocking new avenues for economic growth and job creation. Around the world, countries are seeking clean energy technologies and supplies to power their economies well into the coming decades. Canada is stepping up to support them. A great example is the work we have been doing with Romania to build Canadian CANDU reactors that will help them to both phase out coal, wean eastern European grids off Putin's energy, create jobs here in Canada and in eastern Europe. All of the financing will go back to Canadian companies, creating sustainable jobs here in Ontario.

Government Orders

Unfortunately, Conservatives let down Ukraine by opposing the free trade agreement between Canada and Ukraine. I think we need to note that the Canada-Ukraine free trade agreement was ratified by the Ukrainian Parliament this week. We will always stand beside the Ukrainian deputies, the Ukrainian people and Ukraine as it fights for its sovereignty and its freedom.

Beyond nuclear, the Minister of Energy recently signed a hydrogen accord with the vice-chancellor of Germany, in which Canada is unlocking the first direct hydrogen trade window into a major European market. Partnerships like this will support thousands of good jobs in Atlantic and eastern Canada to produce renewable hydrogen and ship it to Europe to displace Russian gas. Unfortunately, rabid climate denialism has made the federal Conservatives blind to this opportunity that the Progressive Conservative government of Nova Scotia is championing with us.

● (1705)

Beyond hydrogen, Canada built the Sustainable Critical Minerals Alliance with many global partners to export the Canadian minerals that are building blocks to clean energy technologies, supporting thousands of great jobs in every part of this country. In British Columbia, for example, the clean energy sector is booming, with investments in hydroelectric power, wind farms, and battery factories like E-One Moli. These investments are both creating sustainable jobs and reducing our reliance on fossil fuels, while positioning B.C. as a leader in the development of a low-carbon economy. Unfortunately, the party on the opposite side is opposed to all these investments and continues to attack the Government of British Columbia for its climate leadership.

Similarly, in Alberta, the shift towards hydrogen and other forms of clean energy is creating opportunities for workers in the oil and gas sector to use their skills to help build new plants. I visited the industrial heartland in Alberta a couple of years ago and saw the investments that are taking place, literally \$10 billion or \$20 billion of petrochemical and chemical investments, net-zero investments, are taking place. We are going to ensure that they get done. We actually partnered with the Government of Alberta and invested in these projects, and we will continue to do that. Unfortunately, the Conservatives and their UCP allies are holding back Alberta's full potential through their job-killing red tape on the renewables industry.

Government Orders

The Conservatives are holding back Nova Scotia, and Newfoundland and Labrador by filibustering and delaying Bill C-49. Actually, I should take that back. Today at the natural resources committee, we finished Bill C-49 and have sent it back. Bill C-49 would build an offshore renewable industry in Atlantic Canada. Meanwhile in Ontario, investments in energy-efficient building retrofits are creating jobs for construction workers by reducing emissions and lowering energy bills for homeowners.

We know that in Bill C-50, the creation of a secretariat to coordinate action and the creation of a sustainable jobs partnership council would really bring industry, labour and indigenous organizations to the table, ensuring that workers have a place at the table.

We know that investments are being made in electric vehicle manufacturing plants and battery plants, not only for today but for decades. All the auto companies know that this transition is happening and that EV production will occur. It may not occur smoothly. It may not occur without some bumps along the way, but it is going to occur. They are all going that way, whether it is Stellantis, Volkswagen, Toyota or Honda. We see the exciting things happening in Oxford, and in St. Thomas with Volkswagen. I hope the member opposite who represents Oxford gets on board and supports that investment. It means tens of thousands of Canadians will be working, directly and indirectly, around this plant.

As we can see, there are so many new developments across growing clean industries at the moment. Canada is attracting billions of dollars of direct investment, and Canadian innovation is driving new opportunities. As we grow, we cannot allow a shortage of skills, training and tools to stop our workers from achieving their goals and reaching their full potential in building generational economic drivers. The sustainable jobs bill is fundamentally about supporting hard-working Canadian workers and their families in all 338 ridings that we represent, and ensuring that our and future governments will be accountable to deliver for these workers.

Clearly the Conservative opposition to the bill is founded either in opposition to workers or to accountability, or in being anti-union. Unfortunately I can confirm, based on their statements, that it is based on all of those scenarios. The legislation would ensure that workers have access to training programs, job opportunities and fair wages in the emerging low-carbon economy, as they rightfully should. Yet despite the clear benefits of the sustainable jobs bill, the opposition remains steadfast in its opposition. Its stance is not just completely divorced from reality but is also downright dangerous economically.

I love the 100,000 energy workers in this country who go to work every day. We are going to need them, and we are going to need the resources for years to come. However, we know that capital around the world is being placed in the renewable sector. We know that solar, wind, hydro and nuclear are here to stay. We need to continue displacing forms of higher GHG-emitting sources with lower GHG-emitting sources. We will continue to do that.

• (1710)

Mr. Clifford Small: Madam Speaker, I seek unanimous consent that, notwithstanding any standing order, special order, or usual practices of the House, the vote of the member for Coast of Bays—

Central—Notre Dame on division No. 684 from Wednesday, April 10, should be changed from nay to yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The member did rise yesterday and ask for the same thing. I was the one who refused consent. I am now giving consent for that vote change.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): There is not unanimous consent, as the hon. member did not receive unanimous consent from other members in the House.

The hon. member for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke.

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, CPC): Madam Speaker, notwithstanding that what the Ukrainians need are NASAMS and ammunition, rather than a carbon tax, does the member opposite realize that the European EV market is taking a blood bath because nobody wants EVs, and that President Biden is rolling back his Soviet-style requirements for the sales of EVs? Is he aware of—

• (1715)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): We are out of time.

I have to give the hon. member a few seconds to answer.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Madam Speaker, the adoption of electric vehicles will occur in the coming years as production ramps up across the world. It will happen. We know it is happening, and we know companies are investing literally tens of billions of dollars into plants and facilities. We also need to ensure that we have the infrastructure in place for that—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): It being 5:16 p.m., pursuant to order made on Monday, December 4, 2023, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the report stage of the bill now before the House.

[*Translation*]

Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The question is on Motion No. 1.

Government Orders

[English]

The vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 23, 24, 38 to 40, 47, 58, 76 to 78, 90, 95, 101, 106, 112, 154, 159, 171, 182 and 194.

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, we request a recorded vote, please.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

[Translation]

The question is on Motion No. 2.

A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 6, 7, 12, 15, 18 and 22. A negative vote on Motion No. 2 requires the question to be put on Motions Nos. 3, 4, 16 and 21.

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, we request a recorded vote.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The question is on Motion No. 5. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 48. A negative vote on Motion No. 5 requires the question to be put on Motion No. 49.

• (1720)

[Translation]

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, we request a recorded division.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

[Translation]

The question is on Motion No. 25. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion Nos. 29 and 31. A negative vote on Motion No. 25 requires the question to be put on Motion No. 26.

[English]

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I would again request a recorded vote.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

[Translation]

The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 29 and 31.

[English]

The question is on Motion No. 37.

[Translation]

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I request a recorded vote.

[Translation]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The question is on Motion No. 41. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 45. A negative vote on Motion No. 41 requires the question to be put on Motion No. 45.

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

[English]

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant: Madam Speaker, I request a recorded vote.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The division on the motion stands deferred.

The question is on Motion No. 52.

[Translation]

A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 56. A negative vote on Motion No. 52 requires the question to be put on Motion No. 53.

[English]

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I request a recorded vote, please.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

[Translation]

The question is on Motion No. 59. A negative vote on Motion No. 59 requires the question to be put on Motion No. 60.

Government Orders

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

• (1725)

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I request a recorded vote.

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The recorded division on Motion No. 59 stands deferred.

[*English*]

The question is on Motion No. 79. A negative vote on Motion No. 79 requires the question to be put on Motion No. 80.

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I would request a recorded vote.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The question is on Motion No. 91.

[*Translation*]

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I request a recorded vote.

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The recorded division on Motion No. 91 stands deferred.

[*English*]

The question is on Motion No. 96. A negative vote on Motion No. 96 requires the question to be put on Motion No. 97.

[*Translation*]

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I would request a recorded vote.

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The recorded division on Motion No. 96 stands deferred.

[*English*]

The question is on Motion No. 102.

[*Translation*]

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I request a recorded vote.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The recorded division on Motion No. 102 stands deferred.

The question is on Motion No. 108.

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I request a recorded vote.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The recorded division on Motion No. 108 stands deferred.

[*Translation*]

The next question is on Motion No. 113.

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I request a recorded vote.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The question is on Motion No. 155.

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I request a recorded vote.

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The recorded division on Motion No. 155 stands deferred.

The question is on Motion No. 160. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 165.

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

*Government Orders**[English]*

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I request a recorded vote.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The recorded division on Motion No. 160 stands deferred.

● (1730)

[Translation]

The question is on Motion No. 172.

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I request a recorded vote.

[Translation]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The recorded division on Motion No. 172 stands deferred.

[English]

The question is on Motion No. 178.

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I request a recorded vote.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The recorded division on Motion No. 178 stands deferred.

[Translation]

The question is on Motion No. 183.

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I request a recorded vote.

[Translation]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The recorded division on Motion No. 183 stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motions Nos. 187 and 192.

[English]

The question is on Motion No. 199.

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I request a recorded vote.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The recorded division on Motion No. 199 stands deferred.

[Translation]

Pursuant to order made on Monday, December 4, 2023, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded divisions at report stage of the bill.

Call in the members.

* * *

● (1800)

*[English]***OFFICIAL REPORT**

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Regina—Qu'Appelle, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I believe, if you seek it, you will find unanimous consent for the following motion:

That, notwithstanding any standing order, special order or usual practices of the House, the vote of the member for Coast of Bays—Central—Notre Dame on Division No. 684 from Wednesday, April 10, 2024, be changed from a nay to a yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed to the hon. member's moving the motion will please say nay. It is agreed.

The House has heard the terms of the motion. All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

(Motion agreed to)

Ms. Yvonne Jones: Mr. Speaker, this morning there was a motion on the floor and I had technical difficulties with my app. I asked for leave of the House so I could vote, and I was denied by the opposition. I ask if they would now grant me that leave so my vote may count and I will vote yes.

The Deputy Speaker: Does the hon. member have unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

● (1805)

CANADIAN SUSTAINABLE JOBS ACT

The House resumed consideration of 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, as reported (with amendments) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 1. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 23, 24, 38 to 40, 47, 58, 76 to 78, 90, 95, 101, 106, 112, 154, 159, 171, 182 and 194.

● (1815)

[Translation]

(The House divided on Motion No. 1, which was negated on the following division:)

*Government Orders**(Division No. 687)***YEAS**

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barrett	Berthold
Bezan	Block
Bragdon	Brassard
Brock	Calkins
Caputo	Carrie
Chambers	Chong
Cooper	Dalton
Dancho	Deltell
Doherty	Dowdall
Dreeshen	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Ellis	Epp
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)
Fast	Ferreri
Findlay	Gallant
Généreux	Genius
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gourde
Gray	Hallan
Jeneroux	Jivani
Kelly	Khanna
Kitchen	Kmicic
Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Kurek	Kusie
Lake	Lantsman
Lawrence	Lehoux
Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
Maguire	Majumdar
Martel	Mazier
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLean
Melillo	Moore
Morantz	Morrison
Motz	Muys
Nater	Patzer
Paul-Hus	Perkins
Redekopp	Reid
Rempel Garner	Richards
Roberts	Rood
Ruff	Scheer
Schmale	Seeback
Shields	Shipley
Small	Soroka
Steinley	Stewart
Strahl	Stubbs
Thomas	Tochor
Tolmie	Uppal
Van Popta	Vecchio
Vidal	Vien
Viersen	Vis
Vuong	Wagantall
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Williams
Williamson — 113	

NAYS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker

Barron	Barsalou-Duval
Battiste	Beaulieu
Beech	Bérubé
Bibeau	Bittle
Blair	Blanchet
Blaney	Boissonnault
Boulerice	Bradford
Brière	Brunelle-Duceppe
Cannings	Carr
Casey	Chabot
Chagger	Chahal
Champagne	Champoux
Chatel	Chen
Chiang	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Collins (Victoria)	Cormier
Coteau	Dabrusin
Damoff	Davies
DeBellefeuille	Desbiens
Desilets	Desjarlais
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Dong
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fortin	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Fry	Gaheer
Gainey	Garon
Gaudreau	Gazan
Gerretsen	Gill
Gould	Green
Guilbeault	Hajdu
Hanley	Hardie
Hepfner	Holland
Housefather	Hughes
Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Idlout
Ien	Jaczek
Johns	Joly
Jones	Jowhari
Julian	Kayabaga
Kelloway	Khalid
Khera	Koutrakis
Kusmierczyk	Kwan
Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Larouche	Lattanzio
Lauzon	Lebouthillier
Lemire	Lightbound
Long	Longfield
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney	Martinez Ferrada
Masse	Mathysen
May (Cambridge)	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod	McPherson
Mendès	Mendicino
Miao	Michaud
Miller	Morrice
Morrissey	Murray
Naqvi	Ng
Noormohamed	Normandin
O'Connell	Oliphant
O'Regan	Pauzé
Perron	Petitpas Taylor
Powlowski	Qualtrough
Robillard	Rogers
Romanado	Rota

Government Orders

Sahota
Saks
Sarai
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Singh
Sousa
St-Onge
Tassi
Therrien
Trudeau
Turnbull
Van Bynen
Vandenberg
Villemure
Weiler
Yip
Zarrillo

Sajjan
Samson
Savard-Tremblay
Schiefke
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sinclair-Desgagné
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Sudds
Taylor Roy
Thompson
Trudel
Valdez
van Koeverden
Vignola
Virani
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi— 202

Barrett
Bezan
Bragdon
Brock
Caputo
Chambers
Cooper
Dancho
Doherty
Dreeshen
Ellis
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Findlay
Généreux
Gladu
Goodridge
Gray
Jeneroux
Kelly
Kitchen
Kram
Kurek
Lake
Lawrence
Leslie
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lloyd
Maguire
Martel
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Melillo
Morantz
Motz
Nater
Paul-Hus
Poilievre
Reid
Richards
Rood
Scheer
Seeback
Shipley
Soroka
Stewart
Stubbs
Tochor
Uppal
Vecchio
Vien
Vis
Wagantall
Waugh
Williams

Berthold
Block
Brassard
Calkins
Carrie
Chong
Dalton
Deltell
Dowdall
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Epp
Falk (Provencher)
Ferreri
Gallant
Genuis
Godin
Gourde
Hallan
Jivani
Khanna
Kmiec
Kramp-Neuman
Kusie
Lantsman
Lehoux
Lewis (Essex)
Liefert
Lobb
Majumdar
Mazier
McLean
Moore
Morrison
Muys
Patzner
Perkins
Redekopp
Rempel Garner
Roberts
Ruff
Schmale
Shields
Small
Steinley
Strahl
Thomas
Tolmie
Van Popta
Vidal
Viersen
Vuong
Warkentin
Webber
Williamson— 114

PAIRED

Members

Barlow
Davidson
Plamondon
Vandal

Blois
MacDonald (Malpeque)
Rodriguez
Zimmer— 8

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 1 defeated.

[*English*]

I therefore declare Motions Nos. 23, 24—

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, we do have a number of votes tonight. I understand the member for Carleton has not voted.

However, with those votes, it is important to keep order and decorum. The member for Cypress Hills—Grasslands has made a very disrespectful sign. Could you ask him to stop with those gestures that are inappropriate?

The Deputy Speaker: That is not a point of order.

I therefore declare Motions Nos. 23, 24, 38 to 40, 47, 58, 76 to 78, 90, 95, 101, 106, 112, 154, 159, 171, 182 and 194 defeated.

[*Translation*]

The question is on Motion No. 2. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 6, 7, 12, 15, 18 and 22.

[*English*]

A negative vote on Motion No. 2 requires the question to be put on Motions Nos. 3, 4, 16 and 21.

• (1830)

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 2, which was negatived on the following division:)

(*Division No. 688*)

YEAS

Members

Abouttaif
Albas
Arnold

Aitchison
Allison
Baldinelli

Aldag
Ali
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ashton
Bachrach
Bains
Barron
Battiste
Beech
Bibeau
Blair
Blanchette-Joncas
Boissonnault
Bradford

NAYS

Members

Alghabra
Anand
Angus
Arya
Atwin
Badawey
Baker
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bérubé
Bittle
Blanchet
Blaney
Boulerice
Brière

Government Orders

Brunelle-Duceppe
Carr
Chabot
Chahal
Champoux
Chen
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cormier
Dabrusin
Davies
Desbiens
Desjarlais
Dhillon
Dong
Dubourg
Duguid
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Gaheer
Garon
Gaudreau
Gerretsen
Gould
Guilbeault
Hanley
Hepfner
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Ien
Johns
Jones
Julian
Kelloway
Khera
Kusmierczyk
Lalonde
Lamoureux
Larouche
Lauzon
Lemire
Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacGregor
Maloney
Masse
May (Cambridge)
McDonald (Avalon)
McKay
McLeod
Mendès
Miao
Miller
Morrissey
Naqvi
Noormohamed
O'Connell
O'Regan
Perron
Powlowski
Robillard
Romanado
Sahota
Saks
Sarai
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton East)

Cannings
Casey
Chagger
Champagne
Chatel
Chiang
Collins (Victoria)
Coteau
Damoff
DeBellefeuille
Desilets
Dhaliwal
Diab
Drouin
Duclos
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser
Fry
Gainey
Garrison
Gazan
Gill
Green
Hajdu
Hardie
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Idlout
Jaczek
Joly
Jowhari
Kayabaga
Khalid
Koutrakis
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lapointe
Lattanzio
Lebouthillier
Lightbound
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Martinez Ferrada
Mathysen
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McPherson
Mendicino
Michaud
Morrice
Murray
Ng
Normandin
Oliphant
Pauzé
Petitpas Taylor
Qualtrough
Rogers
Rota
Sajjan
Samson
Savard-Tremblay
Schieffe
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)

Simard
Singh
Sousa
St-Onge
Tassi
Therrien
Trudeau
Turnbull
Van Bynen
Vandenbeld
Villemure
Weiler
Yip
Zarrillo
Sinclair-Desgagné
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Sudds
Taylor Roy
Thompson
Trudel
Valdez
van Koeverden
Vignola
Virani
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi— 204

PAIRED

Members

Barlow
Davidson
Plamondon
Vandal
Blois
MacDonald (Malpeque)
Rodriguez
Zimmer— 8

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 2 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 6, 7, 12, 15, 18 and 22 defeated.

The question is on Motion No. 3. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 9, 20 and 130. A negative vote on Motion No. 3 requires the question to be put on Motion No. 123.

[*English*]

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

Hon. Andrew Scheer: Mr. Speaker, since we are all here, I request a recorded division.

● (1840)

(The House divided on Motion No. 3, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 689*)

YEAS

Members

Aboultatif
Albas
Arnold
Barrett
Bezan
Bragdon
Brock
Caputo
Chambers
Cooper
Dancho
Doherty
Dreeshen
Ellis
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Findlay
Généreux
Gladu
Goodridge
Gray
Jeneroux
Kelly
Kitchen
Aitchison
Allison
Baldinelli
Berthold
Block
Brassard
Calkins
Carrie
Chong
Dalton
Deltell
Dowdall
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Epp
Falk (Provencher)
Ferreri
Gallant
Genuis
Godin
Gourde
Hallan
Jivani
Khanna
Kmiec

Government Orders

Kram
Kurek
Lake
Lawrence
Leslie
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lloyd
Maguire
Martel
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Melillo
Morantz
Motz
Nater
Paul-Hus
Poilievre
Reid
Richards
Rood
Scheer
Seeback
Shipley
Soroka
Stewart
Stubbs
Tochor
Uppal
Vecchio
Vien
Vis
Wagantall
Wagh
Williams

Kramp-Neuman
Kusie
Lantsman
Lehoux
Lewis (Essex)
Liepert
Lobb
Majumdar
Mazier
McLean
Moore
Morrison
Muys
Patzner
Perkins
Redekopp
Rempel Garner
Roberts
Ruff
Schmale
Shields
Small
Steinley
Strahl
Thomas
Tolmie
Van Popta
Vidal
Viersen
Vuong
Warkentin
Webber
Williamson — 114

Freeland
Gaheer
Garon
Gaudreau
Gerretsen
Gould
Guilbeault
Hanley
Hepfner
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Ien
Johns
Jones
Julian
Kelloway
Khera
Kusmierczyk
Lalonde
Lamoureux
Larouche
Lauzon
Lemire
Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacGregor
Maloney
Masse
May (Cambridge)
McDonald (Avalon)
McKay
McLeod
Mendès
Miao
Miller
Morrissey
Naqvi
Noormohamed
O'Connell
O'Regan
Perron
Powlowski
Robillard
Romanado
Sahota
Saks
Sarai
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Singh
Sousa
St-Onge
Tassi
Therrien
Trudeau
Turnbull
Van Bynen
Vandenbeld
Villemure
Weiler
Yip
Zarrillo

Fry
Gainey
Garrison
Gazan
Gill
Green
Hajdu
Hardie
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Idlout
Jaczek
Joly
Jowhari
Kayabaga
Khalid
Koutrakis
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lapointe
Lattanzio
Lebouthillier
Lightbound
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Martinez Ferrada
Mathysen
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McPherson
Mendicino
Michaud
Morrice
Murray
Ng
Normandin
Oliphant
Pauzé
Petitpas Taylor
Qualtrough
Rogers
Rota
Sajjan
Samson
Savard-Tremblay
Schiefke
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sinclair-Desgagné
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Sudds
Taylor Roy
Thompson
Trudel
Valdez
van Koeverden
Vignola
Virani
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi — 204

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Ali
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ashton
Bachrach
Bains
Barron
Battiste
Beech
Bibeau
Blair
Blanchette-Joncas
Boissonnault
Bradford
Brunelle-Duceppe
Carr
Chabot
Chahal
Champoux
Chen
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cormier
Dabrusin
Davies
Desbiens
Desjarlais
Dhillon
Dong
Dubourg
Duguid
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos

Alghabra
Anand
Angus
Arya
Atwin
Badawey
Baker
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bérubé
Bittle
Blanchet
Blaney
Boulerice
Brière
Cannings
Casey
Chagger
Champagne
Chatel
Chiang
Collins (Victoria)
Coteau
Damoff
DeBellefeuille
Desilets
Dhaliwal
Diab
Drouin
Duclos
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser

Barlow
Davidson
Plamondon

PAIRED

Members

Blois
MacDonald (Malpeque)
Rodriguez

Government Orders

Vandal

Zimmer— 8

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 3 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 9, 20 and 130 defeated.

[*Translation*]

The question is on Motion No. 4. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 8, 14 and 19. A negative vote on Motion No. 4 requires the question to be put on Motion No. 10.

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

Mr. Luc Berthold: Mr. Speaker, once again, since we are all here, I am requesting a recorded vote.

● (1855)

(The House divided on Motion No. 4, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 690*)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barrett	Berthold
Bezan	Block
Bragdon	Brassard
Brock	Calkins
Caputo	Carrie
Chambers	Chong
Cooper	Dalton
Dancho	Deltell
Doherty	Dowdall
Dreeshen	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Ellis	Epp
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)
Fast	Ferri
Findlay	Gallant
Généreux	Genuis
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gourde
Gray	Hallan
Jeneroux	Jivani
Kelly	Khanna
Kitchen	Kmiec
Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Kurek	Kusie
Lake	Lantsman
Lawrence	Lehoux
Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
Maguire	Majumdar
Martel	Mazier
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLean
Melillo	Moore
Morantz	Morrison
Motz	Muys
Nater	Patzer
Paul-Hus	Perkins
Poillievre	Redekopp
Reid	Rempel Garner
Richards	Roberts
Rood	Ruff
Scheer	Schmale
Seeback	Shields

Shiple
Soroka
Stewart
Stubbs
Tochor
Uppal
Vecchio
Vien
Vis
Wagantall
Waugh
Williams

Small
Steinley
Strahl
Thomas
Tolmie
Van Popta
Vidal
Viensen
Vuong
Warkentin
Webber
Williamson— 114

NAYS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barron	Barsalou-Duval
Battiste	Beaulieu
Beech	Bérubé
Bibeau	Bittle
Blair	Blanchette-Joncas
Blaney	Boissonnault
Boulerice	Bradford
Brière	Brunelle-Duceppe
Cannings	Carr
Casey	Chabot
Chagger	Chahal
Champagne	Champoux
Chatel	Chen
Chiang	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Collins (Victoria)	Cormier
Coteau	Dabrusin
Damoff	Davies
DeBellefeuille	Desbiens
Desilets	Desjarlais
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Dong
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fortin	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Fry	Gaheer
Gainey	Garon
Garrison	Gaudreau
Gazan	Gerretsen
Gill	Gould
Green	Guilbeault
Hajdu	Hanley
Hardie	Hepfner
Holland	Housefather
Hughes	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Idlout	Ien
Jaczek	Johns
Joly	Jones
Jowhari	Julian
Kayabaga	Kelloway
Khalid	Khera
Koutrakis	Kusmierczyk
Kwan	Lalonde
Lambropoulos	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Larouche

Government Orders

Lattanzio
 LeBlanc
 Lemire
 Long
 Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
 MacGregor
 Maloney
 Masse
 May (Cambridge)
 McDonald (Avalon)
 McKay
 McLeod
 Mendès
 Miao
 Miller
 Morrissey
 Naqvi
 Noormohamed
 O'Connell
 O'Regan
 Perron
 Powlowski
 Robillard
 Romanado
 Sahota
 Saks
 Sarai
 Scarpaleggia
 Serré
 Shanahan
 Sidhu (Brampton East)
 Simard
 Singh
 Sousa
 St-Onge
 Tassi
 Therrien
 Trudeau
 Turnbull
 Van Bynen
 Vandenberg
 Villemure
 Weiler
 Yip
 Zarrillo

Lauzon
 Lebouthillier
 Lightbound
 Longfield
 MacAulay (Cardigan)
 MacKinnon (Gatineau)
 Martinez Ferrada
 Mathysen
 May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
 McGuinty
 McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
 McPherson
 Mendicino
 Morrice
 Murray
 Ng
 Normandin
 Oliphant
 Pauzé
 Petitpas Taylor
 Qualtrough
 Rogers
 Rota
 Sajjan
 Samson
 Savard-Tremblay
 Schiefke
 Sgro
 Sheehan
 Sidhu (Brampton South)
 Sinclair-Desgagné
 Sorbara
 Ste-Marie
 Suds
 Taylor Roy
 Thompson
 Trudel
 Valdez
 van Koeverden
 Vignola
 Virani
 Wilkinson
 Zahid
 Zuberi — 204

Albas
 Arnold
 Barrett
 Bezan
 Bragdon
 Brock
 Caputo
 Chambers
 Cooper
 Dancho
 Doherty
 Dreesen
 Ellis
 Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
 Fast
 Findlay
 Génereux
 Gladu
 Goodridge
 Gray
 Jeneroux
 Kelly
 Kitchen
 Kram
 Kurek
 Lake
 Lawrence
 Leslie
 Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
 Lloyd
 Maguire
 Martel
 McCauley (Edmonton West)
 Melillo
 Morantz
 Motz
 Nater
 Paul-Hus
 Poilievre
 Reid
 Richards
 Rood
 Scheer
 Seeback
 Shipley
 Soroka
 Stewart
 Stubbs
 Tochor
 Uppal
 Vecchio
 Vien
 Vis
 Wagantall
 Waugh
 Williams

Allison
 Baldinelli
 Berthold
 Block
 Brassard
 Calkins
 Carrie
 Chong
 Dalton
 Deltell
 Dowdall
 Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
 Epp
 Falk (Provencher)
 Ferreri
 Gallant
 Genus
 Godin
 Gourde
 Hallan
 Jivani
 Khanna
 Kmiec
 Kramp-Neuman
 Kusie
 Lantsman
 Lehoux
 Lewis (Essex)
 Liepert
 Lobb
 Majumdar
 Mazier
 McLean
 Moore
 Morrison
 Muis
 Patzer
 Perkins
 Redekopp
 Rempel Garner
 Roberts
 Ruff
 Schmale
 Shields
 Small
 Steinley
 Strahl
 Thomas
 Tolmie
 Van Popta
 Vidal
 Viersen
 Vuong
 Warkentin
 Webber
 Williamson — 114

PAIRED

Members

Barlow
 Davidson
 Plamondon
 Vandal

Blois
 MacDonald (Malpeque)
 Rodriguez
 Zimmer — 8

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 4 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 8, 14 and 19 defeated as well.

[*English*]

The question is on Motion No. 5. A vote on the motion also applies to Motion No. 48. A negative vote on Motion No. 5 requires the question to be put on Motion No. 49.

• (1905)

(The House divided on Motion No. 5, which was negatived on the following division:)

(*Division No. 691*)

YEAS

Members

Aboulttaif

Aitchison

NAYS

Members

Aldag
 Ali
 Anandasangaree
 Arseneault
 Ashton
 Bachrach
 Bains
 Barron
 Battiste
 Beech
 Bibeau
 Blair
 Blanchette-Joncas

Alghabra
 Anand
 Angus
 Arya
 Atwin
 Badawey
 Baker
 Barsalou-Duval
 Beaulieu
 Bérubé
 Bittle
 Blanchet
 Blaney

Government Orders

Jeneroux
 Kelly
 Kitchen
 Kram
 Kurek
 Lake
 Lawrence
 Leslie
 Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
 Lloyd
 Maguire
 Martel
 McCauley (Edmonton West)
 Melillo
 Morantz
 Motz
 Nater
 Paul-Hus
 Poilievre
 Reid
 Richards
 Rood
 Scheer
 Seeback
 Shipley
 Soroka
 Stewart
 Stubbs
 Tochor
 Uppal
 Vecchio
 Vien
 Vis
 Warkeintin
 Webber
 Williamson— 113

Jivani
 Khanna
 Kmiec
 Kramp-Neuman
 Kusie
 Lantsman
 Lehoux
 Lewis (Essex)
 Liepert
 Lobb
 Majumdar
 Mazier
 McLean
 Moore
 Morrison
 Muys
 Patzer
 Perkins
 Redekopp
 Rempel Garner
 Roberts
 Ruff
 Schmale
 Shields
 Small
 Steinley
 Strahl
 Thomas
 Tolmie
 Van Popta
 Vidal
 Viersen
 Wagantall
 Waugh
 Williams

Fisher
 Fortier
 Fragiskatos
 Freeland
 Gaheer
 Garon
 Gazan
 Gill
 Green
 Hajdu
 Hardie
 Holland
 Hughes
 Hutchings
 Idlout
 Jaczek
 Joly
 Jowhari
 Kayabaga
 Khalid
 Koutrakis
 Kwan
 Lambropoulos
 Lapointe
 Lattanzio
 LeBlanc
 Lemire
 Long
 Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
 MacGregor
 Maloney
 Masse
 May (Cambridge)
 McDonald (Avalon)
 McKay
 McLeod
 Mendès
 Miao
 Miller
 Morrissey
 Naqvi
 Noormohamed
 O'Connell
 O'Regan
 Perron
 Powlowski
 Robillard
 Romanado
 Sahota
 Saks
 Sarai
 Scarpaleggia
 Serré
 Shanahan
 Sidhu (Brampton East)
 Simard
 Singh
 Sousa
 St-Onge
 Tassi
 Therrien
 Trudeau
 Turnbull
 Van Bynen
 Vandenbeld
 Villemure
 Weiler
 Yip
 Zarrillo

Fonseca
 Fortin
 Fraser
 Fry
 Gaaney
 Gaudreau
 Gerretsen
 Gould
 Guilbeault
 Hanley
 Hepfner
 Housefather
 Hussen
 Iacono
 Ien
 Johns
 Jones
 Julian
 Kelloway
 Khera
 Kusmierczyk
 Lalonde
 Lamoureux
 Larouche
 Lauzon
 Lebouthillier
 Lightbound
 Longfield
 MacAulay (Cardigan)
 MacKinnon (Gatineau)
 Martinez Ferrada
 Mathysen
 May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
 McGuinty
 McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
 McPherson
 Mendicino
 Michaud
 Morrice
 Murray
 Ng
 Normandin
 Oliphant
 Pauzé
 Petitpas Taylor
 Qualtrough
 Rogers
 Rota
 Sajjan
 Samson
 Savard-Tremblay
 Schiefke
 Sgro
 Sheehan
 Sidhu (Brampton South)
 Sinclair-Desgagné
 Sorbara
 Ste-Marie
 Sudds
 Taylor Roy
 Thompson
 Trudel
 Valdez
 van Koeverden
 Vignola
 Virani
 Wilkinson
 Zahid
 Zuberi— 204

NAYS

Members

Aldag
 Ali
 Anandasangaree
 Arseneault
 Ashton
 Bachrach
 Bains
 Barron
 Battiste
 Beech
 Bibeau
 Blair
 Blanchette-Joncas
 Boissonnault
 Bradford
 Brunelle-Duceppe
 Carr
 Chabot
 Chahal
 Champoux
 Chen
 Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
 Cormier
 Dabrusin
 Davies
 Desbiens
 Desjarlais
 Dhillon
 Dong
 Dubourg
 Duguid
 Ehsassi
 Erskine-Smith

Alghabra
 Anand
 Angus
 Arya
 Atwin
 Badawey
 Baker
 Barsalou-Duval
 Beaulieu
 Bérubé
 Bittle
 Blanchet
 Blaney
 Boulerice
 Brière
 Cannings
 Casey
 Chagger
 Champagne
 Chatel
 Chiang
 Collins (Victoria)
 Coteau
 Damoff
 DeBellefeuille
 Desilets
 Dhaliwal
 Diab
 Drouin
 Duclos
 Dzerowicz
 El-Khoury
 Fillmore

Government Orders

PAIRED

Members

Barlow	Blois
Davidson	MacDonald (Malpeque)
Plamondon	Rodriguez
Vandal	Zimmer— 8

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 10 defeated.

The question is on Motion No. 11.

[*Translation*]

A vote on the motion also applies to Motion No. 131. A negative vote on Motion No. 11 requires the question to be put on Motion No. 123.

[*English*]

May I dispense?

Some hon. members: No.

[*Chair read text of motion to House*]

The Deputy Speaker: If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Laila Goodridge: Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Party would call for a recorded division.

• (1930)

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 11, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 693*)

YEAS

Members

Abouttaif	Aitchison
Allison	Arnold
Baldinelli	Barrett
Berthold	Bezan
Block	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Calkins	Caputo
Carrie	Chambers
Chong	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho
Deltell	Doherty
Dowdall	Dreeshen
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Ferreri	Findlay
Gallant	Généreux
Genuis	Gladu
Godin	Goodridge
Gourde	Gray
Hallan	Jeneroux
Jivani	Kelly
Khanna	Kitchen
Kmiec	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek

Kusie	Lake
Lantsman	Lawrence
Lehoux	Leslie
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Liepert	Lloyd
Lobb	Maguire
Majumdar	Martel
Mazier	McCaughey (Edmonton West)
McLean	Melillo
Moore	Morantz
Morrison	Motz
Muys	Nater
Patzner	Paul-Hus
Perkins	Poillievre
Redekopp	Reid
Rempel Garner	Richards
Roberts	Rood
Ruff	Secheer
Schmale	Seeback
Shields	Shipley
Small	Soroka
Steinley	Stewart
Strahl	Stubbs
Thomas	Tochor
Tolmie	Uppal
Van Popta	Vecchio
Vidal	Vien
Viersen	Vis
Vuong	Wagantall
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Williams
Williamson— 113	

NAYS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barron	Barsalou-Duval
Battiste	Beaulieu
Beech	Bérubé
Bibeau	Bittle
Blair	Blanchet
Blaney	Boissonnault
Boulerice	Bradford
Brière	Brunelle-Duceppe
Cannings	Carr
Casey	Chabot
Chagger	Chahal
Champagne	Champoux
Chatel	Chen
Chiang	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Collins (Victoria)	Cormier
Coteau	Dabrusin
Damoff	Davies
DeBellefeuille	Desbiens
Desilets	Desjarlais
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Dong
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fortin	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Fry	Gaheer

Government Orders

Gainey
Gaudreau
Gerretsen
Gould
Guilbeault
Hanley
Hepfner
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Ien
Johns
Jones
Julian
Kelloway
Khera
Kusmierczyk
Lalonde
Lamoureux
Larouche
Lauzon
Lebouthillier
Lightbound
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Martinez Ferrada
Mathysen
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McPherson
Mendicino
Michaud
Morrice
Murray
Ng
Normandin
Oliphant
Pauzé
Petipas Taylor
Qualtrough
Rogers
Rota
Sajjan
Samson
Savard-Tremblay
Schieffe
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sinclair-Desgagné
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Sudds
Taylor Roy
Thompson
Trudel
Valdez
van Koeverden
Vignola
Virani
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi — 203

Garon
Gazan
Gill
Green
Hajdu
Hardie
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Idlout
Jaczek
Joly
Jowhari
Kayabaga
Khalid
Koutrakis
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lapointe
Lattanzio
LeBlanc
Lemire
Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacGregor
Maloney
Masse
May (Cambridge)
McDonald (Avalon)
McKay
McLeod
Mendès
Miao
Miller
Morrissey
Naqvi
Noormohamed
O'Connell
O'Regan
Perron
Powlowski
Robillard
Romanado
Sahota
Saks
Sarai
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Singh
Sousa
St-Onge
Tassi
Therrien
Trudeau
Turnbull
Van Bynen
Vandenbeld
Villemure
Weiler
Yip
Zarrillo

PAIRED

Members

Barlow
Davidson
Plamondon
Vandal

Blois
MacDonald (Malpeque)
Rodriguez
Zimmer — 8

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 11 defeated.

[*Translation*]

I therefore declare Motion No. 131 defeated.

[*English*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The question is on Motion No. 16. A negative vote on Motion No. 16 requires the question be put on Motion No. 17.

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

The hon. member for Northumberland—Peterborough South.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Madam Speaker, we request a recorded division.

● (1945)

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 16, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 694*)

YEAS

Members

Aboutaif	Aitchison
Allison	Arnold
Baldinelli	Barrett
Berthold	Bezan
Block	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Calkins	Caputo
Carrie	Chambers
Chong	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho
Deltell	Doherty
Dowdall	Dreeschen
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Ferreri	Findlay
Gallant	Généreux
Genuis	Gladu
Godin	Goodridge
Gourde	Gray
Hallan	Jeneroux
Jivani	Kelly
Khanna	Kitchen
Kmiec	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Kusie	Lake
Lantsman	Lawrence
Lehoux	Leslie
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Liepert	Lloyd
Lobb	Maguire
Majumdar	Martel
Mazier	McCaughey (Edmonton West)
McLean	Melillo
Moore	Morantz
Morrison	Motz
Muys	Nater
Patzer	Paul-Hus

Government Orders

Perkins
Redekopp
Rempel Garner
Roberts
Ruff
Schmale
Shields
Small
Steinley
Strahl
Thomas
Tolmie
Van Popta
Vidal
Viersen
Vuong
Warkentin
Webber
Williamson— 113

Poilievre
Reid
Richards
Rood
Scheer
Seeback
Shipley
Soroka
Stewart
Stubbs
Tochor
Uppal
Vecchio
Vien
Vis
Wagantall
Waugh
Williams

Julian
Kelloway
Khera
Kusmierczyk
Lalonde
Lamoureux
Larouche
Lauzon
Lebouthillier
Lightbound
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Martinez Ferrada
Mathysen
May (Saanch—Gulf Islands)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McPherson
Mendicino
Michaud
Morrice
Murray
Ng
Normandin
Oliphant
Pauzé
Petipas Taylor
Qualtrough
Rogers
Sahota
Saks
Sarai
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Singh
Sousa
St-Onge
Tassi
Therrien
Trudeau
Turnbull
Van Bynen
Vandenbeld
Villemure
Weiler
Yip
Zarrillo

Kayabaga
Khalid
Koutrakis
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lapointe
Lattanzio
LeBlanc
Lemire
Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacGregor
Maloney
Masse
May (Cambridge)
McDonald (Avalon)
McKay
McLeod
Mendès
Miao
Miller
Morrisey
Naqvi
Noormohamed
O'Connell
O'Regan
Perron
Powlowski
Robillard
Romanado
Sajjan
Samson
Savard-Tremblay
Schiefke
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sinclair-Desgagné
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Sudds
Taylor Roy
Thompson
Trudel
Valdez
van Koeverden
Vignola
Virani
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi— 202

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Ali
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ashton
Bachrach
Bains
Barron
Battiste
Beech
Bérubé
Bittle
Blanchet
Boissonnault
Bradford
Brunelle-Duceppe
Carr
Chabot
Chahal
Champoux
Chen
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cormier
Dabrusin
Davies
Desbiens
Desjarlais
Dhillon
Dong
Dubourg
Duguid
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Gaheer
Garon
Gazan
Gill
Green
Hajdu
Hardie
Holland
Hussen
Iacono
Ien
Johns
Jones

Alghabra
Anand
Angus
Arya
Atwin
Badawey
Baker
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bergeron
Bibeau
Blair
Blaney
Boulerice
Brière
Cannings
Casey
Chagger
Champagne
Chatel
Chiang
Collins (Victoria)
Coteau
Damoff
DeBellefeuille
Desilets
Dhaliwal
Diab
Drouin
Duclos
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser
Fry
Gainey
Gaudreau
Gerretsen
Gould
Guilbeault
Hanley
Hepfner
Housefather
Hutchings
Idlout
Jaczek
Joly
Jowhari

Mendicino
Michaud
Morrice
Murray
Ng
Normandin
Oliphant
Pauzé
Petipas Taylor
Qualtrough
Rogers
Sahota
Saks
Sarai
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Singh
Sousa
St-Onge
Tassi
Therrien
Trudeau
Turnbull
Van Bynen
Vandenbeld
Villemure
Weiler
Yip
Zarrillo

PAIRED

Members

Barlow
Davidson
Plamondon
Vandal

Blois
MacDonald (Malpeque)
Rodriguez
Zimmer— 8

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I declare Motion No. 16 defeated.

The question is on Motion No. 17.

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

Mr. Joël Godin: Madam Speaker, we want to request a recorded division.

Government Orders

● (1955)

(The House divided on Motion No. 17, which was defeated on the following division:)

(Division No. 695)

YEAS

Members

Abouttaif	Aitchison
Allison	Arnold
Baldinelli	Barrett
Barsalou-Duval	Beaulieu
Bergeron	Berthold
Bérubé	Bezan
Block	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Brunelle-Duceppe	Calkins
Caputo	Carrie
Chabot	Chambers
Champoux	Chong
Cooper	Dalton
Dancho	DeBellefeuille
Deltell	Desbiens
Desilets	Doherty
Dowdall	Dreeshen
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Ferreri	Findlay
Fortin	Gallant
Garon	Gaudreau
Généreux	Genuis
Gill	Gladu
Godin	Goodridge
Gourde	Gray
Hallan	Jeneroux
Jivani	Kelly
Khanna	Kitchen
Kmiec	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Kusie	Lake
Lantsman	Larouche
Lawrence	Lehoux
Lemire	Leslie
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Liepert	Lloyd
Lobb	Maguire
Majumdar	Martel
Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLean	Melillo
Michaud	Moore
Morantz	Morrison
Motz	Muys
Nater	Normandin
Patzer	Paul-Hus
Pauzé	Perkins
Perron	Poilievre
Redekopp	Reid
Rempel Garner	Richards
Roberts	Rood
Ruff	Savard-Tremblay
Scheer	Schmale
Seeback	Shields
Shiple	Simard
Sinclair-Desgagné	Small
Soroka	Steinley
Ste-Marie	Stewart
Strahl	Stubbs
Therrien	Thomas
Tochor	Tolmie
Trudel	Uppal
Van Popta	Vecchio

Vidal
 Viersen
 Villemure
 Vuong
 Warkentin
 Williams

Vien
 Vignola
 Vis
 Wagantall
 Webber
 Williamson— 140

NAYS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barron	Battiste
Beech	Bibeau
Bittle	Blair
Blaney	Boissonnault
Boulerice	Bradford
Brière	Cannings
Carr	Casey
Chagger	Chahal
Champagne	Chatel
Chen	Chiang
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Damoff
Davies	Desjarlais
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Dong
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fragiskatos	Fraser
Freeland	Fry
Gaheer	Gainey
Gazan	Gerretsen
Gould	Green
Guilbeault	Hajdu
Hanley	Hardie
Hepfner	Holland
Housefather	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Idlout	Ien
Jaczek	Johns
Joly	Jones
Jowhari	Julian
Kayabaga	Kelloway
Khalid	Khera
Koutrakis	Kusmierczyk
Kwan	Lalonde
Lambropoulos	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Lattanzio
Lauzon	LeBlanc
Lebouthillier	Lightbound
Long	Longfield
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney	Martinez Ferrada
Masse	Mathysen
May (Cambridge)	May (Saanieh—Gulf Islands)
McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod	McPherson
Mendès	Medicino
Miao	Miller
Morrice	Morrissey

Government Orders

Murray	Naqvi	Ellis	Epp
Ng	Noormohamed	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)
O'Connell	Oliphant	Fast	Ferreri
O'Regan	Petipas Taylor	Findlay	Généreux
Powlowski	Qualtrough	Genius	Gladu
Robillard	Rogers	Godin	Goodridge
Romanado	Rota	Gourde	Gray
Sahota	Sajjan	Hallan	Jeneroux
Saks	Samson	Jivani	Kelly
Sarai	Scarpaleggia	Khanna	Kitchen
Schiefke	Serré	Kmiec	Kram
Sgro	Shanahan	Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Sheehan	Sidhu (Brampton East)	Kusie	Lake
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Singh	Lantsman	Lawrence
Sorbara	Sousa	Lehoux	Leslie
St-Onge	Sudds	Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Tassi	Taylor Roy	Liepert	Lloyd
Thompson	Trudeau	Lobb	Maguire
Turnbull	Valdez	Majumdar	Martel
Van Bynen	van Koeverden	Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)
Vandenbeld	Virani	McLean	Melillo
Weiler	Wilkinson	Moore	Morantz
Yip	Zahid	Morrison	Motz
Zarrillo	Zuberi— 174	Muys	Nater
		Patzer	Paul-Hus
		Perkins	Poilievre
		Redekopp	Reid
		Rempel Garner	Richards
		Roberts	Rood
		Ruff	Scheer
		Schmale	Seebach
		Shields	Shipley
		Small	Soroka
		Steinley	Stewart
		Strahl	Stubbs
		Thomas	Tochor
		Tolmie	Uppal
		Van Popta	Vidal
		Vien	Viersen
		Vis	Vuong
		Wagantall	Warkentin
		Webber	Williams
		Williamson— 111	

PAIRED

Members

Barlow	Blois
Davidson	MacDonald (Malpeque)
Plamondon	Rodriguez
Vandal	Zimmer— 8

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I declare the motion defeated.

• (2000)

[*Translation*]

The question is on Motion No. 21.

[*English*]

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

Mr. Warren Steinley: Madam Speaker, I would call for a recorded division.

• (2010)

(The House divided on Motion No. 21, which was defeated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 696*)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Allison	Arnold
Baldinelli	Barrett
Berthold	Bezan
Block	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Calkins	Caputo
Carrie	Chambers
Chong	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho
Deltell	d'Entremont
Doherty	Dowdall
Dreeshen	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)

Aldag
Ali
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ashton
Bachrach
Bains
Barron
Battiste
Beech
Bérubé
Bittle
Blanchet
Blaney
Boulerice
Brière
Cannings
Casey
Chagger
Champagne
Chatel
Chiang
Collins (Victoria)
Coteau
Damoff
DeBellefeuille

NAYS

Members

Alghabra
Anand
Angus
Arya
Atwin
Badawey
Baker
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bergeron
Bibeau
Blair
Blanchette-Joncas
Boissonnault
Bradford
Brunelle-Duceppe
Carr
Chabot
Chahal
Champoux
Chen
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cormier
Dabrusin
Davies
Desbiens

Government Orders

Desilets
 Dhaliwal
 Diab
 Drouin
 Duclos
 Dzerowicz
 El-Khoury
 Fillmore
 Fonseca
 Fortin
 Fraser
 Fry
 Gainey
 Gaudreau
 Gerretsen
 Gould
 Guilbeault
 Hanley
 Hepfner
 Housefather
 Hutchings
 Idlout
 Jaczek
 Joly
 Jowhari
 Kayabaga
 Khalid
 Koutrakis
 Kwan
 Lambropoulos
 Lapointe
 Lattanzio
 LeBlanc
 Lemire
 Long
 Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
 MacGregor
 Maloney
 Masse
 May (Cambridge)
 McDonald (Avalon)
 McKay
 McLeod
 Mendès
 Miao
 Miller
 Morrissey
 Naqvi
 Noormohamed
 O'Connell
 O'Regan
 Perron
 Powlowski
 Robillard
 Romanado
 Sahota
 Saks
 Sarai
 Scarpaleggia
 Serré
 Shanahan
 Sidhu (Brampton East)
 Simard
 Singh
 Sousa
 St-Onge
 Tassi
 Therrien
 Trudeau
 Turnbull
 Van Bynen
 Vandenberg
 Villemure

Desjarlais
 Dhillon
 Dong
 Dubourg
 Duguid
 Ehsassi
 Erskine-Smith
 Fisher
 Fortier
 Fragiskatos
 Freeland
 Gaheer
 Garon
 Gazan
 Gill
 Green
 Hajdu
 Hardie
 Holland
 Hussien
 Iacono
 Ien
 Johns
 Jones
 Julian
 Kelloway
 Khera
 Kusmierczyk
 Lalonde
 Lamoureux
 Larouche
 Lauzon
 Leboathillier
 Lightbound
 Longfield
 MacAulay (Cardigan)
 MacKinnon (Gatineau)
 Martinez Ferrada
 Mathysen
 May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
 McGuinty
 McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
 McPherson
 Mendicino
 Michaud
 Morrice
 Murray
 Ng
 Normandin
 Oliphant
 Pausé
 Petitpas Taylor
 Qualtrough
 Rogers
 Rota
 Sajjan
 Samson
 Savard-Tremblay
 Schiefke
 Sgro
 Sheehan
 Sidhu (Brampton South)
 Sinclair-Desgagné
 Sorbara
 Ste-Marie
 Suds
 Taylor Roy
 Thompson
 Trudel
 Valdez
 van Koevorden
 Vignola
 Virani

Weiler
 Yip
 Zarrillo

 Barlow
 Davidson
 Plamondon
 Vandal

 Aboutaif
 Allison
 Baldinelli
 Berthold
 Block
 Brassard
 Calkins
 Carrie
 Chong
 Dalton
 Deltell
 Doherty
 Dreesen
 Ellis
 Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
 Fast
 Findlay
 Génèreux
 Gladu
 Goodridge
 Gray
 Jivani
 Khanna
 Kmiec
 Kramp-Neuman
 Kusie
 Lantsman
 Lehoux
 Lewis (Essex)
 Liepert
 Lobb
 Majumdar
 Mazier
 McLean
 Moore
 Morrison
 Muys
 Patzer
 Perkins
 Redekopp
 Rempel Garner
 Roberts
 Ruff

Wilkinson
 Zahid
 Zuberi — 204

PAIRED

Members

Blois
 MacDonald (Malpeque)
 Rodriguez
 Zimmer — 8

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I declare the motion defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 25. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 29 and 31.

A negative vote on Motion No. 25 requires the question to be put on Motion No. 26.

● (2025)

(The House divided on Motion No. 25, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 697)

YEAS

Members

Aitchison
 Arnold
 Barrett
 Bezan
 Bragdon
 Brock
 Caputo
 Chambers
 Cooper
 Dancho
 d'Entremont
 Dowdall
 Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
 Epp
 Falk (Provencher)
 Ferreri
 Gallant
 Genuis
 Godin
 Gourde
 Jeneroux
 Kelly
 Kitchen
 Kram
 Kurek
 Lake
 Lawrence
 Leslie
 Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
 Lloyd
 Maguire
 Martel
 McCauley (Edmonton West)
 Melillo
 Morantz
 Motz
 Nater
 Paul-Hus
 Poilievre
 Reid
 Richards
 Road
 Scheer

Government Orders

Schmale
Shields
Small
Steinley
Strahl
Thomas
Tolmie
Van Popta
Vien
Vis
Wagantall
Webber
Williamson— 111

Seeback
Shipley
Soroka
Stewart
Stubbs
Tochor
Uppal
Vidal
Viersen
Vuong
Warkentin
Williams

Lapointe
Lattanzio
LeBlanc
Lemire
Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacGregor
Maloney
Masse
May (Cambridge)
McDonald (Avalon)
McKay
McLeod
Mendès
Miao
Miller
Morrissey
Naqvi
Noormohamed
O'Connell
O'Regan
Perron
Powlowski
Robillard
Romanado
Sahota
Saks
Sarai
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Singh
Sousa
St-Onge
Tassi
Therrien
Trudeau
Turnbull
Van Bynen
Vandenbeld
Villemure
Weiler
Yip
Zarrillo

Larouche
Lauzon
Lebouthillier
Lightbound
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Martinez Ferrada
Mathysen
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McPherson
Mendicino
Michaud
Morrice
Murray
Ng
Normandin
Oliphant
Pauzé
Petipas Taylor
Qualtrough
Rogers
Rota
Sajjan
Samson
Savard-Tremblay
Schieffe
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sinclair-Desgagné
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Sudds
Taylor Roy
Thompson
Trudel
Valdez
van Koeverden
Vignola
Virani
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi— 204

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Ali
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ashton
Bachrach
Bains
Barron
Battiste
Beech
Bérubé
Bittle
Blanchet
Blaney
Boulerice
Brière
Cannings
Casey
Chagger
Champagne
Chatel
Chiang
Collins (Victoria)
Coteau
Damoff
DeBellefeuille
Desilets
Dhaliwal
Diab
Drouin
Duclos
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser
Fry
Gaine
Gaudreau
Gerretsen
Gould
Guilbeault
Hanley
Hepfner
Housefather
Hutchings
Idlout
Jaczek
Joly
Jowhari
Kayabaga
Khalid
Koutrakis
Kwan
Lambropoulos

Alghabra
Anand
Angus
Arya
Atwin
Badawey
Baker
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bergeron
Bibeau
Blair
Blanchette-Joncas
Boissonnault
Bradford
Brunelle-Duceppe
Carr
Chabot
Chahal
Champoux
Chen
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cormier
Dabrusin
Davies
Desbiens
Desjarlais
Dhillon
Dong
Dubourg
Duguid
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Gaheer
Garon
Gazan
Gill
Green
Hajdu
Hardie
Holland
Hussen
Iacono
Ien
Johns
Jones
Julian
Kelloway
Khera
Kusmierczyk
Lalonde
Lamoureux

PAIRED

Members

Barlow
Davidson
Plamondon
Vandal

Blois
MacDonald (Malpeque)
Rodriguez
Zimmer— 8

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I declare Motion No. 25 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 29 and 31 defeated as well.

The question is now on Motion No. 26.

[*Translation*]

A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 30 and 32. A negative vote on Motion No. 26 requires the question to be put on Motions Nos. 27, 28 and 36.

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

[English]

Mr. Chris Warkentin: Madam Speaker, we would request a recorded division.

• (2035)

[Translation]

(The House divided on Motion No. 26, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 698)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Allison	Arnold
Baldinelli	Barrett
Berthold	Bezan
Block	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Calkins	Caputo
Carrie	Chambers
Chong	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho
Deltell	d'Entremont
Doherty	Dowdall
Dreeshen	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Ellis	Epp
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)
Fast	Ferreri
Findlay	Gallant
Généreux	Genuis
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gourde
Gray	Jeneroux
Jivani	Kelly
Khanna	Kitchen
Kmiec	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Kusie	Lake
Lantsman	Lawrence
Lehoux	Leslie
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Liepert	Lloyd
Lobb	Maguire
Majumdar	Martel
Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLean	Melillo
Moore	Morantz
Morrison	Motz
Muys	Nater
Patzer	Paul-Hus
Perkins	Poilievre
Redekopp	Reid
Rempel Garner	Richards
Roberts	Rood
Ruff	Scheer
Schmale	Seeback
Shields	Shipley
Small	Soroka
Steinley	Stewart
Strahl	Stubbs
Thomas	Tochor
Tolmie	Uppal
Van Popta	Vidal
Vien	Viersen
Vis	Vuong
Wagantall	Warkentin
Webber	Williams
Williamson—	

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barron	Barsalou-Duval
Battiste	Beaulieu
Beech	Bergeron
Bérubé	Bibeau
Bittle	Blair
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Blaney	Boissonnault
Boulerice	Bradford
Brière	Brunelle-Duceppe
Cannings	Carr
Casey	Chabot
Chagger	Chahal
Champagne	Champoux
Chatel	Chen
Chiang	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Chiang (Victoria)	Cormier
Coteau	Dabrusin
Damoff	Davies
DeBellefeuille	Desbiens
Desilets	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Diab
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fortin	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Fry	Gaheer
Gainey	Garon
Gaudreau	Gazan
Gerretsen	Gill
Gould	Green
Guilbeault	Hajdu
Hanley	Hardie
Hepfner	Holland
Housefather	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Idlout	Ien
Jaczek	Johns
Joly	Jones
Jowhari	Julian
Kayabaga	Kelloway
Khalid	Khera
Koutrakis	Kusmierczyk
Kwan	Lalonde
Lambropoulos	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Larouche
Lattanzio	Lauzon
LeBlanc	Lemire
Lightbound	Long
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney
Martinez Ferrada	Masse
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	McDonald (Avalon)
McGuinty	McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod
McPherson	Mendès
Mendicino	Miao
Michaud	Miller

Government Orders

Morrice	Morrissey
Murray	Naqvi
Ng	Noormohamed
Normandin	O'Connell
Oliphant	O'Regan
Pauzé	Perron
Petitpas Taylor	Powlowski
Qualtrough	Robillard
Rogers	Romanado
Rota	Sahota
Sajjan	Saks
Samson	Sarai
Savard-Tremblay	Scarpaleggia
Schieffke	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Brampton East)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard
Sinclair-Desgagné	Singh
Sorbara	Sousa
Ste-Marie	St-Onge
Sudds	Tassi
Taylor Roy	Therrien
Thompson	Trudeau
Trudel	Turnbull
Valdez	Van Bynen
van Koeverden	Vandenbeld
Vignola	Villemure
Virani	Weiler
Wilkinson	Yip
Zahid	Zarrillo
Zuberi— 201	

PAIRED

Members

Barlow	Blois
Davidson	MacDonald (Malpeque)
Plamondon	Rodriguez
Vandal	Zimmer— 8

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I declare Motion No. 26 defeated.

The question is on Motion No. 27. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 33. A negative vote on Motion No. 27 requires the question to be put on Motion No. 28.

[*English*]

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Berthold: Madam Speaker, we request a recorded division.

• (2050)

Mr. Luc Berthold: Madam Speaker, I would like you to check something and ask for clarification.

Perhaps there is a technical problem, but it is impossible for our team to verify the identity of the member for Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères, because we cannot see his picture. It is impossible to see the person voting, so their vote cannot be clearly identified.

I would like you to verify the vote, if possible.

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Madam Speaker, we agree with the member who just explained that it is impossible to identify our member. We know that. He is experiencing difficulties at the moment. He is trying to connect, but it is not working. We can proceed to the next vote. We are fine with that.

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 27, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 699*)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaf	Aitchison
Allison	Arnold
Baldinelli	Barrett
Berthold	Bezan
Block	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Calkins	Caputo
Carrie	Chambers
Chong	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho
Deltell	d'Entremont
Doherty	Dowdall
Dreeshen	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Ellis	Epp
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)
Fast	Ferreri
Findlay	Gallant
Généreux	Genuis
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gourde
Gray	Jeneroux
Jivani	Kelly
Khanna	Kitchen
Kniec	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Kusie	Lake
Lantsman	Lawrence
Lehoux	Leslie
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Liepert	Lloyd
Lobb	Maguire
Majumdar	Martel
Mazier	McCaulley (Edmonton West)
McLean	Melillo
Moore	Morantz
Morrison	Motz
Muys	Nater
Patzer	Paul-Hus
Perkins	Poilievre
Redekopp	Reid
Rempel Garner	Richards
Roberts	Rood
Ruff	Scheer
Schmale	Seeback
Shields	Shiple
Small	Soroka
Steinley	Stewart
Stubbs	Thomas
Tochor	Tolmie
Uppal	Van Popta
Vecchio	Vidal
Vien	Viensen
Vis	Vuong
Wagantall	Warkentin
Webber	Williams
Williamson— 111	

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barron	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Bergeron	Bérubé
Bibeau	Bittle
Blair	Blanchet
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney
Boissonnault	Boulerice
Bradford	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings
Carr	Casey
Chabot	Chagger
Chahal	Champagne
Champoux	Chatel
Chen	Chiang
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Damoff
Davies	DeBellefeuille
Desbiens	Desilets
Desjarlais	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Diab
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fortin	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Fry	Gaheer
Gainey	Garon
Gaudreau	Gazan
Gerretsen	Gill
Gould	Green
Guilbeault	Hajdu
Hanley	Hardie
Hepfner	Housefather
Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Idlout
Ien	Jaczek
Johns	Joly
Jones	Jowhari
Julian	Kayabaga
Kelloway	Khalid
Khera	Koutrakis
Kusmierczyk	Kwan
Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Larouche	Lattanzio
Lauzon	LeBlanc
Lebouthillier	Lemire
Lightbound	Long
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney
Martinez Ferrada	Masse
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	McDonald (Avalon)
McGuinty	McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod
McPherson	Mendès
Medicino	Miao
Michaud	Miller

Morrice	Morrissey
Murray	Naqvi
Ng	Noormohamed
Normandin	O'Connell
Oliphant	O'Regan
Paupé	Perron
Petitpas Taylor	Powlowski
Qualtrough	Robillard
Rogers	Romanado
Rota	Sahota
Sajjan	Saks
Samson	Sarai
Savard-Tremblay	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Brampton East)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard
Sinclair-Desgagné	Singh
Sorbara	Sousa
Ste-Marie	St-Onge
Sudds	Tassi
Taylor Roy	Therrien
Thompson	Trudeau
Trudel	Turnbull
Valdez	Van Bynen
van Koeverden	Vandenbeld
Vignola	Villemure
Virani	Weiler
Wilkinson	Yip
Zahid	Zarrillo
Zuberi— 201	

PAIRED

Members

Barlow	Blois
Davidson	MacDonald (Malpeque)
Plamondon	Rodriguez
Vandal	Zimmer— 8

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I declare Motion No. 27 defeated. I therefore declare Motion No. 33 defeated as well.

[*Translation*]

The question is on Motion No. 28. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 34. A negative vote on Motion No. 28 requires the question to be put on Motion No. 35.

[*English*]

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

Mr. Chris Warkentin: Madam Speaker, we would request a recorded division.

● (2105)

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 28, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 700*)

YEAS

Members

Abouttaif	Aitchison
Allison	Arnold

Government Orders

Baldinelli	Barrett	Bradford	Brière
Berthold	Bezan	Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings
Block	Bragdon	Carr	Casey
Brassard	Brock	Chabot	Chagger
Calkins	Caputo	Chahal	Champagne
Carrie	Chambers	Champoux	Chen
Chong	Cooper	Chiang	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Dalton	Dancho	Collins (Victoria)	Cormier
Deltell	d'Entremont	Coteau	Dabrusin
Doherty	Dowdall	Damoff	Davies
Dreeshen	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	DeBellefeuille	Desbiens
Ellis	Epp	Desilets	Desjarlais
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)	Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Fast	Ferri	Diab	Dong
Findlay	Gallant	Drouin	Dubourg
Généreux	Genius	Duclos	Duguid
Gladu	Godin	Dzerowicz	Ehsassi
Goodridge	Gourde	El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Gray	Hallan	Fillmore	Fisher
Jeneroux	Jivani	Fonseca	Fortier
Kelly	Khanna	Fortin	Fragiskatos
Kitchen	Kmiec	Fraser	Freeland
Kram	Kramp-Neuman	Fry	Gaheer
Kurek	Kusie	Gainey	Garon
Lake	Lantsman	Gaudreau	Gazan
Lawrence	Lehoux	Gerretsen	Gill
Leslie	Lewis (Essex)	Gould	Green
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert	Guilbeault	Hajdu
Lloyd	Lobb	Hanley	Hardie
Maguire	Majumdar	Hepfner	Holland
Martel	Mazier	Housefather	Hussen
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLean	Hutchings	Iacono
Melillo	Moore	Idlout	Ien
Morantz	Morrison	Jaczek	Johns
Motz	Muys	Joly	Jones
Nater	Patzer	Jowhari	Julian
Paul-Hus	Perkins	Kayabaga	Kelloway
Poilievre	Redekopp	Khalid	Khera
Reid	Rempel Garner	Koutrakis	Kusmierczyk
Richards	Roberts	Kwan	Lalonde
Rood	Ruff	Lambropoulos	Lamoureux
Scheer	Schmale	Lapointe	Larouche
Seebach	Shields	Lattanzio	Lauzon
Shiple	Small	LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Soroka	Steinley	Lemire	Lightbound
Stewart	Strahl	Long	Longfield
Stubbs	Thomas	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)
Tochor	Tolmie	MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Uppal	Van Popta	Maloney	Martinez Ferrada
Vecchio	Vidal	Masse	Mathysen
Vien	Viersen	May (Cambridge)	May (Saarich—Gulf Islands)
Vis	Vuong	McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty
Wagantall	Warkentin	McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Webber	Williams	McLeod	McPherson
Williamson— 113		Mendès	Mendicino
		Miao	Michaud
		Miller	Morrice
		Morrissey	Murray
		Naqvi	Ng
		Noormohamed	Normandin
		O'Connell	Oliphant
		O'Regan	Pauzé
		Perron	Petipas Taylor
		Powlowski	Qualtrough
		Robillard	Rogers
		Romanado	Rota
		Sahota	Sajjan
		Saks	Samson
		Sarai	Savard-Tremblay
		Scarpaleggia	Schieffe
		Serré	Sgro
		Shanahan	Sheehan
		Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)

NAYS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barron	Barsalou-Duval
Battiste	Beaulieu
Beech	Bergeron
Bérubé	Bibeau
Bittle	Blair
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney
Boissonnault	Boulerice

Government Orders

Simard
Singh
Sousa
St-Onge
Tassi
Therrien
Trudeau
Turnbull
Van Bynen
Vandenbeld
Villemure
Weiler
Yip
Zarrillo

Sinclair-Desgagné
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Sudds
Taylor Roy
Thompson
Trudel
Valdez
van Koeverden
Vignola
Virani
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi— 202

Kmiec
Kramp-Neuman
Lake
Lawrence
Leslie
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lloyd
Maguire
Martel
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Melillo
Morantz
Motz
Nater
Paul-Hus
Poilievre
Reid
Richards
Rood
Scheer
Seeback
Shipley
Soroka
Stewart
Stubbs
Tochor
Uppal
Vecchio
Vien
Vis
Wagantall
Waugh
Williams

Kram
Kurek
Lantsman
Lehoux
Lewis (Essex)
Liepert
Lobb
Majumdar
Mazier
McLean
Moore
Morrison
Muys
Patzner
Perkins
Redekopp
Rempel Garner
Roberts
Ruff
Schmale
Shields
Small
Steinley
Strahl
Thomas
Tolmie
Van Popta
Vidal
Viersen
Vuong
Warkentin
Webber
Williamson— 114

PAIRED

Members

Barlow
Davidson
Plamondon
Vandal

Blois
MacDonald (Malpeque)
Rodriguez
Zimmer— 8

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I declare Motion No. 28 defeated.

[*English*]

The question is on Motion No. 35.

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Berthold: Madam Speaker, we request a recorded division.

● (2120)

(The House divided on Motion No. 35, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 701)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Albas
Arnold
Barrett
Bezan
Bragdon
Brock
Caputo
Chambers
Cooper
Dancho
d'Entremont
Dowdall
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Epp
Falk (Provencher)
Ferreri
Gallant
Genius
Godin
Gourde
Hallan
Jivani
Khanna

Aitchison
Allison
Baldinelli
Berthold
Block
Brassard
Calkins
Carrie
Chong
Dalton
Deltell
Doherty
Dreeshen
Ellis
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Findlay
Généreux
Gladu
Goodridge
Gray
Jeneroux
Kelly
Kitchen

Aldag
Ali
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ashton
Bachrach
Bains
Barron
Battiste
Beech
Bérubé
Bittle
Blanchette-Joncas
Boissonnault
Bradford
Brunelle-Duceppe
Carr
Chabot
Chahal
Champoux
Chen
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cormier
Dabrusin
Davies
Desbiens
Desjarlais
Dhillon
Dong
Dubourg
Duguid
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos

NAYS

Members

Alghabra
Anand
Angus
Arya
Atwin
Badawey
Baker
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bergeron
Bibeau
Blair
Blaney
Boulerice
Brière
Cannings
Casey
Chagger
Champagne
Chatel
Chiang
Collins (Victoria)
Coteau
Damoff
DeBellefeuille
Desilets
Dhaliwal
Diab
Drouin
Duclos
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser

Government Orders

Freeland	Fry
Gaheer	Gainey
Garon	Gaudreau
Gazan	Gerretsen
Gill	Gould
Green	Guilbeault
Hajdu	Hanley
Hardie	Hepfner
Holland	Housefather
Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Idlout
Ien	Jaczek
Johns	Joly
Jones	Jowhari
Julian	Kayabaga
Kelloway	Khalid
Khera	Koutrakis
Kusmierczyk	Kwan
Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Larouche	Lattanzio
Lauzon	LeBlanc
Lebouthillier	Lemire
Lighbound	Long
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney
Martinez Ferrada	Masse
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	McDonald (Avalon)
McGuinty	McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod
McPherson	Mendès
Mendicino	Miao
Michaud	Miller
Morrice	Morrissey
Murray	Naqvi
Ng	Noormohamed
Normandin	O'Connell
Oliphant	O'Regan
Pauzé	Perron
Petitpas Taylor	Powlowski
Qualtrough	Robillard
Rogers	Romanado
Rota	Sahota
Sajjan	Saks
Samson	Sarai
Savard-Tremblay	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Brampton East)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard
Sinclair-Desgagné	Singh
Sorbara	Sousa
Ste-Marie	St-Onge
Sudds	Tassi
Taylor Roy	Therrien
Thompson	Trudeau
Trudel	Turnbull
Valdez	Van Bynen
van Koeverden	Vandenbeld
Vignola	Villemure
Virani	Weiler
Wilkinson	Yip
Zahid	Zarrillo
Zuberi— 203	

PAIRED

Members

Barlow	Blois
Davidson	MacDonald (Malpeque)
Plamondon	Rodriguez

Vandal Zimmer— 8

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I declare Motion No. 35 defeated.

The question is on Motion No. 36.

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

Mrs. Laila Goodridge: Madam Speaker, we request a recorded division.

● (2130)

[English]

(The House divided on the Motion No. 36, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 702)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barrett	Berthold
Bezan	Block
Bragdon	Brassard
Brock	Calkins
Caputo	Carrie
Chambers	Chong
Cooper	Dalton
Dancho	Deltell
d'Entremont	Doherty
Dowdall	Dreeshen
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Ferreri	Findlay
Gallant	Généreux
Genuis	Gladu
Godin	Goodridge
Gourde	Gray
Hallan	Jeneroux
Jivani	Kelly
Khanna	Kitchen
Kmiec	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Kusie	Lake
Lantsman	Lawrence
Lehoux	Leslie
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Liepert	Lloyd
Lobb	Maguire
Majumdar	Martel
Mazier	McCaulley (Edmonton West)
McLean	Melillo
Moore	Morantz
Morrison	Motz
Muys	Nater
Patzer	Paul-Hus
Perkins	Poilievre
Redekopp	Reid
Rempel Garner	Richards
Roberts	Rood
Ruff	Secheer
Schmale	Seeback
Shields	Shipley
Small	Soroka

Government Orders

Steinley
Strahl
Thomas
Tolmie
Van Popta
Vidal
Viersen
Vuong
Warkentin
Webber
Williamson— 115

Stewart
Stubbs
Tochor
Uppal
Vecchio
Vien
Vis
Wagantall
Waugh
Williams

Lebouthillier
Lightbound
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Martinez Ferrada
Mathysen
May (Saenich—Gulf Islands)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McPherson
Mendicino
Michaud
Morrice
Murray
Ng
Normandin
Oliphant
Pauzé
Petitpas Taylor
Qualtrough
Rogers
Rota
Sajjan
Samson
Savard-Tremblay
Schiefke
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sinclair-Desgagné
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Sudds
Taylor Roy
Thompson
Trudel
Valdez
van Koeverden
Vignola
Virani
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi— 203

Lemire
Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacGregor
Maloney
Masse
May (Cambridge)
McDonald (Avalon)
McKay
McLeod
Mendès
Miao
Miller
Morrissey
Naqvi
Noormohamed
O'Connell
O'Regan
Perron
Powlowski
Robillard
Romanado
Sahota
Saks
Saraï
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Singh
Souza
St-Onge
Tassi
Therrien
Trudeau
Turnbull
Van Bynen
Vandenbeld
Villemure
Weiler
Yip
Zarrillo

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Ali
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ashton
Bachrach
Bains
Barron
Battiste
Beech
Bérubé
Bittle
Blanchette-Joncas
Boissonnault
Bradford
Brunelle-Duceppe
Carr
Chabot
Chahal
Champoux
Chen
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cormier
Dabrusin
Davies
Desbiens
Desjarlais
Dhillon
Dong
Dubourg
Duguid
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Gaheer
Garon
Gazan
Gill
Green
Hajdu
Hardie
Holland
Hussen
Iacono
Ien
Johns
Jones
Julian
Kelloway
Khera
Kusmierczyk
Lalonde
Lamoureux
Larouche
Lauzon

Alghabra
Anand
Angus
Arya
Atwin
Badawey
Baker
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bergeron
Bibeau
Blair
Blaney
Boulerice
Brière
Cannings
Casey
Chagger
Champagne
Chatel
Chiang
Collins (Victoria)
Coteau
Damoff
DeBellefeuille
Desilets
Dhaliwal
Diab
Drouin
Duclos
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser
Fry
Gainey
Gaudreau
Gerretsen
Gould
Guilbeault
Hanley
Hepfner
Housefather
Hutchings
Idlout
Jaczek
Joly
Jowhari
Kayabaga
Khalid
Koutrakis
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lapointe
Lattanzio
LeBlanc

PAIRED

Members

Barlow
Davidson
Plamondon
Vandal

Blois
MacDonald (Malpeque)
Rodriguez
Zimmer— 8

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I declare Motion No. 36 defeated.

[*Translation*]

The question is on Motion No. 37.

● (2145)

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 37, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 703*)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Ali
Anandasangaree

Alghabra
Anand
Angus

Government Orders

Arseneault
Ashton
Bachrach
Bains
Barron
Beech
Bittle
Blaney
Boulerice
Brière
Carr
Chagger
Champagne
Chen
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cormier
Dabrusin
Davies
Dhaliwal
Diab
Drouin
Duclos
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Gaheer
Gazan
Gould
Guilbeault
Hanley
Hepfner
Housefather
Hutchings
Idlout
Jaczek
Joly
Jowhari
Kayabaga
Khalid
Koutrakis
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lapointe
Lauzon
Lebouthillier
Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacGregor
Maloney
Masse
May (Cambridge)
McDonald (Avalon)
McKay
McLeod
Mendicino
Miller
Morrissey
Naqvi
Noormohamed
Oliphant
Petitpas Taylor
Qualtrough
Rogers
Rota
Sajjan
Samson
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton East)

Arya
Atwin
Badawey
Baker
Battiste
Bibeau
Blair
Boissonnault
Bradford
Cannings
Casey
Chahal
Chatel
Chiang
Collins (Victoria)
Coteau
Damoff
Desjarlais
Dhillon
Dong
Dubourg
Duguid
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser
Fry
Gainey
Gerretsen
Green
Hajdu
Hardie
Holland
Hussen
Iacono
Ien
Johns
Jones
Julian
Kelloway
Khera
Kusmierczyk
Lalonde
Lamoureux
Lattanzio
LeBlanc
Lightbound
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Martinez Ferrada
Mathysen
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McPherson
Miao
Morrice
Murray
Ng
O'Connell
O'Regan
Powlowski
Robillard
Romanado
Sahota
Saks
Sarai
Schieffe
Sgro
Shechan
Sidhu (Brampton South)

Singh
Sousa
Sudds
Taylor Roy
Trudeau
Valdez
van Koeverden
Virani
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi— 173

Sorbara
St-Onge
Tassi
Thompson
Turnbull
Van Bynen
Vandenbeld
Weiler
Yip
Zarrillo

*NAYS**Members*

Aboultarif
Albas
Arnold
Barrett
Beaulieu
Berthold
Bezan
Block
Brassard
Brunelle-Duceppe
Caputo
Chabot
Champoux
Cooper
Dancho
Deltell
Desbiens
Doherty
Dreeschen
Ellis
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Ferrerri
Fortin
Garon
Généreux
Gill
Godin
Gourde
Hallan
Jivani
Khanna
Kmiec
Kramp-Neuman
Kusie
Lantsman
Lawrence
Lemire
Lewis (Essex)
Lloyd
Maguire
Martel
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Melillo
Moore
Morrison
Muys
Normandin
Paul-Hus
Perkins
Poilievre
Reid
Richards
Rood
Savard-Tremblay
Schmale
Shields
Simard
Small

Aitchison
Allison
Baldinelli
Barsalou-Duval
Bergeron
Bérubé
Blanchette-Joncas
Bragdon
Brock
Calkins
Carrie
Chambers
Chong
Dalton
DeBellefeuille
d'Entremont
Desilets
Dowdall
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Epp
Fast
Findlay
Gallant
Gaudreau
Genuis
Gladu
Goodridge
Gray
Jeneroux
Kelly
Kitchen
Kram
Kurek
Lake
Larouche
Lehoux
Leslie
Liepert
Lobb
Majumdar
Mazier
McLean
Michaud
Morantz
Motz
Nater
Patzner
Pauzé
Perron
Redekopp
Rempel Garner
Roberts
Ruff
Scheer
Seeback
Shipley
Sinclair-Desgagné
Soroka

Government Orders

Steinley	Ste-Marie
Stewart	Strahl
Stubbs	Therrien
Thomas	Tochor
Tolmie	Trudel
Uppal	Van Popta
Vecchio	Vidal
Vien	Viersen
Vignola	Villemure
Vis	Vuong
Wagantall	Warkentin
Waugh	Webber
Williams	Williamson— 142

PAIRED

Members

Barlow	Blois
Davidson	MacDonald (Malpeque)
Plamondon	Rodriguez
Vandal	Zimmer— 8

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I declare Motion No. 37 carried.

[*Translation*]

The question is on Motion No. 41. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 45. A negative vote on Motion No. 41 requires the question to be put on Motion No. 42.

● (2155)

(The House divided on Motion No. 41, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 704)

YEAS

Members

Abouttaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barrett	Berthold
Bezan	Block
Bragdon	Brassard
Brock	Calkins
Caputo	Carrie
Chambers	Chong
Cooper	Dalton
Dancho	Deltell
d'Entremont	Doherty
Dowdall	Dreeshen
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Ferreri	Findlay
Gallant	Généreux
Genuis	Gladu
Godin	Goodridge
Gourde	Gray
Hallan	Jeneroux
Jivani	Kelly
Khanna	Kitchen
Kmiec	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Lake	Lantsman
Lawrence	Lehoux
Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
Maguire	Majumdar
Martel	Mazier

McCauley (Edmonton West)
Melillo
Morantz
Motz
Nater
Paul-Hus
Poilievre
Reid
Richards
Rood
Scheer
Seeback
Shipley
Soroka
Stewart
Stubbs
Tochor
Uppal
Vidal
Viersen
Vuong
Warkentin
Webber
Williamson— 113

McLean
Moore
Morrison
Muys
Patzner
Perkins
Redekopp
Rempel Garner
Roberts
Ruff
Schmale
Shields
Small
Steinley
Strahl
Thomas
Tolmie
Van Popta
Vien
Vis
Wagantall
Waugh
Williams

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Ali
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ashton
Bachrach
Bains
Barron
Battiste
Beech
Bérubé
Bittle
Blanchette-Joncas
Boissonnault
Bradford
Brunelle-Duceppe
Carr
Chabot
Chahal
Champoux
Chen
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cormier
Dabrusin
Davies
Desbiens
Desjarlais
Dhillon
Dong
Dubourg
Duguid
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Gaheer
Garon
Gazan
Gill
Green
Hajdu
Hardie
Holland
Alghabra
Anand
Angus
Arya
Atwin
Badawey
Baker
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bergeron
Bibeau
Blair
Blaney
Boulerice
Brière
Cannings
Casey
Chagger
Champagne
Chatel
Chiang
Collins (Victoria)
Coteau
Damoff
DeBellefeuille
Desilets
Dhaliwal
Diab
Drouin
Duclos
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser
Fry
Gahey
Gaudreau
Gerretsen
Gould
Guilbeault
Hanley
Hepfner
Housefather

Government Orders

Hughes	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Idlout	Ien
Jaczek	Johns
Joly	Jones
Jowhari	Julian
Kayabaga	Kelloway
Khalid	Khera
Koutrakis	Kusmierczyk
Kwan	Lalonde
Lambropoulos	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Larouche
Lattanzio	Lauzon
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Lemire	Lightbound
Long	Longfield
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney	Martinez Ferrada
Masse	Mathysen
May (Cambridge)	May (Saainich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod	McPherson
Mendicino	Miao
Michaud	Miller
Morrice	Morrissey
Murray	Naqvi
Ng	Noormohamed
Normandin	O'Connell
Oliphant	O'Regan
Pauzé	Perron
Petitpas Taylor	Powlowski
Qualtrough	Robillard
Rogers	Romanado
Rota	Sahota
Sajjan	Saks
Samson	Sarai
Savard-Tremblay	Scarpaleggia
Schieffe	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Brampton East)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard
Sinclair-Desgagné	Singh
Sorbara	Sousa
Ste-Marie	St-Onge
Sudds	Tassi
Taylor Roy	Therrien
Thompson	Trudeau
Trudel	Turnbull
Valdez	Van Bynen
van Koeverden	Vandenbeld
Vignola	Villemure
Virani	Weiler
Wilkinson	Yip
Zahid	Zarrillo
Zuberi — 203	

PAIRED

Members

Barlow	Blois
Davidson	MacDonald (Malpeque)
Plamondon	Rodriguez
Vandal	Zimmer — 8

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I declare Motion No. 41 defeated.

[*English*]

The question is on Motion No. 42.

A negative vote on Motion No. 42 requires the question to be put on Motion No. 44.

[*Translation*]

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

● (2200)

Mr. Luc Berthold: Madam Speaker, we request a recorded division.

● (2210)

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Madam Speaker, could you check the member for Chilliwack—Hope's photo. I do not think you can recognize him.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): We checked and there is no photo for the hon. member for Chilliwack—Hope. His vote has been withdrawn.

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 42, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 705*)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barrett	Berthold
Bezan	Block
Bragdon	Brassard
Brock	Calkins
Caputo	Carrie
Chambers	Chong
Cooper	Dalton
Dancho	d'Entremont
Doherty	Dowdall
Dreeshen	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Ellis	Epp
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)
Fast	Ferreri
Findlay	Gallant
Généreux	Genuis
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gourde
Gray	Hallan
Jeneroux	Jivani
Kelly	Khanna
Kitchen	Kmiec
Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Kurek	Lake
Lantsman	Lawrence
Lehoux	Leslie
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Liepert	Lloyd
Lobb	Maguire
Majumdar	Martel
Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLean	Melillo
Moore	Morantz
Morrison	Motz
Muys	Nater
Patzer	Paul-Hus
Perkins	Poillievre

Government Orders

Redekopp
 Richards
 Rood
 Scheer
 Seeback
 Shipley
 Soroka
 Stewart
 Thomas
 Tolmie
 Van Popta
 Vidal
 Viersen
 Vuong
 Warkentin
 Webber
 Williamson— 111

Rempel Garner
 Roberts
 Ruff
 Schmale
 Shields
 Small
 Steinley
 Stubbs
 Tochor
 Uppal
 Vecchio
 Vien
 Vis
 Wagantall
 Waugh
 Williams

Khera
 Kusmierczyk
 Lalonde
 Lamoureux
 Larouche
 Lauzon
 Lebouthillier
 Lightbound
 Longfield
 MacAulay (Cardigan)
 MacKinnon (Gatineau)
 Martinez Ferrada
 Mathysen
 May (Saarnich—Gulf Islands)
 McGuinty
 McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
 McPherson
 Miao
 Miller
 Morrissey
 Naqvi
 Noormohamed
 O'Connell
 O'Regan
 Perron
 Powlowski
 Robillard
 Romanado
 Sahota
 Saks
 Sarai
 Scarpaleggia
 Serré
 Shanahan
 Sidhu (Brampton East)
 Simard
 Singh
 Sousa
 St-Onge
 Tassi
 Therrien
 Trudeau
 Turnbull
 Van Bynen
 Vandenbeld
 Villemure
 Weiler
 Yip
 Zarrillo

Koutrakis
 Kwan
 Lambropoulos
 Lapointe
 Lattanzio
 LeBlanc
 Lemire
 Long
 Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
 MacGregor
 Maloney
 Masse
 May (Cambridge)
 McDonald (Avalon)
 McKay
 McLeod
 Mendicino
 Michaud
 Morrice
 Murray
 Ng
 Normandin
 Oliphant
 Pauzé
 Petitpas Taylor
 Qualtrough
 Rogers
 Rota
 Sajjan
 Samson
 Savard-Tremblay
 Schiefke
 Sgro
 Sheehan
 Sidhu (Brampton South)
 Sinclair-Desgagné
 Sorbara
 Ste-Marie
 Sudds
 Taylor Roy
 Thompson
 Trudel
 Valdez
 van Koeverden
 Vignola
 Virani
 Wilkinson
 Zahid
 Zuberi— 202

NAYS

Members

Aldag
 Ali
 Anandasangaree
 Arseneault
 Ashton
 Bachrach
 Bains
 Barron
 Battiste
 Beech
 Bérubé
 Bittle
 Blanchette-Joncas
 Boissonnault
 Bradford
 Brunelle-Duceppe
 Carr
 Chabot
 Chahal
 Champoux
 Chen
 Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
 Cormier
 Dabrusin
 Davies
 Desbiens
 Desjarlais
 Dhillon
 Drouin
 Duclos
 Dzerowicz
 El-Khoury
 Fillmore
 Fonseca
 Fortin
 Fraser
 Fry
 Gainey
 Gaudreau
 Gerretsen
 Gould
 Guilbeault
 Hanley
 Hepfner
 Housefather
 Hussien
 Iacono
 Ien
 Johns
 Jones
 Julian
 Kelloway

Alghabra
 Anand
 Angus
 Arya
 Atwin
 Badawey
 Baker
 Barsalou-Duval
 Beaulieu
 Bergeron
 Bibeau
 Blair
 Blaney
 Boulerice
 Brière
 Cannings
 Casey
 Chagger
 Champagne
 Chatel
 Chiang
 Collins (Victoria)
 Coteau
 Damoff
 DeBellefeuille
 Desilets
 Dhaliwal
 Diab
 Dubourg
 Duguid
 Ehsassi
 Erskine-Smith
 Fisher
 Fortier
 Fragiskatos
 Freeland
 Gaheer
 Garon
 Gazan
 Gill
 Green
 Hajdu
 Hardie
 Holland
 Hughes
 Hutchings
 Idlout
 Jaczek
 Joly
 Jowhari
 Kayabaga
 Khalid

PAIRED

Members

Barlow
 Davidson
 Plamondon
 Vandal
 Blois
 MacDonald (Malpeque)
 Rodriguez
 Zimmer— 8

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I declare Motion No. 42 defeated.

The question is on Motion No. 44.

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tako Van Popta: Madam Speaker, we request a recorded division.

Government Orders

● (2225)

[English]

(The House divided on Motion No. 44, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 706)***YEAS**

Members

Abouttaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barrett	Berthold
Bezan	Block
Bragdon	Brassard
Brock	Calkins
Caputo	Carrie
Chambers	Chong
Cooper	Dalton
Dancho	Deltell
d'Entremont	Doherty
Dowdall	Dreeshen
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Ferreri	Findlay
Gallant	Généreux
Genuis	Gladu
Godin	Goodridge
Gourde	Gray
Hallan	Jeneroux
Jivani	Kelly
Khanna	Kitchen
Kmiec	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Lake	Lantsman
Lawrence	Lehoux
Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
Maguire	Majumdar
Martel	Mazier
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLean
Melillo	Moore
Morantz	Morrison
Motz	Muys
Nater	Patzer
Paul-Hus	Perkins
Poillievre	Redekopp
Reid	Rempel Garner
Richards	Roberts
Rood	Ruff
Scheer	Schmale
Seeback	Shields
Shiple	Small
Soroka	Steinley
Stewart	Strahl
Stubbs	Thomas
Tochor	Tolmie
Uppal	Van Popta
Vecchio	Vidal
Vien	Viersen
Vis	Wagantall
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Williams
Williamson— 113	

NAYS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
-------	----------

Ali	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barron	Barsalou-Duval
Battiste	Beaulieu
Beech	Bergeron
Bérubé	Bibeau
Bittle	Blair
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney
Boissonnault	Bradford
Brière	Brunelle-Duceppe
Cannings	Carr
Casey	Chabot
Chagger	Chahal
Champagne	Champoux
Chatel	Chen
Chiang	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Collins (Victoria)	Cormier
Coteau	Dabrusin
Damoff	Davies
DeBellefeuille	Desbiens
Desilets	Desjarlais
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Dong
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fortin	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Fry	Gaheer
Gainey	Garon
Gaudreau	Gazan
Gerretsen	Gill
Gould	Green
Guilbeault	Hajdu
Hanley	Hardie
Hepfner	Holland
Housefather	Hughes
Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Idlout
Ien	Jaczek
Johns	Joly
Jones	Jowhari
Julian	Kayabaga
Kelloway	Khalid
Khera	Koutrakis
Kusmierczyk	Kwan
Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Larouche	Lattanzio
Lauzon	LeBlanc
Lebouthillier	Lemire
Lightbound	Long
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney
Martinez Ferrada	Masse
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	McDonald (Avalon)
McGuinty	McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod
McPherson	Mendicino
Miao	Michaud
Miller	Morrice
Morrissey	Murray
Naqvi	Ng
Noormohamed	Normandin

Government Orders

(Division No. 707)

YEAS

Members

- Aitchison
- Allison
- Baldinelli
- Berthold
- Block
- Brassard
- Calkins
- Carrie
- Chong
- Dalton
- Deltell
- Doherty
- Dreeshen
- Ellis
- Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
- Fast
- Findlay
- Généreux
- Gladu
- Goodridge
- Gray
- Jeneroux
- Kelly
- Kitchen
- Kram
- Kurek
- Lantsman
- Lehoux
- Lewis (Essex)
- Liepert
- Lobb
- Majumdar
- Mazier
- McLean
- Moore
- Morrison
- Muys
- Patzer
- Perkins
- Redekopp
- Rempel Garner
- Roberts
- Ruff
- Schmale
- Shields
- Small
- Steinley
- Stubbs
- Tochor
- Uppal
- Vecchio
- Vien
- Vis
- Warkentin
- Webber

NAYS

Members

- Alghabra
- Anand
- Angus
- Arya
- Atwin
- Badawey
- Baker
- Barsalou-Duval

- O'Connell
- O'Regan
- Perron
- Powlowski
- Robillard
- Romanado
- Sahota
- Saks
- Sarai
- Scarpaleggia
- Serré
- Shanahan
- Sidhu (Brampton East)
- Simard
- Singh
- Sousa
- St-Onge
- Tassi
- Therrien
- Trudeau
- Turnbull
- Van Bynen
- Vandenbeld
- Villemure
- Weiler
- Yip
- Zarrillo
- Oliphant
- Pauzé
- Petitpas Taylor
- Qualtrough
- Rogers
- Rota
- Sajjan
- Samson
- Savard-Tremblay
- Schieffe
- Sgro
- Sheehan
- Sidhu (Brampton South)
- Sinclair-Desgagné
- Sorbara
- Ste-Marie
- Sudds
- Taylor Roy
- Thompson
- Trudel
- Valdez
- van Koeverden
- Vignola
- Virani
- Wilkinson
- Zahid
- Zuberi — 202

PAIRED

Members

- Barlow
- Davidson
- Plamondon
- Vandal
- Blois
- MacDonald (Malpeque)
- Rodriguez
- Zimmer — 8

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I declare Motion No. 44 defeated.

[*Translation*]

The question is on Motion No. 49. A negative vote on Motion No. 49 requires the question to be put on Motion No. 51.

[*English*]

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Tracy Gray: Madam Speaker, I request a recorded division.

Before the Clerk announced the result of the vote:

• (2235)

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Madam Speaker, could you check to see if you recognize the member for Chilliwack—Hope in his photo.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I thank the hon. member. His vote will be withdrawn.

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 49, which was defeated on the following division:)

- Aboutaif
- Albas
- Arnold
- Barrett
- Bezan
- Bragdon
- Brock
- Caputo
- Chambers
- Cooper
- Dancho
- d'Entremont
- Dowdall
- Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
- Epp
- Falk (Provencher)
- Ferreri
- Gallant
- Genius
- Godin
- Gourde
- Hallan
- Jivani
- Khanna
- Kmiec
- Kramp-Neuman
- Lake
- Lawrence
- Leslie
- Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
- Lloyd
- Maguire
- Martel
- McCauley (Edmonton West)
- Melillo
- Morantz
- Motz
- Nater
- Paul-Hus
- Poilievre
- Reid
- Richards
- Rood
- Scheer
- Seeback
- Shipley
- Soroka
- Stewart
- Thomas
- Tolmie
- Van Popta
- Vidal
- Viersen
- Wagantall
- Waugh
- Williamson — 111

Government Orders

Gourde
Hallan
Jivani
Khanna
Kmicc
Kramp-Neuman
Lake
Lawrence
Leslie
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lloyd
Maguire
Martel
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Melillo
Morantz
Motz
Nater
Paul-Hus
Poilievre
Reid
Richards
Rood
Scheer
Seeback
Shipley
Soroka
Stewart
Stubbs
Tochor
Uppal
Vecchio
Vien
Vis
Wagantall
Waugh
Williams

Gray
Jeneroux
Kelly
Kitchen
Kram
Kurek
Lantsman
Lehoux
Lewis (Essex)
Liepert
Lobb
Majumdar
Mazier
McLean
Moore
Morrison
Muys
Patzner
Perkins
Redekopp
Rempel Garner
Roberts
Ruff
Schmale
Shields
Small
Steinley
Strahl
Thomas
Tolmie
Van Popta
Vidal
Viersen
Vuong
Warkentin
Webber
Williamson— 114

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Ali
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ashton
Bachrach
Bains
Barron
Battiste
Beech
Bérubé
Bittle
Blanchette-Joncas
Boissonnault
Bradford
Brunelle-Duceppe
Carr
Chabot
Chahal
Champoux
Chen
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cormier
Dabrusin
Davies
Desbiens
Desjarlais
Dhillon
Dong
Dubourg
Duguid
Ehsassi

Alghabra
Anand
Angus
Arya
Atwin
Badawey
Baker
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bergeron
Bibeau
Blair
Blaney
Boulerice
Brière
Cannings
Casey
Chagger
Champagne
Chatel
Chiang
Collins (Victoria)
Coteau
Damoff
DeBellefeuille
Desilets
Dhaliwal
Diab
Drouin
Duclous
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury

Erskine-Smith
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Gaheer
Garon
Gazan
Gill
Green
Hajdu
Hardie
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Idlout
Jaczek
Joly
Jowhari
Kayabaga
Khalid
Koutrakis
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lapointe
Lattanzio
LeBlanc
Lemire
Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacGregor
Maloney
Masse
May (Cambridge)
McDonald (Avalon)
McKay
McLeod
Mendicino
Michaud
Morrice
Murray
Ng
Normandin
Oliphant
Pauzé
Petitpas Taylor
Qualtrough
Rogers
Rota
Sajjan
Samson
Savard-Tremblay
Schiefke
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sinclair-Desgagné
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Sudds
Taylor Roy
Thompson
Trudel
Valdez
van Koeverden
Vignola
Virani
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi— 203

Fillmore
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser
Fry
Gainey
Gaudreau
Gerretsen
Gould
Guilbeault
Hanley
Hepfner
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Ien
Johns
Jones
Julian
Kelloway
Khera
Kusmierczyk
Lalonde
Lamoureux
Larouche
Lauzon
Lebouthillier
Lightbound
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Martinez Ferrada
Mathysen
May (Saainich—Gulf Islands)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McPherson
Miao
Miller
Morrissey
Naqvi
Noormohamed
O'Connell
O'Regan
Perron
Powlowski
Robillard
Romanado
Sahota
Saks
Saraï
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Singh
Sousa
St-Onge
Tassi
Thériault
Trudeau
Turnbull
Van Bynen
Vandenbeld
Villemure
Weiler
Yip
Zarrillo

Government Orders

PAIRED

Members

Barlow	Blois
Davidson	MacDonald (Malpeque)
Plamondon	Rodriguez
Vandal	Zimmer— 8

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I declare Motion No. 51 defeated.

[*English*]

The question is on Motion No. 52.

The vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 56. A negative vote on Motion No. 52 requires the question to be put on Motion No. 53.

• (2300)

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 52, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 709*)

YEAS

Members

Abouttaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barrett	Berthold
Bezan	Block
Bragdon	Brassard
Brock	Calkins
Caputo	Carrie
Chambers	Chong
Cooper	Dalton
Dancho	Doherty
Dowdall	Dreeshen
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Ferreri	Findlay
Gallant	Généreux
Genuis	Gladu
Godin	Goodridge
Gourde	Gray
Hallan	Jeneroux
Jivani	Kelly
Khanna	Kitchen
Kmiec	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Lake	Lantsman
Lawrence	Lehoux
Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
Maguire	Majumdar
Martel	Mazier
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLean
Melillo	Moore
Morantz	Morrison
Motz	Muys
Nater	Patzer
Paul-Hus	Perkins
Poilievre	Redekopp
Reid	Rempel Garner
Richards	Roberts
Rood	Ruff
Scheer	Schmale

Seeback
Shipley
Soroka
Stewart
Thomas
Tolmie
Van Popta
Vidal
Viersen
Vuong
Warkentin
Webber
Williamson— 111

Shields
Small
Steinley
Stubbs
Tochor
Uppal
Vecchio
Vien
Vis
Wagantall
Waugh
Williams

NAYS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barron	Barsalou-Duval
Battiste	Beaulieu
Beech	Bergeron
Bérubé	Bibeau
Bittle	Blair
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney
Boissonnault	Boulerice
Bradford	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings
Carr	Casey
Chabot	Chagger
Chahal	Champagne
Champoux	Chatel
Chen	Chiang
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Damoff
Davies	DeBellefeuille
Desbiens	Desilets
Desjarlais	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Diab
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fortin	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Fry	Gaheer
Gainey	Garon
Gaudreau	Gazan
Gerretsen	Gill
Gould	Green
Guilbeault	Hajdu
Hanley	Hardie
Hepfner	Holland
Housefather	Hughes
Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Idlout
Ien	Jaczek
Johns	Joly
Jones	Jowhari
Julian	Kayabaga
Kelloway	Khalid
Khera	Koutrakis
Kusmierczyk	Kwan
Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Lamoureux	Lapointe

Government Orders

Larouche	Lattanzio
Lauzon	LeBlanc
Lebouthillier	Lemire
Lighbound	Long
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney
Martinez Ferrada	Masse
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	McDonald (Avalon)
McGuinty	McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod
McPherson	Mendicino
Miao	Michaud
Miller	Morrice
Morrissey	Murray
Naqvi	Ng
Noormohamed	Normandin
O’Connell	Oliphant
O’Regan	Pauzé
Perron	Petitpas Taylor
Powlowski	Qualtrough
Robillard	Rogers
Romanado	Rota
Sahota	Sajjan
Saks	Samson
Sarai	Savard-Tremblay
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné
Singh	Sorbara
Sousa	Ste-Marie
St-Onge	Sudds
Tassi	Taylor Roy
Thériault	Thompson
Trudeau	Trudel
Turnbull	Valdez
Van Bynen	van Koeverden
Vandenbeld	Vignola
Villemure	Virani
Weiler	Wilkinson
Yip	Zahid
Zarrillo	Zuberi— 202

PAIRED

Members

Barlow	Blois
Davidson	MacDonald (Malpeque)
Plamondon	Rodriguez
Vandal	Zimmer— 8

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I declare Motion No. 52 defeated. I therefore declare Motion No. 56 defeated.

The question is on Motion No. 53. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 57. A negative vote on Motion No. 53 requires the question to be put on Motion No. 54.

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

Mr. Luc Berthold: Madam Speaker, I request a recorded division.

● (2315)

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 53, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 710*)

YEAS

Members

Abouttaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barrett	Berthold
Bezan	Block
Bragdon	Brassard
Brock	Calkins
Caputo	Carrie
Chambers	Chong
Cooper	Dalton
Dancho	Doherty
Dowdall	Dreeshen
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Ferrier	Findlay
Gallant	Généreux
Genuis	Gladu
Godin	Goodridge
Gourde	Gray
Hallan	Jeneroux
Jivani	Kelly
Khanna	Kitchen
Kmiec	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Lake	Lantsman
Lawrence	Lehoux
Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
Maguire	Majumdar
Martel	Mazier
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLean
Melillo	Moore
Morantz	Morrison
Motz	Muys
Nater	Patzer
Paul-Hus	Perkins
Poilievre	Redekopp
Reid	Rempel Garner
Richards	Roberts
Rood	Ruff
Scheer	Schmale
Seeback	Shields
Shiple	Singh
Small	Soroka
Steinley	Stewart
Stubbs	Thomas
Tochor	Tolmie
Uppal	Van Popta
Vecchio	Vidal
Vien	Viersen
Vis	Vuong
Wagantall	Warkentin
Waugh	Webber
Williams	Williamson— 112

NAYS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anand

Government Orders

Carrie	Chabot	Boulerice	Bradford
Chambers	Champoux	Brière	Cannings
Chong	Cooper	Carr	Casey
Dalton	Dancho	Chagger	Chahal
DeBellefeuille	Deltell	Champagne	Chatel
Desbiens	Desilets	Chen	Chiang
Doherty	Dowdall	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)
Dreeshen	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Cormier	Coteau
Ellis	Epp	Dabrusin	Damoff
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)	Davies	Dhaliwal
Fast	Ferri	Dhillon	Diab
Findlay	Fortin	Dong	Drouin
Gallant	Garon	Dubourg	Duclos
Gaudreau	Généreux	Duguid	Dzerowicz
Genuis	Gill	Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Gladu	Godin	Erskine-Smith	Fillmore
Goodridge	Gourde	Fisher	Fonseca
Gray	Hallan	Fortier	Fragiskatos
Jeneroux	Jivani	Fraser	Freeland
Kelly	Khanna	Fry	Gaheer
Kitchen	Kmiec	Gainey	Garrison
Kram	Kramp-Neuman	Gazan	Gerretsen
Lantsman	Larouche	Gould	Green
Lawrence	Lehoux	Guilbeault	Hajdu
Lemire	Leslie	Hanley	Hardie
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Hepfner	Holland
Liepert	Lloyd	Housefather	Hughes
Lobb	Maguire	Hussen	Hutchings
Majumdar	Martel	Iacono	Idlout
Mazier	McLean	Ien	Jaczek
Melillo	Michaud	Johns	Joly
Moore	Morantz	Jones	Jowhari
Morrison	Motz	Julian	Kayabaga
Muys	Nater	Kelloway	Khalid
Normandin	Patzer	Khera	Koutrakis
Paul-Hus	Pauzé	Kusmierczyk	Kwan
Perkins	Perron	Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Poilievre	Redekopp	Lamoureux	Lapointe
Reid	Rempel Garner	Lattanzio	Lauzon
Richards	Roberts	LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Rood	Ruff	Lightbound	Long
Savard-Tremblay	Scheer	Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
Schmale	Seeback	MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacGregor
Shields	Shipley	MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney
Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné	Martinez Ferrada	Masse
Small	Soroka	Mathysen	May (Cambridge)
Steinley	Ste-Marie	May (Saanic—Gulf Islands)	McDonald (Avalon)
Stewart	Strahl	McGuinty	McKay
Stubbs	Thériault	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod
Thomas	Tolmie	McPherson	Mendicino
Trudel	Van Popta	Miao	Miller
Vecchio	Vidal	Morrice	Morrissey
Vien	Viersen	Murray	Naqvi
Vignola	Villemure	Ng	Noormohamed
Vis	Vuong	O'Connell	Oliphant
Wagantall	Warkentin	O'Regan	Petipas Taylor
Waugh	Webber	Powlowski	Qualtrough
Williams	Williamson — 136	Robillard	Rogers
		Romanado	Rota
		Sahota	Sajjan
		Saks	Samson
		Sarai	Scarpaleggia
		Schiefke	Serré
		Sgro	Shanahan
		Sheehan	Sidhu (Brampton East)
		Sidhu (Brampton South)	Singh
		Sorbara	Sousa
		St-Onge	Sudds
		Tassi	Taylor Roy
		Thompson	Trudeau
		Turnbull	Valdez
		Van Bynen	van Koeverden
		Vandenbeld	Virani

NAYS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barron	Battiste
Beech	Bibeau
Bittle	Blair
Blaney	Boissonnault

Government Orders

Weiler
Yip
Zarrillo

Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi— 174

PAIRED

Members

Barlow
Davidson
Plamondon
Vandal

Blois
MacDonald (Malpeque)
Rodriguez
Zimmer— 8

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I declare the motion defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 59. A negative vote on Motion No. 59 requires the question to be put on Motion No. 60.

● (2340)

(The House divided on the Motion No. 59, which was negatived on the following division:)

*(Division No. 712)***YEAS**

Members

Aboultaif
Albas
Arnold
Barrett
Bezan
Bragdon
Brock
Caputo
Chambers
Cooper
Dancho
Dowdall
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Epp
Falk (Provencher)
Ferrerri
Gallant
Genuis
Godin
Gourde
Hallan
Jivani
Khanna
Kmiec
Kramp-Neuman
Lake
Lawrence
Leslie
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lloyd
Maguire
Martel
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Melillo
Morantz
Motz
Nater
Paul-Hus
Poilievre
Reid
Richards
Rood
Scheer
Seeback
Shipley
Soroka

Aitchison
Allison
Baldinelli
Berthold
Block
Brassard
Calkins
Carrie
Chong
Dalton
Doherty
Dreeshen
Ellis
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Findlay
Généreux
Gladu
Goodridge
Gray
Jeneroux
Kelly
Kitchen
Kram
Kurek
Lantsman
Lehoux
Lewis (Essex)
Liepert
Lobb
Majumdar
Mazier
McLean
Moore
Morrison
Muys
Patzner
Perkins
Redekopp
Rempel Garner
Roberts
Ruff
Schmale
Shields
Small
Steinley

Stewart
Stubbs
Tolmie
Van Popta
Vidal
Viersen
Vuong
Warkentin
Webber
Williamson— 111

Strahl
Thomas
Uppal
Vecchio
Vien
Vis
Wagantall
Waugh
Williams

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Ali
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ashton
Bachrach
Bains
Barron
Battiste
Beech
Béribé
Bittle
Blanchette-Joncas
Boissonnault
Bradford
Brunelle-Duceppe
Carr
Chabot
Chahal
Champoux
Chen
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cormier
Dabrusin
Davies
Desbiens
Desjarlais
Dhillon
Dong
Dubourg
Duguid
Ehsassi
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser
Fry
Gaine
Garrison
Gazan
Gill
Green
Hajdu
Hardie
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Idlout
Jaczek
Joly
Jowhari
Kayabaga
Khalid
Koutrakis
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lapointe
Lattanzio
LeBlanc

Alghabra
Anand
Angus
Arya
Atwin
Badawey
Baker
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bergeron
Bibeau
Blair
Blaney
Boulerice
Brière
Cannings
Casey
Chagger
Champagne
Chatel
Chiang
Collins (Victoria)
Coteau
Damoff
DeBellefeuille
Desilets
Dhaliwal
Diab
Drouin
Duclous
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Gaheer
Garon
Gaudreau
Gerretsen
Gould
Guilbeault
Hanley
Hepfner
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Ien
Johns
Jones
Julian
Kelloway
Khera
Kusmierczyk
Lalonde
Lamoureux
Larouche
Lauzon
Lebouthillier

Government Orders
(Division No. 713)

YEAS

Members

Aboutaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barrett	Berthold
Bezan	Block
Bragdon	Brassard
Brock	Calkins
Caputo	Carrie
Chambers	Chong
Cooper	Dalton
Dancho	Doherty
Dowdall	Dreeshen
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Epp	Falk (Provencher)
Fast	Ferreri
Findlay	Gallant
Généreux	Genuis
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gourde
Gray	Hallan
Jeneroux	Jivani
Kelly	Khanna
Kitchen	Kmiec
Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Kurek	Lake
Lantsman	Lawrence
Lehoux	Leslie
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Liepert	Lloyd
Lobb	Maguire
Majumdar	Martel
Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLean	Melillo
Moore	Morantz
Morrison	Motz
Muys	Nater
Patzer	Paul-Hus
Perkins	Poilievre
Redekopp	Reid
Rempel Garner	Richards
Roberts	Rood
Ruff	Scheer
Schmale	Seeback
Shields	Shipley
Small	Soroka
Steinley	Stewart
Strahl	Stubbs
Thomas	Tolmie
Uppal	Van Popta
Vecchio	Vidal
Vien	Viersen
Vis	Vuong
Wagantall	Warkentin
Waugh	Webber
Williams	Williamson— 110

NAYS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barron	Barsalou-Duval
Battiste	Beaulieu

Lemire
Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacGregor
Maloney
Masse
May (Cambridge)
McDonald (Avalon)
McKay
McLeod
Mendicino
Michaud
Morrice
Murray
Ng
Normandin
Oliphant
Pauzé
Petitpas Taylor
Qualtrough
Rogers
Rota
Sajjan
Samson
Savard-Tremblay
Schiefke
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sinclair-Desgagné
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Sudds
Taylor Roy
Thompson
Trudel
Valdez
van Koeverden
Vignola
Virani
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi— 203

Lightbound
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Martinez Ferrada
Mathysen
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McPherson
Miao
Miller
Morrissey
Naqvi
Noormohamed
O'Connell
O'Regan
Perron
Powlowski
Robillard
Romanado
Sahota
Saks
Sarai
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Singh
Sousa
St-Onge
Tassi
Thériault
Trudeau
Turnbull
Van Bynen
Vandenbeld
Villemure
Weiler
Yip
Zarrillo

PAIRED

Members

Barlow	Blois
Davidson	MacDonald (Malpeque)
Plamondon	Rodriguez
Vandal	Zimmer— 8

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I declare the motion defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 60. A negative vote on Motion No. 60 requires the question to be put on Motion No. 61.

[*Translation*]

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Madam Speaker, we request a recorded division.

● (2350)

(The House divided on Motion No. 60, which was negated on the following division:)

Government Orders

Beech	Bergeron
Bérubé	Bibeau
Bittle	Blair
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney
Boissonnault	Boulerice
Bradford	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings
Carr	Casey
Chabot	Chagger
Chahal	Champagne
Champoux	Chatel
Chen	Chiang
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)
Cornier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Damoff
DeBellefeuille	Desbiens
Desilets	Desjarlais
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Dong
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fortin	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Fry	Gaheer
Gainey	Garon
Garrison	Gaudreau
Gazan	Gerretsen
Gill	Gould
Green	Guilbeault
Hajdu	Hanley
Hardie	Hepfner
Holland	Housefather
Hughes	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Idlout	Ien
Jaczek	Johns
Joly	Jones
Jowhari	Julian
Kayabaga	Kelloway
Khalid	Khera
Koutrakis	Kusmierczyk
Kwan	Lalonde
Lambropoulos	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Larouche
Lattanzio	Lauzon
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Lemire	Lightbound
Long	Longfield
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney	Martinez Ferrada
Masse	Mathysen
May (Cambridge)	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod	McPherson
Mendicino	Miao
Michaud	Miller
Morrice	Morrissey
Murray	Naqvi
Ng	Noormohamed
Normandin	O'Connell
Oliphant	O'Regan
Paucé	Perron
Petitpas Taylor	Powlowski
Qualtrough	Robillard
Rogers	Romanado
Rota	Sahota
Sajjan	Saks

Samson	Sarai
Savard-Tremblay	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Brampton East)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard
Sinclair-Desgagné	Singh
Sorbara	Sousa
Ste-Marie	St-Onge
Sudds	Tassi
Taylor Roy	Thériault
Thompson	Trudeau
Trudel	Turnbull
Valdez	Van Bynen
van Koeverden	Vandenbeld
Vignola	Villemure
Virani	Weiler
Wilkinson	Yip
Zahid	Zarrillo
Zuberi— 203	

PAIRED

Members

Barlow	Blois
Davidson	MacDonald (Malpeque)
Plamondon	Rodriguez
Vandal	Zimmer— 8

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I declare Motion No. 60 defeated.

The question is on Motion No. 61. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 74. A negative vote on Motion No. 61 requires the question to be put on Motion No. 64.

[*English*]

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rick Perkins: Madam Speaker, we request a recorded division.

● (2405)

(The House divided on Motion No. 61, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 714*)

YEAS

Members

Abouttaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barrett	Berthold
Bezan	Block
Bragdon	Brassard
Brock	Calkins
Caputo	Carrie
Chambers	Chong
Cooper	Dalton
Dancho	Doherty
Dowdall	Dreeschen
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Epp	Falk (Provencher)
Fast	Ferrieri
Findlay	Gallant

Government Orders

Généreux	Genuis	El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Gladu	Godin	Fillmore	Fisher
Goodridge	Gourde	Fonseca	Fortier
Gray	Hallan	Fortin	Fragiskatos
Jeneroux	Jivani	Fraser	Freeland
Kelly	Khanna	Fry	Gaheer
Kitchen	Kmiec	Gainey	Garon
Kram	Kramp-Neuman	Garrison	Gaudreau
Kurek	Lake	Gazan	Gerretsen
Lantsman	Lawrence	Gill	Gould
Lehoux	Leslie	Green	Guilbeault
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Hajdu	Hanley
Liepert	Lloyd	Hardie	Hepfner
Lobb	Maguire	Holland	Housefather
Majumdar	Martel	Hughes	Hussen
Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)	Hutchings	Iacono
McLean	Melillo	Idlout	Ien
Moore	Morantz	Jaczek	Johns
Morrison	Motz	Joly	Jones
Muys	Nater	Jowhari	Julian
Patzer	Paul-Hus	Kayabaga	Kelloway
Perkins	Poilievre	Khalid	Khera
Redekopp	Rempel Garner	Koutrakis	Kusmierczyk
Richards	Roberts	Kwan	Lalonde
Rood	Ruff	Lambropoulos	Lamoureux
Scheer	Schmale	Lapointe	Larouche
Seeback	Shields	Lattanzio	Lauzon
Shipley	Small	LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Soroka	Steinley	Lemire	Lightbound
Stewart	Stubbs	Long	Longfield
Thomas	Tolmie	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)
Uppal	Van Popta	MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Vecchio	Vidal	Maloney	Martinez Ferrada
Vien	Viersen	Masse	Mathysen
Vis	Vuong	May (Cambridge)	May (Saanic—Gulf Islands)
Wagantall	Warkentin	McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty
Waugh	Webber	McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Williams	Williamson— 108	McLeod	McPherson

NAYS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra	Murray	Naqvi
Ali	Anand	Ng	Noormohamed
Anandasangaree	Angus	Normandin	O'Connell
Arseneault	Arya	Oliphant	O'Regan
Ashton	Atwin	Pauzé	Perron
Bachrach	Badawey	Petitpas Taylor	Powlowski
Bains	Baker	Qualtrough	Robillard
Barron	Barsalou-Duval	Rogers	Romanado
Battiste	Beaulieu	Rota	Sahota
Beech	Bergeron	Sajjan	Saks
Bérubé	Bibeau	Samson	Sarai
Bittle	Blair	Savard-Tremblay	Scarpaleggia
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney	Schiefke	Serré
Boissonnault	Boulerice	Sgro	Shanahan
Bradford	Brière	Sheehan	Sidhu (Brampton East)
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings	Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard
Carr	Casey	Sinclair-Desgagné	Singh
Chabot	Chagger	Sorbara	Sousa
Chahal	Champagne	Ste-Marie	St-Onge
Champoux	Chatel	Sudds	Tassi
Chen	Chiang	Taylor Roy	Thériault
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)	Thompson	Trudeau
Cormier	Coteau	Trudel	Turnbull
Dabrusin	Damoff	Valdez	Van Bynen
DeBellefeuille	Desbiens	van Koeverden	Vandenbeld
Desilets	Desjarlais	Vignola	Villemure
Dhaliwal	Dhillon	Virani	Weiler
Diab	Dong	Wilkinson	Yip
Drouin	Dubourg	Zahid	Zarrillo
Duclos	Duguid	Zuberi— 203	
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi		

Government Orders

PAIRED

Members

Barlow	Blois
Davidson	MacDonald (Malpeque)
Plamondon	Rodriguez
Vandal	Zimmer— 8

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I declare Motion No. 61 defeated.

[*English*]

The question is on Motion No. 64. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 69, 71 and 75.

[*Translation*]

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

Mrs. Tracy Gray: Madam Speaker, I request a recorded division.

• (2415)

(The House divided on Motion No. 64, which was negatived on the following division:)

(*Division No. 715*)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Allison	Arnold
Baldinelli	Barrett
Berthold	Bezan
Block	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Calkins	Caputo
Carrie	Chambers
Chong	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho
Doherty	Dowdall
Dreeshean	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Ellis	Epp
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Ferreri	Findlay
Gallant	Généreux
Genuis	Gladu
Godin	Goodridge
Gourde	Gray
Hallan	Jeneroux
Jivani	Kelly
Khanna	Kitchen
Kmiec	Kram
Kurek	Lake
Lantsman	Lawrence
Lehoux	Leslie
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Liepert	Lloyd
Lobb	Maguire
Majumdar	Martel
Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLean	Melillo
Moore	Morantz
Morrison	Motz
Muys	Nater
Patzer	Paul-Hus
Perkins	Poilievre
Redekopp	Reid

Rempel Garner
Roberts
Ruff
Schmale
Shields
Small
Steinley
Stubbs
Tolmie
Van Popta
Vidal
Viersen
Wagantall
Waugh
Williams

Richards
Rood
Scheer
Seeback
Shipley
Soroka
Stewart
Thomas
Uppal
Vecchio
Vien
Vis
Warkentin
Webber
Williamson— 106

NAYS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barron	Barsalou-Duval
Battiste	Beaulieu
Beech	Bergeron
Bérubé	Bibea
Bittle	Blair
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney
Boissonnault	Boulerice
Bradford	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings
Carr	Casey
Chabot	Chagger
Chahal	Champagne
Champoux	Chatel
Chen	Chiang
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Damoff
DeBellefeuille	Desbiens
Desilets	Desjarlais
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Dong
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fortin	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Fry	Gaheer
Gainey	Garon
Garrison	Gaudreau
Gazan	Gerretsen
Gill	Gould
Green	Guilbeault
Hajdu	Hanley
Hardie	Hepfner
Holland	Housefather
Hughes	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Idlout	Ien
Jaczek	Johns
Joly	Jones
Jowhari	Julian
Kayabaga	Kelloway
Khalid	Khera
Koutrakis	Kusmierczyk

Government Orders

Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lapointe
Lattanzio
LeBlanc
Lemire
Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacGregor
Maloney
Masse
May (Cambridge)
McDonald (Avalon)
McKay
McLeod
Mendicino
Michaud
Morrice
Murray
Ng
Normandin
Oliphant
Pauzé
Petitpas Taylor
Qualtrough
Rogers
Rota
Sajjan
Samson
Savard-Tremblay
Schiefke
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sinclair-Desgagné
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Sudds
Taylor Roy
Thompson
Trudel
Valdez
van Koeverden
Vignola
Virani
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi— 203

Lalonde
Lamoureux
Larouche
Lauzon
Lebouthillier
Lightbound
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Martinez Ferrada
Mathysen
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McPherson
Miao
Miller
Morrissey
Naqvi
Noormohamed
O'Connell
O'Regan
Perron
Powlowski
Robillard
Romanado
Sahota
Saks
Sarai
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Singh
Sousa
St-Onge
Tassi
Thériault
Trudeau
Turnbull
Van Bynen
Vandenbeld
Villemure
Weiler
Yip
Zarrillo

PAIRED

Members
Blois
MacDonald (Malpeque)
Rodriguez
Zimmer— 8

Barlow
Davidson
Plamondon
Vandal

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I declare Motion No. 64 defeated.

* * *

[*English*]

SITTING SUSPENDED

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, on a point of order, we have had a great evening fighting for Canadian jobs and opportunity, and—

Hon. Andrew Scheer: I just want to correct the government House leader. He is destroying jobs in Canada.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: —we will be back first thing in the morning to do it all again.

● (2420)

[*Translation*]

I move:

That the sitting be now suspended.

[*English*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Pursuant to order made on Wednesday, February 28, the minister's request to suspend the sitting is deemed adopted.

Accordingly, the sitting is suspended until later this day at 9 a.m.

(The sitting of the House was suspended at 12:21 a.m.)

● (3315)

[*Translation*]

SITTING RESUMED

(The House resumed at 9:16 a.m.)

The Speaker: Order.

It being 9:16 a.m., pursuant to order made on Wednesday, February 28, the House will now resume the taking of the deferred recorded divisions at the report stage of Bill C-50.

[*English*]

The question is on Motion No. 79.

A negative vote on Motion No. 79 requires the question to be put on Motion No. 80.

● (3330)

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 79, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 716*)

YEAS

Members

Aboulttaif
Aldag
Ali
Anand
Angus
Arseneault
Atwin
Badawey
Baker
Barrett
Battiste
Berthold
Bibeau
Blair
Block
Boulerice
Bragdon
Brière
Calkins
Carr
Casey
Chahal
Champagne

Aitchison
Alghabra
Allison
Anandasangaree
Arnold
Arya
Bachrach
Bains
Baldinelli
Barron
Beech
Bezan
Bittle
Blaney
Boissonnault
Bradford
Brassard
Brock
Cannings
Carrie
Chagger
Chambers
Chatel

Government Orders

Chen	Chiang	Patzer	Paul-Hus
Chong	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Perkins	Petitpas Taylor
Collins (Victoria)	Cormier	Poilievre	Powlowski
Coteau	Dabrusin	Qualtrough	Redekopp
Dalton	Damoff	Reid	Rempel Garner
Dancho	Delell	Roberts	Robillard
d'Entremont	Desjarlais	Rogers	Romanado
Dhaliwal	Dhillon	Rood	Rota
Diab	Doherty	Ruff	Sahota
Dong	Dowdall	Sajjan	Saks
Drouin	Dubourg	Samson	Sarai
Duclos	Duguid	Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Dzerowicz	Schmale	Seeback
Ehsassi	El-Khoury	Serré	Sgro
Ellis	Epp	Shanahan	Sheehan
Erskine-Smith	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Shields	Shiple
Ferreri	Fillmore	Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Findlay	Fisher	Singh	Small
Fonseca	Fortier	Sorbara	Soroka
Fragiskatos	Fraser	Sousa	Steinley
Freeland	Gaheer	Stewart	St-Onge
Gainey	Gallant	Strahl	Stubbs
Garrison	Gazan	Sudds	Tassi
Généreux	Genuis	Taylor Roy	Thomas
Gerretsen	Gladu	Thompson	Tochor
Godin	Goodridge	Tolmie	Trudeau
Gould	Gourde	Turnbull	Uppal
Gray	Green	Valdez	Van Bynen
Guilbeault	Hajdu	van Koevorden	Van Popta
Hallan	Hanley	Vandenbeld	Vecchio
Hardie	Hepfner	Vidal	Vien
Hoback	Holland	Viersen	Virani
Housefather	Hughes	Vis	Wagantall
Hussen	Hutchings	Warkentin	Waugh
Iacono	Idlout	Webber	Weiler
Ien	Jaczek	Wilkinson	Williams
Jeneroux	Jivani	Williamson	Yip
Johns	Joly	Zahid	Zarrillo
Jones	Jowhari	Zuberi— 269	
Julian	Kayabaga		
Kelloway	Kelly		
Khalid	Khanna		
Khera	Kmiec		
Koutrakis	Kram		
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek	Barsalou-Duval	Beaulieu
Kusmierczyk	Kwan	Bergeron	Bérubé
Lake	Lalonde	Blanchette-Joncas	Brunelle-Duceppe
Lambropoulos	Lamoureux	Chabot	Champoux
Lantsman	Lapointe	DeBellefeuille	Desbiens
Lattanzio	Lauzon	Desilets	Fortin
Lawrence	Lebouthillier	Garon	Gaudreau
Lehoux	Lewis (Essex)	Gill	Larouche
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert	Lemire	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
Lightbound	Lloyd	Michaud	Morrice
Lobb	Long	Normandin	Pauzé
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	Perron	Savard-Tremblay
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacGregor	Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney	Ste-Marie	Thériault
Martinez Ferrada	Masse	Therrien	Trudel
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)	Vignola	Villemere— 32
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McDonald (Avalon)		
McGuinty	McKay		
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLean		
McLeod	McPherson		
Mendès	Mendicino	Barlow	Blois
Miao	Miller	Davidson	MacDonald (Malpeque)
Moore	Morantz	Plamondon	Rodriguez
Morrison	Morrissey	Vandal	Zimmer— 8
Motz	Murray		
Muys	Naqvi		
Nater	Ng		
Noormohamed	O'Connell		
Oliphant	O'Regan		

NAYS

Members

Beaulieu
Bérubé
Brunelle-Duceppe
Champoux
Desbiens
Fortin
Gaudreau
Larouche
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
Morrice
Pauzé
Savard-Tremblay
Sinclair-Desgagné
Thériault
Trudel
Villemere— 32

PAIRED

Members

Blois
MacDonald (Malpeque)
Rodriguez
Zimmer— 8

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 79 carried.

[*English*]

The question is on Motion No. 91.

Government Orders

● (3340)

[Translation]

(The House divided on Motion No. 91, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 717)

YEAS

Members

Abouttaif	Aitchison	Jowhari	Julian
Aldag	Alghabra	Kayabaga	Kelloway
Ali	Allison	Kelly	Khalid
Anand	Anandasangaree	Khanna	Khera
Angus	Arnold	Kniec	Koutrakis
Arseneault	Arya	Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Atwin	Bachrach	Kurek	Kusie
Badawey	Bains	Kusmierczyk	Kwan
Baker	Baldinelli	Lake	Lalonde
Barrett	Barron	Lambropoulos	Lamoureux
Battiste	Beech	Lantsman	Lapointe
Berthold	Bezan	Lattanzio	Lauzon
Bibeau	Bittle	Lawrence	LeBlanc
Blair	Blaney	Lebouthillier	Lehoux
Block	Boissonnault	Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Boulerice	Bradford	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Bragdon	Brassard	Lightbound	Lloyd
Brière	Brock	Lobb	Long
Calkins	Cannings	Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
Caputo	Carr	MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacGregor
Carrie	Casey	MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Majumdar
Chagger	Chahal	Maloney	Martínez Ferrada
Chambers	Champagne	Masse	Mathysen
Chatel	Chen	May (Cambridge)	May (Saanic—Gulf Islands)
Chiang	Chong	McCauley (Edmonton West)	McDonald (Avalon)
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)	McGuinty	McKay
Cormier	Coteau	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLean
Dabrusin	Dalton	McLeod	McPherson
Damoff	Dancho	Mendès	Medicino
Deltell	d'Entremont	Miao	Miller
Desjarlais	Dhaliwal	Moore	Morantz
Dhillon	Diab	Morrison	Morrissey
Doherty	Dong	Motz	Murray
Dowdall	Dreeshen	Muys	Naqvi
Drouin	Dubourg	Nater	Ng
Duclos	Duguid	Noormohamed	O'Connell
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Dzerowicz	Oliphant	O'Regan
Ehsassi	El-Khoury	Patzer	Paul-Hus
Ellis	Epp	Perkins	Petitpas Taylor
Erskine-Smith	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Powlowski	Qualtrough
Ferreri	Fillmore	Redekopp	Reid
Findlay	Fisher	Rempel Garner	Roberts
Fonseca	Fortier	Robillard	Rogers
Fragiskatos	Fraser	Romanado	Rood
Freeland	Fry	Rota	Ruff
Gaheer	Gainey	Sahota	Sajjan
Gallant	Garrison	Saks	Samson
Gazan	Généreux	Sarai	Scarpaleggia
Genuis	Gerretsen	Schiefke	Schmale
Gladu	Godin	Seeback	Serré
Goodridge	Gould	Sgro	Shanahan
Gourde	Gray	Sheehan	Shields
Green	Guilbeault	Shiple	Sidhu (Brampton East)
Hajdu	Hanley	Sidhu (Brampton South)	Singh
Hardie	Hepfner	Small	Sorbara
Hoback	Holland	Soroka	Sousa
Housefather	Hughes	Steinley	Stewart
Hussen	Hutchings	St-Onge	Strahl
Iacono	Idlout	Stubbs	Sudds
Ien	Jaczek	Tassi	Taylor Roy
Jivani	Johns	Thomas	Thompson
Joly	Jones	Thomas	Thompson
		Tochor	Tolmie
		Trudeau	Turnbull
		Uppal	Valdez
		Van Bynen	van Koeverden
		Van Popta	Vandenbeld
		Vecchio	Vidal
		Vien	Vierson
		Virani	Vis
		Wagantall	Warkentin
		Waugh	Webber
		Weiler	Wilkinson
		Williams	Williamson

Government Orders

Yip
Zarrillo

Zahid
Zuberi — 274

NAYS

Members

Barsalou-Duval
Bergeron
Blanchette-Joncas
Chabot
DeBellefeuille
Desilets
Garon
Gill
Lemire
Morrice
Pauzé
Savard-Tremblay
Sinclair-Desgagné
Thériault
Trudel
Villemure — 31

Beaulieu
Bérubé
Brunelle-Duceppe
Champoux
Desbiens
Fortin
Gaudreau
Larouche
Michaud
Normandin
Perron
Simard
Ste-Marie
Therrien
Vignola

PAIRED

Members

Barlow
Davidson
Plamondon
Vandal

Blois
MacDonald (Malpeque)
Rodriguez
Zimmer — 8

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 91 carried.

[*English*]

The question is on Motion No. 96. A negative vote on Motion No. 96 requires the question to be put on Motion No. 97.

Before the Clerk announced the results of the vote:

• (3355)

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, could you please check the photos of the members for Winnipeg Centre and Winnipeg South Centre? It is hard to identify them.

The Speaker: I thank the member for Salaberry—Suroît for raising these issues. The member for Winnipeg South Centre is here in the House, so we will count his vote, as requested.

However, we will be withdrawing the vote of the member for Winnipeg Centre.

(The House divided on Motion No. 96, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 718*)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Ali
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Atwin
Badawey
Baker
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bergeron
Bibeau
Blair

Alghabra
Anand
Angus
Arya
Bachrach
Bains
Barron
Battiste
Beech
Bérubé
Bittle
Blanchette-Joncas

Blaney
Boulerice
Brière
Cannings
Casey
Chagger
Champagne
Chatel
Chiang
Collins (Victoria)
Coteau
Damoff
Desbiens
Desjarlais
Dhillon
Dong
Dubourg
Duguid
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Gaheer
Garon
Gaudreau
Gerretsen
Gould
Guilbeault
Hanley
Hepfner
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Ien
Johns
Jones
Julian
Kelloway
Khera
Kusmierczyk
Lalonde
Lamoureux
Larouche
Lauzon
Lebouthillier
Lightbound
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Martinez Ferrada
Mathysen
McDonald (Avalon)
McKay
McLeod
Mendès
Miao
Miller
Murray
Ng
Normandin
Oliphant
Pauzé
Petitpas Taylor
Qualtrough
Romanado
Sahota
Saks
Sarai
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan

Boissonnault
Bradford
Brunelle-Duceppe
Carr
Chabot
Chahal
Champoux
Chen
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cormier
Dabrusin
DeBellefeuille
Desilets
Dhaliwal
Diab
Drouin
Duclos
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser
Fry
Gainey
Garrison
Gazan
Gill
Green
Hajdu
Hardie
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Idlout
Jaczek
Joly
Jowhari
Kayabaga
Khalid
Koutrakis
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lapointe
Lattanzio
LeBlanc
Lemire
Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacGregor
Maloney
Masse
May (Cambridge)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McPherson
Mendicino
Michaud
Morrissey
Naqvi
Noormohamed
O'Connell
O'Regan
Perron
Powlowski
Rogers
Rota
Sajjan
Samson
Savard-Tremblay
Schieffe
Sgro
Sheehan

Government Orders

Sidhu (Brampton East)
 Simard
 Singh
 Sousa
 St-Onge
 Tassi
 Thériault
 Thompson
 Trudel
 Valdez
 van Koeverden
 Vignola
 Virani
 Wilkinson
 Zahid
 Zuberi — 201

Sidhu (Brampton South)
 Sinclair-Desgagné
 Sorbara
 Ste-Marie
 Sudds
 Taylor Roy
 Therrien
 Trudeau
 Turnbull
 Van Bynen
 Vandenberg
 Villemure
 Weiler
 Yip
 Zarrillo

NAYS

Members

Aboultatif
 Allison
 Baldinelli
 Berthold
 Block
 Brassard
 Calkins
 Carrie
 Chong
 Dancho
 d'Entremont
 Dowdall
 Ellis
 Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
 Ferreri
 Gallant
 Genuis
 Godin
 Gourde
 Hallan
 Jivani
 Khanna
 Kram
 Kurek
 Lake
 Lawrence
 Leslie
 Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
 Lloyd
 Majumdar
 McCauley (Edmonton West)
 Moore
 Morrice
 Motz
 Nater
 Paul-Hus
 Poilievre
 Reid
 Roberts
 Schmale
 Shields
 Small
 Steinley
 Strahl
 Thomas
 Tolmie
 Van Popta
 Vidal
 Viersen
 Wagantall
 Waugh
 Williams

Aitchison
 Arnold
 Barrett
 Bezan
 Bragdon
 Brock
 Caputo
 Chambers
 Dalton
 Deltell
 Doherty
 Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
 Epp
 Falk (Provencher)
 Findlay
 Gagné
 Gladu
 Goodridge
 Gray
 Hoback
 Kelly
 Kmiec
 Kramp-Neuman
 Kusie
 Lantsman
 Lehoux
 Lewis (Essex)
 Liepert
 Lobb
 May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
 McLean
 Morantz
 Morrison
 Muys
 Patzer
 Perkins
 Redekopp
 Rempel Garner
 Ruff
 Seebach
 Shipley
 Soroka
 Stewart
 Stubbs
 Tochor
 Uppal
 Vecchio
 Vien
 Vis
 Warkentin
 Webber
 Williamson — 104

PAIRED

Members

Barlow
 Davidson
 Plamondon
 Vandal
 Blois
 MacDonald (Malpeque)
 Rodriguez
 Zimmer — 8

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 96 carried.

Mr. Martin Champoux: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order of sorts.

I know that all members of the House care a lot about the education that our younger generations get in terms of political involvement. I know we cannot name the people in the galleries, but if by any chance there are students here hoping to hear a robust question period, I wonder if members would be open to some heckling across the aisle to at least give them a good show while they are here visiting Parliament.

The Speaker: That is not a point of order. I thank the hon. member for Drummond.

The question is on Motion No. 102.

● (3410)

(The House divided on Motion No. 102, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 719)

YEAS

Members

Aboultatif
 Allison
 Baldinelli
 Berthold
 Block
 Brassard
 Calkins
 Carrie
 Chong
 Dancho
 d'Entremont
 Dowdall
 Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
 Epp
 Falk (Provencher)
 Findlay
 Gagné
 Gladu
 Goodridge
 Gray
 Hoback
 Kelly
 Kitchen
 Kram
 Kurek
 Lake
 Lawrence
 Leslie
 Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
 Lloyd
 Majumdar
 Mazier
 McLean
 Morantz
 Morrison
 Muys
 Patzer
 Aitchison
 Arnold
 Barrett
 Bezan
 Bragdon
 Brock
 Caputo
 Chambers
 Dalton
 Deltell
 Doherty
 Dreeshen
 Ellis
 Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
 Ferreri
 Gallant
 Genuis
 Godin
 Gourde
 Hallan
 Jivani
 Khanna
 Kmiec
 Kramp-Neuman
 Kusie
 Lantsman
 Lehoux
 Lewis (Essex)
 Liepert
 Lobb
 May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
 McCauley (Edmonton West)
 Moore
 Morrice
 Motz
 Nater
 Paul-Hus

Government Orders

Perkins
Redekopp
Rempel Garner
Rood
Scheer
Shields
Small
Steinley
Strahl
Thomas
Tolmie
Van Popta
Vidal
Viersen
Vuong
Warkentin
Webber
Williamson— 109

Poilievre
Reid
Roberts
Ruff
Schmale
Shipley
Soroka
Stewart
Stubbs
Tochor
Uppal
Vecchio
Vien
Vis
Wagantall
Waugh
Williams

Khera
Kusmierczyk
Lalonde
Lamoureux
Larouche
Lauzon
Lebouthillier
Lightbound
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Martinez Ferrada
Mathysen
McDonald (Avalon)
McKay
McLeod
Mendès
Miao
Miller
Murray
Ng
Normandin
Oliphant
Pauzé
Petitpas Taylor
Qualtrough
Rogers
Rota
Sajjan
Samson
Savard-Tremblay
Schiefke
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sinclair-Desgagné
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Sudds
Taylor Roy
Thompson
Trudel
Valdez
van Koeverden
Vignola
Virani
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi— 199

Koutrakis
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lapointe
Lattanzio
LeBlanc
Lemire
Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacGregor
Maloney
Masse
May (Cambridge)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McPherson
Mendicino
Michaud
Morrissey
Naqvi
Noormohamed
O'Connell
O'Regan
Perron
Powlowski
Robillard
Romanado
Sahota
Saks
Sarai
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Singh
Sousa
St-Onge
Tassi
Therrien
Trudeau
Turnbull
Van Bynen
Vandenbeld
Villemure
Weiler
Yip
Zarrillo

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Ali
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Atwin
Badawey
Baker
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bergeron
Bibeau
Blair
Blaney
Boulerice
Brière
Cannings
Casey
Chagger
Champagne
Chatel
Chiang
Collins (Victoria)
Coteau
Damoff
Desbiens
Desjarlais
Dhillon
Drouin
Duclos
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser
Fry
Gahey
Garrison
Gerretsen
Gould
Guilbeault
Hanley
Hepfner
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Ien
Johns
Jones
Julian
Kelloway

Alghabra
Anand
Angus
Arya
Bachrach
Bains
Barron
Battiste
Beech
Bérubé
Bittle
Blanchette-Joncas
Boissonnault
Bradford
Brunelle-Duceppe
Carr
Chabot
Chahal
Champoux
Chen
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cormier
Dabrusin
DeBellefeuille
Desilets
Dhaliwal
Diab
Dubourg
Duguid
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Gaheer
Garon
Gaudreau
Gill
Green
Hajdu
Hardie
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Idlout
Jaczek
Joly
Jowhari
Kayabaga
Khalid

PAIRED

Members

Barlow
Davidson
Plamondon
Vandal

Blois
MacDonald (Malpeque)
Rodriguez
Zimmer— 8

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 102 defeated.

The question is on Motion No. 108.

• (3425)

(The House divided on Motion No. 108, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 720*)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Albas
Alghabra

Aitchison
Aldag
Ali

Government Orders

Allison	Anand	Kusmierczyk	Kwan
Anandasangaree	Angus	Lake	Lalonde
Arnold	Arseneault	Lambropoulos	Lamoureux
Arya	Atwin	Lantsman	Lapointe
Bachrach	Badawey	Larouche	Lattanzio
Bains	Baker	Lauzon	Lawrence
Baldinelli	Barrett	LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Barron	Barsalou-Duval	Lehoux	Lemire
Battiste	Beaulieu	Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Beech	Bergeron	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Berthold	Bérubé	Lightbound	Lloyd
Bezan	Bibeau	Lobb	Long
Bittle	Blair	Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney	MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacGregor
Block	Boissonnault	MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Majumdar
Boulerice	Bradford	Maloney	Martinez Ferrada
Bragdon	Brassard	Masse	Mathysen
Brière	Brock	May (Cambridge)	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
Brunelle-Duceppe	Calkins	Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)
Cannings	Caputo	McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty
Carr	Carrie	McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Casey	Chabot	McLean	McLeod
Chagger	Chahal	McPherson	Mendès
Chambers	Champagne	Mendicino	Miao
Champoux	Chen	Michaud	Miller
Chiang	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Moore	Morantz
Collins (Victoria)	Cormier	Morrice	Morrison
Coteau	Dabrusin	Morrissey	Motz
Dalton	Damoff	Murray	Muys
Dancho	DeBellefeuille	Naqvi	Nater
Deltell	d'Entremont	Ng	Noormohamed
Desbiens	Desilets	Normandin	O'Connell
Desjarlais	Dhaliwal	Oliphant	O'Regan
Dhillon	Diab	Patzer	Paul-Hus
Doherty	Dong	Paupé	Perkins
Dowdall	Dreeshen	Perron	Petitpas Taylor
Drouin	Dubourg	Powlowski	Redekopp
Duclos	Duguid	Reid	Rempel Garner
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Dzerowicz	Richards	Roberts
Ehsassi	El-Khoury	Robillard	Rogers
Ellis	Epp	Romanado	Rood
Erskine-Smith	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Rota	Ruff
Ferreri	Fillmore	Sahota	Sajjan
Findlay	Fisher	Saks	Samson
Fonseca	Fortier	Sarai	Savard-Tremblay
Fortin	Fragiskatos	Scarpaleggia	Scheer
Fraser	Freeland	Schiefke	Schmale
Fry	Gaheer	Serré	Sgro
Gainey	Gallant	Shanahan	Sheehan
Garon	Garrison	Shields	Shiple
Gaudreau	Gazan	Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Généreux	Genuis	Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné
Gerretsen	Gill	Singh	Small
Glada	Godin	Sorbara	Soroka
Goodridge	Gould	Sousa	Steinley
Gourde	Gray	Ste-Marie	Stewart
Green	Guilbeault	St-Onge	Strahl
Hajdu	Hallan	Stubbs	Sudds
Hanley	Hardie	Tassi	Taylor Roy
Hepfner	Hoback	Thériault	Therrien
Housefather	Hughes	Thomas	Thompson
Hussen	Hutchings	Tochor	Tolmie
Iacono	Idlout	Trudeau	Trudel
Ien	Jaczek	Turnbull	Uppal
Jivani	Johns	Valdez	Van Bynen
Joly	Jones	van Koevorden	Van Popta
Jowhari	Julian	Vandenbeld	Vecchio
Kayabaga	Kelloway	Vidal	Vien
Kelly	Khalid	Viersen	Vignola
Khanna	Khera	Villemure	Virani
Kitchen	Kmiec	Vis	Vuong
Koutrakis	Kram	Wagantall	Warkentin
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek	Waugh	Webber

Government Orders

Weiler
Williams
Yip
Zarrillo

Wilkinson
Williamson
Zahid
Zuberi — 306

NAYS

Nil

PAIRED

Members

Barlow
Davidson
Plamondon
Vandal

Blois
MacDonald (Malpeque)
Rodriguez
Zimmer — 8

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 108 carried.

The hon. Minister of Public Services and Procurement.

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos: Mr. Speaker, thank you for giving me an opportunity to ask for the unanimous consent of the House to change my vote on Motion No. 79 from nay to yea.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*English*]

The Speaker: The hon. member for Beaches—East York.

Mr. Nathaniel Erskine-Smith: Mr. Speaker, I ask for unanimous consent to change my vote on Motion No. 79 from no to yes.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 113. A negative vote on Motion No. 113 requires the question to be put on Motion No. 117.

Before the Clerk announced the results of the vote:

● (3440)

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, again, the member for Kenora's photo is not showing up, so I think you will have to withdraw his vote again.

The Speaker: Regrettably, I must withdraw the vote of the member for Kenora.

(The House divided on Motion No. 113, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 721*)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Albas
Arnold
Barrett
Beaulieu
Berthold
Bezan
Blanchette-Joncas
Bragdon
Brock
Calkins
Carrie

Aitchison
Allison
Baldinelli
Barsalou-Duval
Bergeron
Bérubé
Blanchet
Block
Brassard
Brunelle-Duceppe
Caputo
Chabot

Chambers
Dalton
DeBellefeuille
d'Entremont
Desilets
Dowdall
Ellis
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Ferreri
Fortin
Garon
Généreux
Gill
Godin
Gourde
Hallan
Jivani
Khanna
Kmiec
Kramp-Neuman
Kusie
Lantsman
Lawrence
Lemire
Lewis (Essex)
Liepert
Lobb
Mazier
McLean
Moore
Morrison
Muys
Normandin
Pauzé
Perron
Reid
Richards
Rood
Savard-Tremblay
Schmale
Shiple
Sinclair-Desgagné
Soroka
Ste-Marie
Strahl
Thériault
Thomas
Trudel
Van Popta
Vidal
Viersen
Villemure
Vuong
Warkentin
Webber
Williamson — 135

Champoux
Dancho
Deltell
Desbiens
Doherty
Dreeshen
Epp
Falk (Provencher)
Findlay
Gallant
Gaudreau
Genuis
Gladu
Goodridge
Gray
Hoback
Kelly
Kitchen
Kram
Kurek
Lake
Larouche
Lehoux
Leslie
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lloyd
Majumdar
McCaughey (Edmonton West)
Michaud
Morantz
Motz
Nater
Patzner
Perkins
Redekopp
Rempel Garner
Roberts
Ruff
Scheer
Shields
Simard
Small
Steinley
Stewart
Stubbs
Therrien
Tochor
Uppal
Vecchio
Vien
Vignola
Vis
Wagantall
Waugh
Williams

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Ali
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Atwin
Badawey
Baker
Battiste
Bibeau
Blair
Boissonnault
Bradford
Cannings

Alghabra
Anand
Angus
Arya
Bachrach
Bains
Barron
Beech
Bittle
Blaney
Boulerice
Brière
Carr

Government Orders

Casey
 Chahal
 Chatel
 Chiang
 Collins (Victoria)
 Coteau
 Damoff
 Dhaliwal
 Diab
 Drouin
 Duclos
 Dzerowicz
 El-Khoury
 Fillmore
 Fonseca
 Fragiskatos
 Freeland
 Gaheer
 Garrison
 Gould
 Guilbeault
 Hanley
 Hepfner
 Housefather
 Hussen
 Iacono
 Ien
 Johns
 Jones
 Julian
 Kelloway
 Khera
 Kusmierczyk
 Lalonde
 Lamoureux
 Lattanzio
 LeBlanc
 Lightbound
 Longfield
 MacAulay (Cardigan)
 MacKinnon (Gatineau)
 Martinez Ferrada
 Mathysen
 May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
 McGuinty
 McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
 McPherson
 Mendicino
 Miller
 Morrissey
 Naqvi
 Noormohamed
 Oliphant
 Petitpas Taylor
 Qualtrough
 Rogers
 Rota
 Sajjan
 Samson
 Scarpaleggia
 Serré
 Shanahan
 Sidhu (Brampton East)
 Singh
 Sousa
 Sudds
 Taylor Roy
 Trudeau
 Valdez
 van Koeverden
 Virani
 Wilkinson
 Zahid

Chagger
 Champagne
 Chen
 Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
 Cormier
 Dabrusin
 Desjarlais
 Dhillon
 Dong
 Dubourg
 Duguid
 Ehsassi
 Erskine-Smith
 Fisher
 Fortier
 Fraser
 Fry
 Gainey
 Gerretsen
 Green
 Hajdu
 Hardie
 Holland
 Hughes
 Hutchings
 Idlout
 Jaczek
 Joly
 Jowhari
 Kayabaga
 Khalid
 Koutrakis
 Kwan
 Lambropoulos
 Lapointe
 Lauzon
 Leboutillier
 Long
 Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
 MacGregor
 Maloney
 Masse
 May (Cambridge)
 McDonald (Avalon)
 McKay
 McLeod
 Mendès
 Miao
 Morrice
 Murray
 Ng
 O'Connell
 O'Regan
 Powlowski
 Robillard
 Romano
 Sahota
 Saks
 Sarai
 Schiefke
 Sgro
 Sheehan
 Sidhu (Brampton South)
 Sorbara
 St-Onge
 Tassi
 Thompson
 Turnbull
 Van Bynen
 Vandenbeld
 Weiler
 Yip
 Zarrillo

Zuberi— 173

PAIRED

Members

Barlow	Blais
Davidson	MacDonald (Malpeque)
Plamondon	Rodriguez
Vandal	Zimmer— 8

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 113 defeated.

[*English*]

The question is on Motion No. 117. A negative vote on Motion No. 117 requires the question to be put on Motion No. 118.

[*Translation*]

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

An hon. member: I request a recorded division.

Before the Clerk announced the results of the vote:

● (3450)

[*English*]

Ms. Heather McPherson: Mr. Speaker, this appears to be a pattern we are in today. There are three photos that are not showing up on the dashboard: the member for Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, the member for Kenora and the member for Markham—Thornhill.

The Speaker: That is correct and those three votes will be withdrawn.

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 117, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 722*)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Atwin	Bachrach
Badawey	Bains
Baker	Barron
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Bergeron	Bérubé
Bibeau	Bittle
Blair	Blanchet
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney
Boissonnault	Boulerice
Bradford	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings
Carr	Casey
Chabot	Chagger
Chahal	Champagne
Champoux	Chatel
Chen	Chiang
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Damoff
DeBellefeuille	Desbiens

Government Orders

Desilets	Desjarlais	Wilkinson	Yip
Dhaliwal	Dhillon	Zahid	Zarrillo
Diab	Dong	Zuberi— 201	
Drouin	Dubourg		
Duclos	Duguid		NAYS
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi		Members
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith		Aitchison
Fillmore	Fisher	Aboultaif	Allison
Fonseca	Fortier	Albas	Baldinelli
Fortin	Fragiskatos	Arnold	Berthold
Fraser	Freeland	Barrett	Bragdon
Fry	Gaheer	Block	Brock
Gahey	Garon	Brassard	Caputo
Garrison	Gaudreau	Calkins	Chambers
Gerretsen	Gill	Carrie	Dancho
Gould	Green	Dalton	d'Entremont
Guilbeault	Hajdu	Deltell	Dowdall
Hanley	Hardie	Doherty	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Hepfner	Holland	Dreeschen	Epp
Housefather	Hughes	Ellis	Falk (Provencher)
Hussen	Hutchings	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Findlay
Iacono	Idlout	Ferreri	Généreux
Ien	Jaczek	Gallant	Gladu
Johns	Joly	Genuis	Goodridge
Jones	Jowhari	Godin	Gray
Julian	Kayabaga	Gourde	Hoback
Kelloway	Khalid	Hallan	Kelly
Khera	Koutrakis	Jivani	Kitchen
Kusmierczyk	Kwan	Khanna	Kram
Lalonde	Lambropoulos	Kniec	Kurek
Lamoureux	Lapointe	Kramp-Neuman	Lake
Larouche	Lattanzio	Kusie	Lawrence
Lauzon	LeBlanc	Lantsman	Leslie
Lebouthillier	Lemire	Lehoux	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lightbound	Lobb	Lewis (Essex)	Lloyd
Long	Longfield	Liepert	May (Saanic—Gulf Islands)
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAtulay (Cardigan)	Majumdar	McCauley (Edmonton West)
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Mazier	Moore
Maloney	Martinez Ferrada	McLean	Morrice
Masse	Mathysen	Morantz	Motz
May (Cambridge)	McDonald (Avalon)	Morrison	Nater
McGuinty	McKay	Muys	Perkins
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod	Patzer	Redekopp
McPherson	Mendès	Poilievre	Rempel Garner
Mendicino	Miao	Reid	Roberts
Michaud	Miller	Richards	Ruff
Morrissey	Murray	Rood	Schmale
Naqvi	Noormohamed	Scheer	Shields
Normandin	O'Connell	Seeback	Small
Oliphant	O'Regan	Shiple	Steinley
Pauzé	Perron	Soroka	Strahl
Petitpas Taylor	Powlowski	Stewart	Thomas
Qualtrough	Robillard	Stubbs	Uppal
Rogers	Romanado	Tochor	Vecchio
Rota	Sahota	Van Popta	Vien
Sajjan	Saks	Vidal	Vis
Samson	Sarai	Viersen	Wagantall
Savard-Tremblay	Scarpaleggia	Vuong	Waugh
Schiefke	Serré	Warkentin	Williams
Sgro	Shanahan	Webber	
Sheehan	Sidhu (Brampton East)	Williamson— 107	
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard		
Sinclair-Desgagné	Singh		
Sorbara	Sousa		
Ste-Marie	St-Onge		
Sudds	Tassi		PAIRED
Taylor Roy	Thériault		Members
Thompson	Trudeau	Barlow	Blois
Trudel	Turnbull	Davidson	MacDonald (Malpeque)
Valdez	Van Bynen	Plamondon	Rodriguez
van Koeverden	Vandenbeld	Vandal	Zimmer— 8
Vignola	Villemure		
Virani	Weiler		

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 117 carried.

[English]

The question is on Motion No. 123. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 128, 132, 136, 140, 145 and 149. A negative vote on Motion No. 123 requires the question to be put on Motion No. 127.

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

Mr. Chris Warkentin: Mr. Speaker, we would request a recorded division.

• (3505)

Ms. Heather McPherson: Mr. Speaker, again, the member for Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman is not showing up on the dashboard.

The Speaker: Accordingly, regrettably, the vote of the member for Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman will be withdrawn.

(The House divided on Motion No. 123, which was negated to on the following division:)

(Division No. 723)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barrett	Berthold
Block	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Calkins	Caputo
Carrie	Chambers
Cooper	Dalton
Dancho	Deltell
d'Entremont	Doherty
Dowdall	Dreeshen
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Ferreri
Findlay	Gallant
Généreux	Genuis
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gourde
Gray	Hallan
Hoback	Jeneroux
Jivani	Kelly
Khanna	Kitchen
Kmiec	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Kusie	Lake
Lantsman	Lawrence
Lehoux	Leslie
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Liepert	Lloyd
Lobb	Majumdar
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLean
Melillo	Moore
Morantz	Morrison
Motz	Muys
Nater	Patzer
Perkins	Redekopp
Reid	Rempel Garner
Richards	Roberts
Rood	Ruff
Scheer	Schmale
Seeback	Shields

Shipley
Soroka
Stewart
Stubbs
Tochor
Uppal
Vecchio
Vien
Vis
Wagantall
Waugh
Williams

Aldag
Ali
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ashton
Bachrach
Bains
Barron
Battiste
Beech
Bérubé
Bittle
Blanchet
Blaney
Boulerice
Brière
Cannings
Casey
Chagger
Champagne
Chatel
Chiang
Collins (Victoria)
Coteau
Damoff
Desbiens
Dhaliwal
Diab
Drouin
Duclos
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser
Fry
Gainey
Garrison
Gazan
Gill
Green
Hajdu
Hardie
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Idlout
Jaczek
Jones
Julian
Kelloway
Khera
Kusmierczyk
Lalonde
Lamoureux
Larouche

Government Orders

Small
Steinley
Strahl
Thomas
Tolmie
Van Popta
Vidal
Viersen
Vuong
Warkentin
Webber
Williamson — 108

NAYS

Members

Alghabra
Anand
Angus
Arya
Atwin
Badawey
Baker
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bergeron
Bibeau
Blair
Blanchette-Joncas
Boissonnault
Bradford
Brudelle-Duceppe
Carr
Chabot
Chahal
Champoux
Chen
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cormier
Dabrusin
DeBellefeuille
Desilets
Dhillon
Dong
Dubourg
Duguid
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Gaheer
Garon
Gaudreau
Gerretsen
Gould
Guilbeault
Hanley
Hepfner
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Ien
Johns
Jowhari
Kayabaga
Khalid
Koutrakis
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lapointe
Lattanzio

Government Orders

Lauzon	LeBlanc
Lebouthillier	Lemire
Lighthouse	Long
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney
Martinez Ferrada	Masse
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	McDonald (Avalon)
McGuinty	McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod
McPherson	Mendès
Mendicino	Miao
Michaud	Miller
Morrice	Morrissey
Murray	Naqvi
Ng	Noormohamed
Normandin	O'Connell
Oliphant	O'Regan
Pauzé	Perron
Petitpas Taylor	Powlowski
Qualtrough	Robillard
Rogers	Romanado
Rota	Sahota
Sajjan	Saks
Samson	Sarai
Savard-Tremblay	Scarpaleggia
Schieffe	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Brampton East)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard
Sinclair-Desgagné	Singh
Sorbara	Sousa
Ste-Marie	St-Onge
Sudds	Tassi
Taylor Roy	Thériault
Therrien	Thompson
Trudeau	Trudel
Turnbull	Valdez
Van Bynen	van Koeverden
Vandenbeld	Vignola
Villemure	Virani
Weiler	Wilkinson
Yip	Zahid
Zarrillo	Zuberi — 204

PAIRED

Members

Barlow	Blois
Davidson	MacDonald (Malpeque)
Plamondon	Rodriguez
Vandal	Zimmer — 8

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 123 negated. I therefore declare Motion Nos. 128, 132, 136, 140, 145 and 149 negated.

[Translation]

The question is on Motion No. 127. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 129, 134, 137, 141, 146 and 151. A negative vote on Motion No. 127 requires the question to be put on Motions Nos. 138 and 142.

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

[English]

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Mr. Speaker, I would ask for a recorded division.

● (3520)

[Translation]

(The House divided on Motion No. 127, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 724)***YEAS**

Members

Abouttaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barrett	Berthold
Block	Bragdon
Brassard	Brook
Calkins	Caputo
Carrie	Chambers
Cooper	Dalton
Dancho	Deltell
d'Entremont	Doherty
Dowdall	Dreeschen
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Ferreri
Findlay	Gallant
Généreux	Genuis
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gourde
Gray	Hallan
Hoback	Jeneroux
Jivani	Kelly
Khanna	Kitchen
Kmiec	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Lake	Lantsman
Lehoux	Leslie
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Liepert	Lloyd
Lobb	Majumdar
Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLean	Melillo
Moore	Morantz
Morrison	Motz
Muys	Nater
Patzner	Perkins
Poillievre	Redekopp
Reid	Rempel Garner
Richards	Roberts
Rood	Ruff
Scheer	Schmale
Seeback	Shields
Shipley	Small
Soroka	Steinley
Strahl	Stubbs
Thomas	Tochor
Tolmie	Uppal
Van Popta	Vecchio
Vidal	Vien
Viersen	Vis
Vuong	Wagantall
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Williams
Williamson — 107	

NAYS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya

Government Orders

Ashton
 Bachrach
 Bains
 Barron
 Battiste
 Beech
 Bérubé
 Bittle
 Blanchet
 Blaney
 Boulerice
 Brière
 Cannings
 Casey
 Chagger
 Champagne
 Chatel
 Chiang
 Collins (Victoria)
 Coteau
 Damoff
 DeBellefeuille
 Desilets
 Dhaliwal
 Diab
 Drouin
 Duclos
 Dzerowicz
 El-Khoury
 Fillmore
 Fonseca
 Fortin
 Fraser
 Fry
 Gainey
 Garrison
 Gazan
 Gill
 Green
 Hajdu
 Hardie
 Holland
 Hughes
 Hutchings
 Idlout
 Jaczek
 Jones
 Julian
 Kelloway
 Khera
 Kusmierczyk
 Lalonde
 Lamoureux
 Larouche
 Lauzon
 Lebouthillier
 Lightbound
 Longfield
 MacAulay (Cardigan)
 MacKinnon (Gatineau)
 Martinez Ferrada
 Mathysen
 May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
 McGuinty
 McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
 McPherson
 Mendicino
 Michaud
 Morrice
 Murray
 Ng
 Normandin
 Oliphant

Atwin
 Badawey
 Baker
 Barsalou-Duval
 Beaulieu
 Bergeron
 Bibeau
 Blair
 Blanchette-Joncas
 Boissonnault
 Bradford
 Brunelle-Duceppe
 Carr
 Chabot
 Chahal
 Champoux
 Chen
 Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
 Cormier
 Dabrusin
 Davies
 Desbiens
 Desjarlais
 Dhillon
 Dong
 Dubourg
 Duguid
 Ehsassi
 Erskine-Smith
 Fisher
 Fortier
 Fragiskatos
 Freeland
 Gaheer
 Garon
 Gaudreau
 Gerretsen
 Gould
 Guilbeault
 Hanley
 Hepfner
 Housefather
 Hussien
 Iacono
 Ien
 Johns
 Jowhari
 Kayabaga
 Khalid
 Koutrakis
 Kwan
 Lambropoulos
 Lapointe
 Lattanzio
 LeBlanc
 Lemire
 Long
 Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
 MacGregor
 Maloney
 Masse
 May (Cambridge)
 McDonald (Avalon)
 McKay
 McLeod
 Mendès
 Miao
 Miller
 Morrissey
 Naqvi
 Noormohamed
 O'Connell
 O'Regan

Paucé
 Petitpas Taylor
 Qualtrough
 Rogers
 Rota
 Sajjan
 Samson
 Savard-Tremblay
 Schiefke
 Sgro
 Sheehan
 Sidhu (Brampton South)
 Sinclair-Desgagné
 Sorbara
 Ste-Marie
 Sudds
 Taylor Roy
 Therrien
 Trudeau
 Turnbull
 Van Bynen
 Vandenbeld
 Villemure
 Weiler
 Yip
 Zarrillo

Perron
 Powlowski
 Robillard
 Romanado
 Sahota
 Saks
 Sarai
 Scarpaleggia
 Serré
 Shanahan
 Sidhu (Brampton East)
 Simard
 Singh
 Sousa
 St-Onge
 Tassi
 Thériault
 Thompson
 Trudel
 Valdez
 van Koverden
 Vignola
 Virani
 Wilkinson
 Zahid
 Zuberi — 206

PAIRED

Members

Barlow
 Davidson
 Plamondon
 Vandal

Blois
 MacDonald (Malpeque)
 Rodriguez
 Zimmer — 8

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 127 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 129, 134, 137, 141, 146 and 151 defeated.

[*English*]

The question is on Motion No. 138. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 144, 148 and 152. A negative vote on Motion No. 138 requires the question to be put on Motion No. 143.

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

Mr. Todd Doherty: Mr. Speaker, we request a recorded division.

● (3530)

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 138, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 725*)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
 Allison
 Baldinelli
 Berthold
 Block
 Brassard
 Calkins
 Carrie
 Cooper
 Dancho
 d'Entremont

Aitchison
 Arnold
 Barrett
 Bezan
 Bragdon
 Brock
 Caputo
 Chambers
 Dalton
 Deltell
 Doherty

Government Orders

Dowdall	Dreeshen	Desbiens	Desilets
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis	Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Diab	Dong
Falk (Provencher)	Ferreri	Drouin	Dubourg
Findlay	Gallant	Duclos	Duguid
Généreux	Genuis	Dzerowicz	Ehsassi
Gladu	Godin	El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Goodridge	Gourde	Fillmore	Fisher
Gray	Hallan	Fonseca	Fortier
Hoback	Jeneroux	Fortin	Fragiskatos
Jivani	Kelly	Fraser	Freeland
Khanna	Kitchen	Fry	Gaheer
Kmiec	Kram	Gainey	Garon
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek	Garrison	Gaudreau
Kusie	Lake	Gazan	Gerretsen
Lantsman	Lehoux	Gill	Gould
Leslie	Lewis (Essex)	Guilbeault	Hajdu
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert	Hanley	Hardie
Lloyd	Lobb	Hepfner	Holland
Majumdar	Mazier	Housefather	Hughes
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLean	Hussen	Hutchings
Melillo	Moore	Iacono	Idlout
Morantz	Morrison	Ien	Jaczek
Motz	Muys	Johns	Jones
Nater	Patzer	Jowhari	Julian
Perkins	Poillievre	Kayabaga	Kelloway
Redekopp	Reid	Khalid	Khera
Rempel Garner	Richards	Koutrakis	Kusmierczyk
Roberts	Rood	Kwan	Lalonde
Ruff	Scheer	Lambropoulos	Lamoureux
Schmale	Seeback	Lapointe	Larouche
Shields	Shipley	Lattanzio	Lauzon
Small	Soroka	LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Steinley	Stewart	Lemire	Lightbound
Strahl	Stubbs	Long	Longfield
Thomas	Tochor	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)
Tolmie	Uppal	MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney
Van Popta	Vecchio	Martinez Ferrada	Masse
Vidal	Vien	Mathysen	May (Cambridge)
Viersen	Vis	May (Saaneich—Gulf Islands)	McDonald (Avalon)
Vuong	Wagantall	McGuinty	McKay
Warkentin	Waugh	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod
Webber	Williams	McPherson	Mendès
Williamson— 109		Mendicino	Miao
		Michaud	Miller
		Morrice	Morrissey
		Murray	Naqvi
		Ng	Noormohamed
		Normandin	O'Connell
		Oliphant	O'Regan
		Pauzé	Perron
		Petitpas Taylor	Powlowski
		Qualtrough	Robillard
		Rogers	Romanado
		Rota	Sahota
		Sajjan	Saks
		Samson	Sarai
		Savard-Tremblay	Scarpaleggia
		Schiefke	Serré
		Sgro	Shanahan
		Sheehan	Sidhu (Brampton East)
		Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard
		Sinclair-Desgagné	Singh
		Sorbara	Sousa
		Ste-Marie	St-Onge
		Sudds	Tassi
		Taylor Roy	Thériault
		Therrien	Thompson
		Trudeau	Trudel
		Turnbull	Valdez
		Van Bynen	van Koevorden
		Vandenbeld	Vignola
		Villemure	Virani

NAYS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Badawey	Bains
Baker	Barron
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Bergeron	Bérubé
Bibeau	Bittle
Blair	Blanchet
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney
Boissonnault	Boulerice
Bradford	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings
Carr	Casey
Chabot	Chagger
Chahal	Champagne
Champoux	Chatel
Chen	Chiang
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Damoff
Davies	DeBellefeuille

Government Orders

Weiler
Yip
Zarrillo

Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi— 202

Rempel Garner
Roberts
Ruff
Schmale
Shields
Small
Steinley
Strahl
Thomas
Tolmie
Van Popta
Vidal
Viersen
Vuong
Warkentin
Webber
Williamson— 107

Richards
Rood
Scheer
Seeback
Shiplely
Soroka
Stewart
Stubbs
Tochor
Uppal
Vecchio
Vien
Vis
Wagantall
Waugh
Williams

PAIRED

Members

Barlow
Davidson
Plamondon
Vandal

Blois
MacDonald (Malpeque)
Rodriguez
Zimmer— 8

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 138 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 144, 148 and 152 defeated.

[*English*]

The question is on Motion No. 142.

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Mr. Speaker, I would ask for a recorded division.

• (3545)

(The House divided on the Motion No. 142, which was negatived on the following division:)

(*Division No. 726*)

YEAS

Members

Abouttaif
Allison
Baldinelli
Berthold
Block
Brassard
Calkins
Carrie
Cooper
Dancho
d'Entremont
Dowdall
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Epp
Falk (Provencher)
Findlay
Généreux
Gladu
Goodridge
Gray
Jivani
Khanna
Kmiec
Kramp-Neuman
Lake
Lawrence
Leslie
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lloyd
Majumdar
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Melillo
Morantz
Motz
Nater
Perkins
Redekopp

Aitchison
Arnold
Barrett
Bezan
Bragdon
Brock
Caputo
Chambers
Dalton
Deltell
Doherty
Dreeshen
Ellis
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Ferrerri
Gallant
Genuis
Godin
Gourde
Hoback
Kelly
Kitchen
Kram
Kurek
Lantsman
Lehoux
Lewis (Essex)
Liepert
Lobb
Mazier
McLean
Moore
Morrison
Muys
Patzner
Poilievre
Reid

Aldag
Ali
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Atwin
Bains
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bergeron
Bibeau
Blair
Blanchette-Joncas
Boissonnault
Bradford
Brunelle-Duceppe
Carr
Chabot
Chahal
Champoux
Chen
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cormier
Dabrusin
Davies
Desbiens
Dhaliwal
Diab
Dubourg
Duguid
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Gaheer
Garon
Gaudreau
Gerretsen
Gould
Guilbeault
Hanley
Hepfner
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Ien
Johns
Jowhari
Kayabaga
Khalid
Koutrakis

NAYS

Members

Alghabra
Anand
Angus
Arya
Badawey
Barron
Battiste
Beech
Bérubé
Bittle
Blanchet
Blaney
Boulerice
Brière
Cannings
Casey
Chagger
Champagne
Chatel
Chiang
Collins (Victoria)
Coteau
Damoff
DeBellefeuille
Desilets
Dhillon
Drouin
Duclos
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser
Fry
Gainey
Garrison
Gazan
Gill
Green
Hajdu
Hardie
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Idlout
Jaczek
Jones
Julian
Kelloway
Khera
Kusmierczyk

Government Orders

Kwan	Lalonde
Lambropoulos	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Larouche
Lattanzio	Lauzon
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Lemire	Lightbound
Long	Longfield
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney	Martinez Ferrada
Masse	Mathysen
May (Cambridge)	May (Saarich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod	McPherson
Mendès	Medicino
Miao	Michaud
Miller	Morrice
Morrissey	Murray
Naqvi	Ng
Noormohamed	Normandin
O'Connell	Oliphant
O'Regan	Pauzé
Perron	Petitpas Taylor
Powlowski	Qualtrough
Robillard	Rogers
Romanado	Rota
Sahota	Sajjan
Saks	Samson
Sarai	Savard-Tremblay
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné
Singh	Sorbara
Sousa	Ste-Marie
St-Onge	Sudds
Tassi	Taylor Roy
Thériault	Thompson
Trudeau	Trudel
Turnbull	Valdez
Van Bynen	van Koevorden
Vandenbeld	Vignola
Virani	Weiler
Wilkinson	Yip
Zahid	Zarrillo
Zuberi — 199	

PAIRED

Members

Barlow	Blois
Davidson	MacDonald (Malpeque)
Plamondon	Rodriguez
Vandal	Zimmer — 8

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 142 defeated.

The question is on Motion No. 143. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 147 and 153.

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Mr. Speaker, I request a recorded division.

● (3555)

(The House divided on Motion No. 143, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 727*)

YEAS

Members

Aboultatif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barrett	Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu	Bergeron
Berthold	Bérubé
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Block	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Brunelle-Duceppe	Calkins
Caputo	Carrie
Chabot	Chambers
Champoux	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho
DeBellefeuille	Deltell
d'Entremont	Desbiens
Desilets	Doherty
Dowdall	Dreeshen
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Ferreri
Findlay	Fortin
Gallant	Garon
Gaudreau	Généreux
Gill	Gladu
Godin	Goodridge
Gourde	Gray
Hallan	Hoback
Jeneroux	Jivani
Kelly	Khanna
Kitchen	Kmiec
Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Kurek	Kusie
Lake	Lantsman
Larouche	Lawrence
Lehoux	Lemire
Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
Majumdar	Mazier
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLean
Melillo	Michaud
Moore	Morantz
Morrison	Motz
Muys	Nater
Normandin	Patzer
Pauzé	Perkins
Perron	Poilievre
Redekopp	Reid
Rempel Garner	Richards
Roberts	Rood
Ruff	Savard-Tremblay
Scheer	Schmale
Seeback	Shields
Shipley	Simard
Sinclair-Desgagné	Small
Soroka	Steinley
Ste-Marie	Stewart
Strahl	Stubbs
Thériault	Thomas
Tochor	Tolmie
Trudel	Uppal
Van Popta	Vecchio
Vidal	Vien

Viersen
 Villemure
 Vuong
 Warkentin
 Webber
 Williamson— 139

Vignola
 Vis
 Wagantall
 Waugh
 Williams

NAYS

Members

Aldag
 Ali
 Anandasangaree
 Arseneault
 Ashton
 Badawey
 Baker
 Battiste
 Bibeau
 Blair
 Boissonnault
 Bradford
 Cannings
 Casey
 Chahal
 Chatel
 Chiang
 Collins (Victoria)
 Coteau
 Damoff
 Dhaliwal
 Diab
 Drouin
 Duclos
 Dzerowicz
 El-Khoury
 Fillmore
 Fonseca
 Fragiskatos
 Freeland
 Gaheer
 Garrison
 Gerretsen
 Guilbeault
 Hanley
 Hepfner
 Housefather
 Hutchings
 Idlout
 Jaczek
 Jones
 Julian
 Kelloway
 Khera
 Kusmierczyk
 Lalonde
 Lamoureux
 Lattanzio
 LeBlanc
 Lightbound
 Longfield
 MacAulay (Cardigan)
 MacKinnon (Gatineau)
 Martinez Ferrada
 Mathysen
 May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
 McGuinty
 MacKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
 McPherson
 Mendicino
 Miller
 Morrissey
 Naqvi

Alghabra
 Anand
 Angus
 Arya
 Atwin
 Bains
 Barron
 Beech
 Bittle
 Blaney
 Boulерice
 Brière
 Carr
 Chagger
 Champagne
 Chen
 Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
 Cormier
 Dabrusin
 Davies
 Dhillon
 Dong
 Dubourg
 Duguid
 Ehsassi
 Erskine-Smith
 Fisher
 Fortier
 Fraser
 Fry
 Gainey
 Gazan
 Green
 Hajdu
 Hardie
 Holland
 Hussen
 Iacono
 Ien
 Johns
 Jowhari
 Kayabaga
 Khalid
 Koutrakis
 Kwan
 Lambropoulos
 Lapointe
 Lauzon
 Leboutillier
 Long
 Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
 MacGregor
 Maloney
 Masse
 May (Cambridge)
 McDonald (Avalon)
 McKay
 McLeod
 Mendès
 Miao
 Morrice
 Murray
 Ng

Noormohamed
 Oliphant
 Petitpas Taylor
 Qualtrough
 Rogers
 Rota
 Sajjan
 Samson
 Scarpaleggia
 Serré
 Shanahan
 Sidhu (Brampton East)
 Singh
 Sousa
 Suds
 Taylor Roy
 Trudeau
 Valdez
 van Koevenden
 Virani
 Wilkinson
 Zahid
 Zuberi— 171

Government Orders

O'Connell
 O'Regan
 Powlowski
 Robillard
 Romanado
 Sahota
 Saks
 Sarai
 Schiefke
 Sgro
 Sheehan
 Sidhu (Brampton South)
 Sorbara
 St-Onge
 Tassi
 Thompson
 Turnbull
 Van Bynen
 Vandenberg
 Weiler
 Yip
 Zarrillo

PAIRED

Members

Barlow
 Davidson
 Plamondon
 Vandal
 Blois
 MacDonald (Malpeque)
 Rodriguez
 Zimmer— 8

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 143, as well as Motions Nos. 147 and 153, defeated.

[English]

The question is on Motion No. 155.

Before the Clerk announced the results of the vote:

● (3610)

Ms. Laurel Collins: Mr. Speaker, I just want to inform the chamber that the member for Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman's photo is not showing up on the app.

The Speaker: Regrettably, the vote for the member for Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman will be withdrawn.

(The House divided on Motion No. 155, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 728)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
 Aldag
 Ali
 Anand
 Angus
 Arseneault
 Ashton
 Badawey
 Baker
 Barrett
 Barsalou-Duval
 Beaulieu
 Bergeron
 Bérubé
 Bittle
 Blanchette-Joncas
 Block
 Albas
 Alghabra
 Allison
 Anandasangaree
 Arnold
 Arya
 Atwin
 Bains
 Baldinelli
 Barron
 Battiste
 Beech
 Berthold
 Bibeau
 Blair
 Blaney
 Boissonnault

Government Orders

Boulerice	Bradford	MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Majumdar
Bragdon	Brassard	Maloney	Martínez Ferrada
Brière	Brock	Masse	Mathysen
Brunelle-Duceppe	Calkins	May (Cambridge)	May (Saaneich—Gulf Islands)
Cannings	Caputo	Mazier	McCaughey (Edmonton West)
Carr	Carrie	McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty
Casey	Chabot	McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Chagger	Chahal	McLean	McLeod
Chambers	Champagne	McPherson	Melillo
Champoux	Chatel	Mendès	Mendicino
Chen	Chiang	Miao	Michaud
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)	Miller	Moore
Cooper	Cormier	Morantz	Morrice
Coteau	Dabrusin	Morrison	Morrissey
Dalton	Damoff	Motz	Murray
Dancho	Davies	Muys	Naqvi
DeBellefeuille	Deltell	Nater	Ng
d'Entremont	Desbiens	Noormohamed	Normandin
Desilets	Dhaliwal	O'Connell	Oliphant
Dhillon	Diab	O'Regan	Patzer
Doherty	Dong	Paul-Hus	Pauzé
Dowdall	Dreeshen	Perkins	Perron
Drouin	Dubourg	Petitpas Taylor	Powlowski
Duclos	Duguid	Qualtrough	Redekopp
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Dzerowicz	Reid	Rempel Garner
Ehsassi	El-Khoury	Richards	Roberts
Ellis	Epp	Robillard	Rogers
Erskine-Smith	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Romanado	Rood
Falk (Provencher)	Ferreri	Rota	Ruff
Fillmore	Findlay	Sahota	Sajjan
Fisher	Fonseca	Saks	Samson
Fortier	Fortin	Sarai	Savard-Tremblay
Fragiskatos	Fraser	Scarpaleggia	Scheer
Freeland	Fry	Schieffe	Schmale
Gaheer	Gainey	Seeback	Serré
Gallant	Garon	Sgro	Shanahan
Garrison	Gaudreau	Sheehan	Shields
Gazan	Généreux	Shipley	Sidhu (Brampton East)
Genuis	Gerretsen	Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard
Gill	Gladu	Sinclair-Desgagné	Singh
Godin	Goodridge	Small	Sorbara
Gourde	Gray	Soroka	Sousa
Green	Guilbeault	Steinley	Ste-Marie
Hajdu	Hallan	Stewart	St-Onge
Hanley	Hardie	Strahl	Stubbs
Hepfner	Hoback	Sudds	Tassi
Housefather	Hughes	Taylor Roy	Thériault
Hussen	Hutchings	Therrien	Thomas
Iacono	Idlout	Thompson	Tochor
Ien	Jaczek	Tolmie	Trudeau
Jeneroux	Jivani	Trudel	Turnbull
Johns	Jones	Uppal	Valdez
Jowhari	Julian	Van Bynen	van Koeverden
Kayabaga	Kelloway	Van Poop	Vandenbeld
Kelly	Khalid	Vecchio	Vidal
Khanna	Khera	Vien	Viersen
Kitchen	Kmiec	Vignola	Villemure
Koutrakis	Kram	Virani	Vis
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek	Vuong	Wagantall
Kusmierczyk	Kwan	Warkentin	Waugh
Lake	Lalonde	Webber	Weiler
Lambropoulos	Lamoureux	Wilkinson	Williams
Lantsman	Lapointe	Williamson	Yip
Larouche	Lattanzio	Zahid	Zarrillo
Lauzon	Lawrence	Zuberi — 309	
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier		
Lehoux	Lemire		
Leslie	Lewis (Essex)	Nil	
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert		
Lightbound	Lloyd		
Lobb	Long		
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)		
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacGregor	Barlow	

NAYS

PAIRED

Members

Blois

Government Orders

Davidson
Plamondon
Vandal

MacDonald (Malpeque)
Rodriguez
Zimmer— 8

Waugh
Williams

Webber
Williamson— 108

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 155 carried.

[*Translation*]

The question is on Motion No. 160. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 165. A negative vote on Motion No. 160 requires the question to be put on Motions Nos. 161 and 164.

• (3620)

(The House divided on Motion No. 160, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 729)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barrett	Berthold
Block	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Calkins	Caputo
Carrie	Chambers
Chong	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho
Deltell	d'Entremont
Doherty	Dowdall
Dreeschen	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Ellis	Epp
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)
Ferreri	Findlay
Gallant	Généreux
Genuis	Gladu
Godin	Goodridge
Gourde	Gray
Hallan	Hoback
Jeneroux	Jivani
Kelly	Khanna
Kitchen	Kmiec
Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Kurek	Lake
Lantsman	Lawrence
Lehoux	Leslie
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Liepert	Lloyd
Lobb	Majumdar
Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLean	Melillo
Moore	Morantz
Morrison	Motz
Muys	Nater
Patzer	Perkins
Redekopp	Reid
Rempel Garner	Richards
Roberts	Rood
Ruff	Scheer
Schmale	Seeback
Shields	Shipley
Small	Soroka
Steinley	Stewart
Strahl	Stubbs
Thomas	Tochor
Tolmie	Uppal
Van Popta	Vecchio
Vidal	Vien
Viersen	Vis
Wagantall	Warkentin

Aldag
Ali
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ashton
Badawey
Baker
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bergeron
Bibeau
Blair
Blaney
Boulerice
Brière
Carr
Chabot
Chahal
Champoux
Chen
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cormier
Dabrusin
Davies
Desbiens
Desjarlais
Dhillon
Dong
Dubourg
Duguid
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Gaheer
Garon
Gaudreau
Gerretsen
Green
Hajdu
Hardie
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Idlout
Jaczek
Jones
Julian
Kelloway
Khera
Kusmierczyk
Lalonde
Lamoureux
Larouche
Lauzon
Lebouthillier
Lightbound
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Martinez Ferrada
Mathysen
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)

NAYS

Members

Alghabra
Anand
Angus
Arya
Atwin
Bains
Barron
Battiste
Beech
Bérubé
Bittle
Blanchette-Joncas
Boissonnault
Bradford
Cannings
Casey
Chagger
Champagne
Chatel
Chiang
Collins (Victoria)
Coteau
Damoff
DeBellefeuille
Desilets
Dhaliwal
Diab
Drouin
Duclos
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser
Fry
Gainey
Garrison
Gazan
Gill
Guilbeault
Hanley
Hepfner
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Ien
Johns
Jowhari
Kayabaga
Khalid
Koutrakis
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lapointe
Lattanzio
LeBlanc
Lemire
Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacGregor
Maloney
Masse
May (Cambridge)
McDonald (Avalon)
McKay
McLeod

Government Orders

McPherson	Mendicino
Michaud	Miller
Morrice	Morrissey
Murray	Naqvi
Ng	Noormohamed
Normandin	O'Connell
Oliphant	O'Regan
Pauzé	Perron
Petitpas Taylor	Powlowski
Qualtrough	Robillard
Rogers	Romanado
Rota	Sahota
Sajjan	Saks
Samson	Sarai
Savard-Tremblay	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Brampton East)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard
Sinclair-Desgagné	Singh
Sorbara	Sousa
Ste-Marie	St-Onge
Sudds	Tassi
Taylor Roy	Thériault
Therrien	Thompson
Trudeau	Trudel
Turnbull	Valdez
Van Bynen	van Koeverden
Vandenbeld	Vignola
Villemure	Virani
Weiler	Wilkinson
Yip	Zahid
Zarrillo	Zuberi — 200

PAIRED

Members

Barlow	Blois
Davidson	MacDonald (Malpeque)
Plamondon	Rodriguez
Vandal	Zimmer — 8

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I declare Motion No. 160 defeated. I therefore declare Motion No. 165 defeated.

[*English*]

The question is on Motion No. 161. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 169. A negative vote on Motion No. 161 requires the question to be put on Motions Nos. 162 and 164.

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

• (3625)

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Madam Speaker, I would like to ask for a recorded division.

• (3635)

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 161, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 730*)

YEAS

Members

Abouttaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barrett	Berthold
Bezan	Block
Bragdon	Brassard
Brock	Calkins
Caputo	Carrie
Chambers	Chong
Cooper	Dalton
Dancho	Deltell
d'Entremont	Doherty
Dowdall	Dreeshen
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Ferreri
Findlay	Gallant
Généreux	Genuis
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gourde
Gray	Hoback
Jeneroux	Jivani
Kelly	Khanna
Kitchen	Kmiec
Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Kurek	Lake
Lantsman	Lawrence
Lehoux	Leslie
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Liepert	Lloyd
Lobb	Majumdar
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLean
Melillo	Moore
Morantz	Morrison
Motz	Muys
Nater	Patzer
Paul-Hus	Perkins
Poilievre	Redekopp
Reid	Rempel Garner
Richards	Roberts
Rood	Ruff
Scheer	Schmale
Seeback	Shields
Shiely	Small
Soroka	Steinley
Stewart	Strahl
Stubbs	Thomas
Tochor	Tolmie
Uppal	Van Popta
Vecchio	Vidal
Viersen	Vis
Vuong	Wagantall
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Williams
Williamson — 109	

NAYS

Members

Alghabra
Anand
Angus
Arya
Atwin
Bains
Barron
Battiste
Beech

Bergeron
Bibeau
Blair
Blanchette-Joncas
Boissonnault
Bradford
Brunelle-Duceppe
Carr
Chabot
Chahal
Champoux
Chen
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cormier
Dabrusin
Davies
Desbiens
Desjarlais
Dhillon
Dong
Dubourg
Duguid
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Gaheer
Garon
Gaudreau
Gerretsen
Green
Hajdu
Hardie
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Idlout
Jaczek
Jones
Julian
Kelloway
Khera
Kusmierczyk
Lalonde
Lamoureux
Larouche
Lauzon
Lebouthillier
Lightbound
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Martinez Ferrada
Mathysse
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McPherson
Miao
Miller
Morrisey
Naqvi
Noormohamed
O'Connell
O'Regan
Perron
Powlowski
Robillard
Romanado
Sahota
Saks

Bérubé
Bittle
Blanchet
Blaney
Boulerice
Brière
Cannings
Casey
Chagger
Champagne
Chatel
Chiang
Collins (Victoria)
Coteau
Damoff
DeBellefeuille
Desilets
Dhaliwal
Diab
Drouin
Duclos
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser
Fry
Gainey
Garrison
Gazan
Gill
Guilbeault
Hanley
Hepfner
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Ien
Johns
Jowhari
Kayabaga
Khalid
Koutrakis
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lapointe
Lattanzio
LeBlanc
Lemire
Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacGregor
Maloney
Masse
May (Cambridge)
McDonald (Avalon)
McKay
McLeod
Mendicino
Michaud
Morrice
Murray
Ng
Normandin
Oliphant
Pauzé
Petipas Taylor
Qualtrough
Rogers
Rota
Sajjan
Samson

Sarai
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Singh
Sousa
St-Onge
Tassi
Thériault
Thompson
Trudel
Valdez
van Koeverden
Vignola
Virani
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi— 203

Government Orders

Savard-Tremblay
Schieffe
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sinclair-Desgagné
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Sudds
Taylor Roy
Therrien
Trudeau
Turnbull
Van Bynen
Vandenbeld
Villemure
Weiler
Yip
Zarrillo

PAIRED

Members

Barlow
Davidson
Plamondon
Vandal

Blois
MacDonald (Malpeque)
Rodriguez
Zimmer— 8

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I declare Motion No. 161 defeated. I therefore declare Motion No. 169 defeated.

[*English*]

The question is on Motion No. 162. A negative vote on Motion No. 162 would require the question to be put on Motion No. 163.

[*Translation*]

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Madam Speaker, I would like to request a recorded division.

● (3645)

(The House divided on Motion No. 162, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 731*)

YEAS

Members

Abouttaif
Albas
Arnold
Barrett
Bezan
Bragdon
Brock
Caputo
Chambers
Cooper
Dancho
d'Entremont
Dowdall
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Epp
Falk (Provencher)

Aitchison
Allison
Baldinelli
Berthold
Block
Brassard
Calkins
Carrie
Chong
Dalton
Deltell
Doherty
Dreeshen
Ellis
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast

Government Orders

Ferreri	Findlay	Dzerowicz	Ehsassi
Gallant	Généreux	El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Genuis	Gladu	Fillmore	Fisher
Godin	Goodridge	Fonseca	Fortier
Gourde	Gray	Fortin	Fragiskatos
Hallan	Hoback	Fraser	Freeland
Jivani	Kelly	Fry	Gaheer
Khanna	Kitchen	Gainey	Garon
Krniec	Kram	Garrison	Gaudreau
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek	Gazan	Gerretsen
Lake	Lawrence	Gill	Green
Lehoux	Leslie	Guilbeault	Hajdu
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Hanley	Hardie
Liepert	Lloyd	Hepfner	Holland
Lobb	Majumdar	Housefather	Hughes
Mazier	McCaughey (Edmonton West)	Hussen	Hutchings
McLean	McLillo	Iacono	Idlout
Moore	Morantz	Ien	Jaczek
Morrison	Motz	Johns	Jones
Muys	Nater	Jowhari	Julian
Patzer	Paul-Hus	Kayabaga	Kelloway
Perkins	Poilievre	Khalid	Khera
Redekopp	Rempel Garner	Koutrakis	Kusmierczyk
Richards	Roberts	Kwan	Lalonde
Rood	Ruff	Lambropoulos	Lamoureux
Scheer	Schmale	Lapointe	Larouche
Seeback	Shields	Lattanzio	Lauzon
Shiple	Small	LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Soroka	Steinley	Lemire	Lightbound
Stewart	Strahl	Long	Longfield
Stubbs	Thomas	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)
Tochor	Tolmie	MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Uppal	Van Popta	Maloney	Martinez Ferrada
Vecchio	Vidal	Masse	Mathysen
Vien	Viersen	May (Cambridge)	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
Vis	Vuong	McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty
Wagantall	Warkentin	McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Wagh	Webber	McLeod	McPherson
Williams	Williamson— 110	Mendicino	Miao

NAYS**Members**

Aldag	Alghabra	Murray	Naqvi
Ali	Anand	Ng	Noormohamed
Anandasangaree	Angus	Normandin	O'Connell
Arseneault	Arya	Oliphant	O'Regan
Ashton	Atwin	Pauzé	Perron
Bachrach	Badawey	Petitpas Taylor	Powlowski
Bains	Baker	Qualtrough	Robillard
Barron	Barsalou-Duval	Rogers	Romanado
Battiste	Beaulieu	Rota	Sahota
Beech	Bergeron	Sajjan	Saks
Bérubé	Bibeau	Samson	Sarai
Bittle	Blair	Savard-Tremblay	Scarpaleggia
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney	Schiefke	Serré
Boissonnault	Boulerice	Sgro	Shanahan
Bradford	Brière	Sheehan	Sidhu (Brampton East)
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings	Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard
Carr	Casey	Sinclair-Desgagné	Singh
Chabot	Chagger	Sorbara	Sousa
Chahal	Champagne	Ste-Marie	St-Onge
Champoux	Chatel	Sudds	Tassi
Chen	Chiang	Taylor Roy	Thompson
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)	Trudeau	Trudel
Cormier	Coteau	Turnbull	Valdez
Dabrusin	Damoff	Van Bynen	van Koevorden
Davies	DeBellefeuille	Vandenbeld	Vignola
Desbiens	Desilets	Villemure	Virani
Desjarlais	Dhaliwal	Weiler	Wilkinson
Dhillon	Diab	Yip	Zahid
Drouin	Dubourg	Zarrillo	Zuberi— 200
Duclos	Duguid		

PAIRED

Members

Barlow	Blois
Davidson	MacDonald (Malpeque)
Plamondon	Rodriguez
Vandal	Zimmer— 8

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I declare Motion No. 162 defeated.

[*English*]

The question is on Motion No. 163.

[*Translation*]

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

[*English*]

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Madam Speaker, I would ask for a recorded division.

• (3700)

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 163, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 732*)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barrett	Berthold
Bezan	Block
Bragdon	Brassard
Brock	Calkins
Caputo	Carrie
Chambers	Chong
Cooper	Dalton
Dancho	Deltell
d'Entremont	Doherty
Dowdall	Dreeshen
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast	Ferreri
Findlay	Gallant
Généreux	Genuis
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gourde
Gray	Hallan
Hoback	Jivani
Kelly	Khanna
Kmiec	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Lake	Lantsman
Lawrence	Lehoux
Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
Majumdar	Mazier
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLean
Melillo	Moore
Morantz	Morrison
Motz	Muys
Nater	Patzer

Paul-Hus
Redekopp
Richards
Rood
Schmale
Shields
Small
Steinley
Strahl
Thomas
Uppal
Vecchio
Vien
Vis
Wagantall
Waugh
Williams

Aldag
Ali
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ashton
Bachrach
Baker
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bergeron
Bibeau
Blair
Blaney
Boulerice
Brière
Cannings
Casey
Chagger
Champagne
Chatel
Chiang
Collins (Victoria)
Coteau
Damoff
DeBellefeuille
Desilets
Dhaliwal
Diab
Drouin
Duclos
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser
Fry
Gainey
Garrison
Gazan
Gill
Guilbeault
Hanley
Hepfner
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Ien
Johns
Jowhari
Kayabaga
Khalid

Government Orders

Perkins
Rempel Garner
Roberts
Ruff
Seeback
Shipley
Soroka
Stewart
Stubbs
Tochor
Van Popta
Vidal
Viersen
Vuong
Warkentin
Webber
Williamson— 106

NAYS

Members

Alghabra
Anand
Angus
Arya
Atwin
Badawey
Barron
Battiste
Beech
Bérubé
Bittle
Blanchette-Joncas
Boissonnault
Bradford
Brunelle-Duceppe
Carr
Chabot
Chahal
Champoux
Chen
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cornier
Dabrusin
Davies
Desbiens
Desjarlais
Dhillon
Dong
Dubourg
Duguid
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Gaheer
Garon
Gaudreau
Gerretsen
Green
Hajdu
Hardie
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Idlout
Jaczek
Jones
Julian
Kelloway
Khera

Government Orders

Koutrakis	Kusmierczyk
Kwan	Lalonde
Lambropoulos	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Larouche
Lattanzio	Lauzon
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Lemire	Lightbound
Long	Longfield
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney	Martinez Ferrada
Masse	Mathysseu
May (Cambridge)	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinity
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod	McPherson
Medicino	Miao
Michaud	Miller
Morrice	Morrissey
Murray	Naqvi
Ng	Noormohamed
Normandin	O'Connell
Oliphant	O'Regan
Pauzé	Perron
Petitpas Taylor	Powlowski
Qualtrough	Robillard
Rogers	Romanado
Rota	Sahota
Sajjan	Saks
Samson	Sarai
Savard-Tremblay	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Brampton East)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard
Sinclair-Desgagné	Singh
Sorbara	Sousa
Ste-Marie	St-Onge
Sudds	Tassi
Taylor Roy	Thériault
Therrien	Thompson
Trudeau	Trudel
Turnbull	Valdez
Van Bynen	van Koeverden
Vandenbeld	Vignola
Villemure	Virani
Weiler	Wilkinson
Yip	Zahid
Zarrillo	Zuberi — 202

PAIRED

Members

Barlow	Blois
Davidson	MacDonald (Malpeque)
Plamondon	Rodriguez
Vandal	Zimmer — 8

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I declare Motion No. 163 defeated.

[*English*]

The hon. minister.

Hon. Mary Ng: Madam Speaker, because of technical issues during the vote on Motion No. 117, I am rising to ask for unanimous consent that my vote be counted and recognized as a yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Ken Hardie: Madam Speaker, on the same issue for Motion No. 117, I voted but did not receive any kind of notification that there was a problem. My vote was not counted, so I am asking for unanimous consent that my vote be counted as a yes.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Parm Bains: Madam Speaker, I had technical difficulties and I would like to vote nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member has no jacket and it will require unanimous consent.

I have already heard members say no. There is no unanimous consent.

The question is on Motion No. 164. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 166.

[*Translation*]

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

[*English*]

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Madam Speaker, I would like to ask for a recorded division.

● (3715)

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 164, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 733*)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barrett	Berthold
Bezan	Block
Bragdon	Brassard
Brock	Calkins
Caputo	Carrie
Chambers	Chong
Cooper	Dalton
Dancho	Deltell
d'Entremont	Doherty
Dowdall	Dreeshen
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Ferreri	Findlay
Gallant	Généreux
Genuis	Gladu
Godin	Goodridge
Gourde	Gray
Hallan	Hoback
Jivani	Kelly
Khanna	Kmiec
Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Kurek	Lake

Government Orders

Lawrence
 Leslie
 Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
 Lloyd
 Majumdar
 McLean
 Moore
 Morrison
 Muys
 Patzer
 Perkins
 Redekopp
 Rempel Garner
 Roberts
 Ruff
 Seeback
 Shipley
 Soroka
 Stewart
 Stubbs
 Tochor
 Van Popta
 Vidal
 Viersen
 Vuong
 Warkentin
 Webber
 Williamson— 107

Lehoux
 Lewis (Essex)
 Liepert
 Lobb
 McCauley (Edmonton West)
 Melillo
 Morantz
 Motz
 Nater
 Paul-Hus
 Poilievre
 Reid
 Richards
 Rood
 Schmale
 Shields
 Small
 Steinley
 Strahl
 Thomas
 Uppal
 Vecchio
 Vien
 Vis
 Wagantall
 Waugh
 Williams

Green
 Hajdu
 Hardie
 Holland
 Hughes
 Hutchings
 Idlout
 Jaczek
 Jones
 Julian
 Kelloway
 Khera
 Kusmierczyk
 Lalonde
 Lamoureux
 Larouche
 Lauzon
 Leboutillier
 Lightbound
 Longfield
 MacAulay (Cardigan)
 MacKinnon (Gatineau)
 Martinez Ferrada
 Mathysen
 May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
 McGuinty
 McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
 McPherson
 Miao
 Miller
 Morrissey
 Naqvi
 Noormohamed
 O'Connell
 O'Regan
 Perron
 Powlowski
 Robillard
 Romanado
 Sahota
 Saks
 Sarai
 Scarpaleggia
 Serré
 Shanahan
 Sidhu (Brampton East)
 Simard
 Singh
 Sousa
 St-Onge
 Tassi
 Thériault
 Thompson
 Trudel
 Valdez
 van Koeverden
 Vignola
 Virani
 Wilkinson
 Zahid
 Zuberi— 203

Guilbeault
 Hanley
 Hepfner
 Housefather
 Hussen
 Iacono
 Ien
 Johns
 Jowhari
 Kayabaga
 Khalid
 Koutrakis
 Kwan
 Lambropoulos
 Lapointe
 Lattanzio
 LeBlanc
 Lemire
 Long
 Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
 MacGregor
 Maloney
 Masse
 May (Cambridge)
 McDonald (Avalon)
 McKay
 McLeod
 Mendicino
 Michaud
 Morrice
 Murray
 Ng
 Normandin
 Oliphant
 Pauzé
 Petitpas Taylor
 Qualtrough
 Rogers
 Rota
 Sajjan
 Samson
 Savard-Tremblay
 Schiefke
 Sgro
 Sheehan
 Sidhu (Brampton South)
 Sinclair-Desgagné
 Sorbara
 Ste-Marie
 Sudds
 Taylor Roy
 Therrien
 Trudeau
 Turnbull
 Van Bynen
 Vandenbeld
 Villemure
 Weiler
 Yip
 Zarrillo

NAYS

Members

Aldag
 Ali
 Anandasangaree
 Arseneault
 Atwin
 Badawey
 Baker
 Barsalou-Duval
 Beaulieu
 Bergeron
 Bibeau
 Blair
 Blanchette-Joncas
 Boissonnault
 Bradford
 Brunelle-Duceppe
 Carr
 Chabot
 Chahal
 Champoux
 Chen
 Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
 Cormier
 Dabrusin
 Davies
 Desbiens
 Desjarlais
 Dhillon
 Dong
 Dubourg
 Duguid
 Ehsassi
 Erskine-Smith
 Fisher
 Fortier
 Fragiskatos
 Freeland
 Gaheer
 Garon
 Gaudreau
 Gerretsen

Alghabra
 Anand
 Angus
 Arya
 Bachrach
 Bains
 Barron
 Battiste
 Beech
 Bérubé
 Bittle
 Blanchet
 Blaney
 Boulерice
 Brière
 Cannings
 Casey
 Chagger
 Champagne
 Chatel
 Chiang
 Collins (Victoria)
 Coteau
 Damoff
 DeBellefeuille
 Desilets
 Dhaliwal
 Diab
 Drouin
 Duclous
 Dzerowicz
 El-Khoury
 Fillmore
 Fonseca
 Fortin
 Fraser
 Fry
 Gainey
 Garrison
 Gazan
 Gill

PAIRED

Members

Barlow
 Davidson
 Plamondon
 Vandal
 Blois
 MacDonald (Malpeque)
 Rodriguez
 Zimmer— 8

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I declare Motion No. 164 defeated.

*Government Orders**[English]*

I therefore declare Motion No. 166 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 172. A negative vote on Motion No. 172 requires the question to be put on Motion No. 176.

● (3725)

(The House divided on the Motion No. 172, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 734)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barrett	Berthold
Bezan	Block
Bragdon	Brassard
Brock	Calkins
Caputo	Carrie
Chambers	Chong
Cooper	Dalton
Dancho	d'Entremont
Doherty	Dowdall
Dreeshen	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Ellis	Epp
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Fast
Ferreri	Findlay
Gallant	Généreux
Genuis	Gladu
Godin	Goodridge
Gourde	Gray
Hoback	Jivani
Kelly	Khanna
Kmiec	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Lake	Lantsman
Lawrence	Lehoux
Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
Majumdar	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLean	Melillo
Moore	Morantz
Morrison	Motz
Muys	Nater
Patzer	Paul-Hus
Perkins	Poilievre
Redekopp	Reid
Rempel Garner	Richards
Roberts	Rood
Ruff	Schmale
Seeback	Shields
Shipley	Small
Soroka	Steinley
Stewart	Strahl
Stubbs	Thomas
Tochor	Uppal
Van Popta	Vecchio
Vidal	Vien
Viersen	Vis
Vuong	Wagantall
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Williams— 104

NAYS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
-------	----------

Ali	Anand
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Atwin	Bachrach
Badawey	Bains
Baker	Barron
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Bergeron	Bérubé
Bibeau	Bittle
Blair	Blanchet
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney
Boissonnault	Boulerice
Bradford	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings
Carr	Casey
Chabot	Chagger
Chahal	Champagne
Champoux	Chatel
Chen	Chiang
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Damoff
Davies	DeBellefeuille
Desbiens	Desilets
Desjarlais	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Diab
Dong	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Dzerowicz
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith	Fillmore
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fortin
Fragiskatos	Fraser
Freeland	Fry
Gaheer	Gainey
Garon	Garrison
Gaudreau	Gazan
Gerretsen	Gill
Green	Guilbeault
Hajdu	Hanley
Hardie	Hepfner
Holland	Housefather
Hughes	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Idlout	Ien
Jaczek	Johns
Jones	Jowhari
Julian	Kayabaga
Kelloway	Khalid
Khera	Koutrakis
Kusmierczyk	Kwan
Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Larouche	Lattanzio
Lauzon	LeBlanc
Lebouthillier	Lemire
Lightbound	Long
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney
Martinez Ferrada	Masse
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	McDonald (Avalon)
McGuinty	McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod
McPherson	Mendicino
Miao	Michaud
Miller	Morrice
Morrissey	Murray
Naqvi	Ng
Noormohamed	Normandin

Government Orders

O'Connell
O'Regan
Perron
Powlowski
Robillard
Romanado
Sahota
Saks
Sarai
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Singh
Sousa
St-Onge
Tassi
Therrien
Trudeau
Turnbull
Van Bynen
Vandenbeld
Villemure
Weiler
Yip
Zarrillo

Oliphant
Pauzé
Petitpas Taylor
Qualtrough
Rogers
Rota
Sajjan
Samson
Savard-Tremblay
Schiefke
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sinclair-Desgagné
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Sudds
Taylor Roy
Thompson
Trudel
Valdez
van Koeverden
Vignola
Virani
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi— 202

Blanchette-Joncas
Boissonnault
Bradford
Brunelle-Duceppe
Carr
Chabot
Chahal
Champoux
Chen
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cormier
Dabrusin
Davies
Desbiens
Desjarlais
Dhillon
Dong
Dubourg
Duguid
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Gaheer
Garon
Gaudreau
Gerretsen
Green
Hajdu
Hardie
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Idlout
Jaczek
Jones
Julian
Kelloway
Khera
Kusmierczyk
Lalonde
Lamoureux
Larouche
Lauzon
Lebouthillier
Lightbound
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Martinez Ferrada
Mathysen
McDonald (Avalon)
McKay
McLeod
Mendicino
Michaud
Morrissey
Naqvi
Noormohamed
O'Connell
O'Regan
Perron
Powlowski
Robillard
Romanado
Sahota
Saks
Sarai
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan

Blaney
Boulerice
Brière
Cannings
Casey
Chagger
Champagne
Chatel
Chiang
Collins (Victoria)
Coteau
Damoff
DeBellefeuille
Desilets
Dhaliwal
Diab
Drouin
Duclos
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser
Fry
Gainey
Garrison
Gazan
Gill
Guilbeault
Hanley
Hepfner
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Ien
Johns
Jowhari
Kayabaga
Khalid
Koutrakis
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lapointe
Lattanzio
LeBlanc
Lemire
Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacGregor
Maloney
Masse
May (Cambridge)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McPherson
Miao
Miller
Murray
Ng
Normandin
Oliphant
Pauzé
Petitpas Taylor
Qualtrough
Rogers
Rota
Sajjan
Samson
Savard-Tremblay
Schiefke
Sgro
Sheehan

PAIRED

Members

Barlow
Davidson
Plamondon
Vandal

Blois
MacDonald (Malpeque)
Rodriguez
Zimmer— 8

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I declare Motion No. 172 defeated.

The question is on Motion No. 176. A negative vote on Motion No. 176 would require the question to be put on Motion No. 177.

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, we request a recorded vote.

● (3740)

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 176, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 735*)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Ali
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ashton
Badawey
Baker
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bergeron
Bibeau
Blair

Alghabra
Anand
Angus
Arya
Atwin
Bains
Barron
Battiste
Beech
Bérubé
Bittle
Blanchet

Government Orders

Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Singh
Sousa
St-Onge
Tassi
Thériault
Trudeau
Turnbull
Van Bynen
Vandenbeld
Villemure
Weiler
Yip
Zarrillo

Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sinclair-Desgagné
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Sudds
Taylor Roy
Thompson
Trudel
Valdez
van Koeverden
Vignola
Virani
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi — 200

NAYS

Members

Aboultouf
Albas
Arnold
Barrett
Bezan
Bragdon
Brock
Caputo
Chambers
Cooper
Dancho
Doherty
Dreeschen
Ellis
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Findlay
Généreux
Godin
Gourde
Hallan
Jivani
Khanna
Kram
Kurek
Lake
Lawrence
Leslie
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lloyd
Majumdar
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Melillo
Morantz
Morrison
Muys
Patzner
Perkins
Redekopp
Rempel Garner
Roberts
Ruff
Seeback
Shipley
Soroka
Stewart
Stubbs
Tochor
Van Popta
Vidal
Viersen
Wagantall
Waugh
Williams

Aitchison
Allison
Baldinelli
Berthold
Block
Brassard
Calkins
Carrie
Chong
Dalton
d'Entremont
Dowdall
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Epp
Falk (Provencher)
Ferreri
Gallant
Genuis
Goodridge
Gray
Hoback
Kelly
Kmieć
Kramp-Neuman
Kusie
Lantsman
Lehoux
Lewis (Essex)
Liepert
Lobb
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McLean
Moore
Morrice
Motz
Nater
Paul-Hus
Poilievre
Reid
Richards
Rood
Schmale
Shields
Small
Steinley
Strahl
Thomas
Uppal
Vecchio
Vien
Vis
Warkentin
Webber
Williamson — 108

PAIRED

Members

Barlow
Davidson
Plamondon
Vandal

Blois
MacDonald (Malpeque)
Rodriguez
Zimmer — 8

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I declare Motion No. 176 carried.

The hon. government House leader.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, there have been discussions among the parties and, if you seek it, I believe you will find unanimous consent for the following motion.

[*English*]

That, in relation to Bill C-50, Motions Nos. 178, 180, 181, 183, 184, 185 and 191 be deemed negatived on division and that Motion No. 199 be deemed carried on division.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): All those opposed to the hon. member moving the motion will please say nay.

It is agreed.

[*Translation*]

The House has heard the terms of the motion. All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

(Motion agreed to)

[*English*]

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (for the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources) moved that the bill be concurred in.

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

[*English*]

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Madam Speaker, we would request a recorded division.

● (3755)

[*Translation*]

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

(*Division No. 736*)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Ali
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ashton
Bachrach
Bains
Barron
Beech

Alghabra
Anand
Angus
Arya
Atwin
Badawey
Baker
Battiste
Bibeau

Government Orders

Bittle
 Blaney
 Boulterice
 Brière
 Carr
 Chagger
 Champagne
 Chen
 Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
 Cormier
 Dabrusin
 Davies
 Dhaliwal
 Diab
 Dubourg
 Duguid
 Ehsassi
 Erskine-Smith
 Fisher
 Fortier
 Fraser
 Fry
 Gainey
 Gazan
 Gould
 Guilbeault
 Hanley
 Hepfner
 Housefather
 Hussien
 Iacono
 Ien
 Johns
 Jowhari
 Kayabaga
 Khalid
 Koutrakis
 Kwan
 Lambropoulos
 Lapointe
 Lauzon
 Lebouthillier
 Long
 Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
 MacGregor
 Maloney
 Masse
 May (Cambridge)
 McDonald (Avalon)
 McKay
 McLeod
 Mendicino
 Miller
 Morrissey
 Naqvi
 Noormohamed
 Oliphant
 Petitpas Taylor
 Qualtrough
 Rogers
 Rota
 Sajjan
 Samson
 Scarpaleggia
 Serré
 Shanahan
 Sidhu (Brampton East)
 Singh
 Sousa
 Suds
 Taylor Roy
 Trudeau
 Valdez

Blair
 Boissonnault
 Bradford
 Cannings
 Casey
 Chahal
 Chatel
 Chiang
 Collins (Victoria)
 Coteau
 Damoff
 Desjarlais
 Dhillon
 Drouin
 Duclos
 Dzerowicz
 El-Khoury
 Fillmore
 Fonseca
 Fraskatos
 Freeland
 Gaheer
 Garrison
 Gerretsen
 Green
 Hajdu
 Hardie
 Holland
 Hughes
 Hutchings
 Idlout
 Jaczek
 Jones
 Julian
 Kelloway
 Khera
 Kusmierczyk
 Lalonde
 Lamoureux
 Lattanzio
 LeBlanc
 Lightbound
 Longfield
 MacAulay (Cardigan)
 MacKinnon (Gatineau)
 Martinez Ferrada
 Mathysen
 May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
 McGuinty
 MacKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
 McPherson
 Miao
 Morrice
 Murray
 Ng
 O'Connell
 O'Regan
 Powlowski
 Robillard
 Romanado
 Sahota
 Saks
 Sarai
 Schiefke
 Sgro
 Sheehan
 Sidhu (Brampton South)
 Sorbara
 St-Onge
 Tassi
 Thompson
 Turnbull
 Van Bynen

van Koevorden
 Virani
 Wilkinson
 Zahid
 Zuberi— 173

 Aboutaif
 Albas
 Arnold
 Barrett
 Beaulieu
 Berthold
 Bezan
 Blanchette-Joncas
 Bragdon
 Brock
 Calkins
 Carrie
 Chambers
 Chong
 Dalton
 d'Entremont
 Desilets
 Dowdall
 Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
 Epp
 Falk (Provencher)
 Ferreri
 Fortin
 Garon
 Généreux
 Gill
 Godin
 Gourde
 Hallan
 Jivani
 Khanna
 Kram
 Kurek
 Larouche
 Lehoux
 Leslie
 Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
 Lloyd
 McCauley (Edmonton West)
 Melillo
 Moore
 Motz
 Nater
 Patzer
 Pautzé
 Perron
 Redekopp
 Rempel Garner
 Roberts
 Ruff
 Schmale
 Shields
 Simard
 Small
 Steinley
 Stewart
 Stubbs
 Therrien
 Tochor
 Uppal
 Vecchio
 Vien
 Vignola
 Vis

Vandenbeld
 Weiler
 Yip
 Zarrillo

NAYS

Members

Aitchison
 Allison
 Baldinelli
 Barsalou-Duval
 Bergeron
 Bérubé
 Blanchet
 Block
 Brassard
 Brunelle-Duceppe
 Caputo
 Chabot
 Champoux
 Cooper
 Dancho
 Desbiens
 Doherty
 Dreeshen
 Ellis
 Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
 Fast
 Findlay
 Gallant
 Gaudreau
 Genuis
 Gladu
 Goodridge
 Gray
 Hoback
 Kelly
 Kmiec
 Kramp-Neuman
 Lake
 Lawrence
 Lemire
 Lewis (Essex)
 Liepert
 Lobb
 McLean
 Michaud
 Morantz
 Muys
 Normandin
 Paul-Hus
 Perkins
 Poilievre
 Reid
 Richards
 Rood
 Savard-Tremblay
 Seeback
 Shipley
 Sinclair-Desgagné
 Soroka
 Ste-Marie
 Strahl
 Thériault
 Thomas
 Trudel
 Van Popta
 Vidal
 Viersen
 Villemure
 Wagantall

Adjournment Proceedings

Warkentin
Webber

Waugh
Williams— 132

PAIRED

Members

Barlow
Davidson
Plamondon
Vandal

Blois
MacDonald (Malpeque)
Rodriguez
Zimmer— 8

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I declare the motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

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

[*English*]

OIL AND GAS INDUSTRY

Mr. Mike Morrice (Kitchener Centre, GP): Madam Speaker, we remain in a climate crisis, one that requires urgent action if we hope to leave a livable planet for future generations. I rise this afternoon to continue to press the government to do better on its commitment to capping big oil's emissions, following up on a question I asked back in December.

It was over three years ago now, in November 2021, when the Prime Minister first said, "We'll cap oil and gas sector emissions today and ensure they decrease tomorrow at a pace and scale needed to reach net-zero by 2050." It sounds nice, particularly when emissions from oil and gas in 2021 were 189 megatonnes; this was an increase of 88% since 1990 and 28% of Canada's total emissions.

Beyond the nice words, let us be clear: This commitment, even in its original form, did not follow climate science to begin with. First, it committed to cap only oil and gas emissions, not production. This is a significant issue; if we hope to hold global average temperatures below 1.5°C, with even a 50% chance of doing so, Canada would need to do its fair share of what remains of the global carbon budget to achieve this goal. That would mean we would have to leave 86% of our proven fossil fuel reserves unextracted. Therefore, it is clear that we must address not only emissions but also production as we shift to other energy sources.

Second, net zero by 2050 is not worth the paper it is printed on if we do not do our fair share of what is required to limit global warming to no more than 1.5°C in the short term. This means reducing it by at least 60% below 2005 levels by 2030, along with international support in emissions reductions across the Global South, equivalent to another 80% of Canada's 2005 emissions. Nevertheless, in the three years since, the government has continued to weaken and even delay this insufficient announcement.

To start, the emissions reduction plan in 2022 said the cap would decrease oil and gas emissions by 79 megatonnes, to 110 megatonnes, aligning with the 40% reduction from 2005 levels by 2030. As I shared, that is already less than what climate scientists tell us is required. The minister then promised that it would all be done and in place by the end of 2023. All we got by then was a frame-

work for discussion, and it is full of loopholes. Now that 79 megatonnes that were promised dropped by more than half.

Now only 34 megatonnes are projected to be reduced; the government is doing things such as exempting 20 megatonnes from downstream oil refining and pipelines and another 25 megatonnes for compliance flexibilities, which is a code word for buying off-sets. Now we know that this weakened cap will not even be in place until 2026. How could this have happened? In the two years since, big oil put forward a full-on campaign, pressing the government with 2,000 meetings. There were three meetings a day, seven days a week, and no days off; clearly, it must have worked.

Will the government put an end to these meetings with big oil, put our children's future ahead of their greed and place a real cap on big oil's emissions?

• (3800)

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 science is clear. Greenhouse gas emissions must be reduced significantly and urgently to avoid the most severe impacts of climate change, like wildfires, droughts, hurricanes and the associated impacts and costs to human health and infrastructure. It has been frustrating in this place to see most of the debate focused not on how we are going to fight climate change and put our best foot forward, but on a fight with the Conservative opposition about whether there should be a fight at all.

We are committed. Action on climate change is essential to avoid the natural disasters impacting our communities. These disasters impact clean air, damage our homes and workplaces and result in large costs, be it to individuals through increased costs of insurance or to governments to invest in adaptation, cleanup and rebuilding. We owe it to the future generations, our communities, children and grandchildren, to take action. We can do the hard work to fight climate change now, or we can pass on the natural disasters and increased costs to the next generation.

I and the Liberal government believe in the need to take climate action now as an economic necessity and as a matter of generational fairness. Capping and reducing emissions from the oil and gas sector is an essential part of this effort. The oil and gas sector is Canada's largest source of greenhouse gas emissions and one of the only parts of the economy where emissions continue to grow.

Adjournment Proceedings

In December, the federal government published a proposed regulatory framework for the emissions cap for comment. The oil and gas emissions cap will apply to emissions. That is what the atmosphere sees and that is what we must reduce. It will ensure that the sector invests in maximum technically achievable decarbonization to achieve significant emissions reductions by 2030 and to get on a pathway to net-zero emissions by 2050.

No other country has capped emissions from oil and gas production. As the world's fourth-largest oil and gas producer, Canada has a responsibility to address these emissions, but it is also important to get the details right: The regulatory process the government is following must be rigorous, open and transparent. Our regulations must be evidence-based with costs and benefits assessed thoroughly.

We are working closely with provinces, indigenous partners, civil society and industry while remaining attuned to considerations such as the need for ongoing investments to significantly decarbonize the sector. We also need to minimize the risk of carbon leakage and avoid Canadian production simply being replaced elsewhere by countries where weaker GHG emissions standards apply. We are committed to a cap on emissions from oil and gas that works, and I hope to be able to provide a further update shortly.

Mr. Mike Morrice: Madam Speaker, I want to start by agreeing with the parliamentary secretary that the debate in this place on climate has been reduced over the last number of months, but we cannot allow this false debate about the carbon tax, which is the most efficient way of taking action on the climate crisis, to take us away from what must be done to follow the science.

The parliamentary secretary spoke about taking action now. On that point, I agree with her as well. The concern is the amount of time it has taken since this commitment was first made. It is true that no other country has a cap, but neither do we still. It has been two and a half years. We need to see this move more quickly, but we also need to see it be stringent enough. We need to see these loopholes eliminated to ensure the reductions come at least even closer to what we must do to follow the climate science between now and 2030.

To follow up, will she commit to pressing the government to reduce its meetings with big oil, which have only gone up in the time since and which have happened at the same time as these loopholes have increased, and will—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. parliamentary secretary has the floor.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: Madam Speaker, I take issue with any implication that we are not fully committed to taking action on climate change and that we are not battling every single day to make sure that it is not only done but done right, done right by Canadians, done right by Canadian industries and done right to make sure we have the jobs of the future for Canadians, which is exactly what we have been voting on in this place for the past day.

We are committed to continuing the work. We have put forward a framework for an oil and gas cap, and it will be put in place. I look forward to the member opposite working to make sure that happens.

• (3805)

EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, I am returning to a question I put forward in the House during question period back on November 22. It deals with something compelling, which is Canada's preparedness for extreme weather events, particularly fires, floods and storms of all kinds, and how the government could better prepare for them.

Certainly, the Minister of Emergency Preparedness and I have talked about this, and I would get the sense no one is against it. My argument then and now is that we are not prepared for extreme weather events of all kinds. I come from a province where 619 people died in four days in the heat dome. They were all preventable deaths. We have lost billions of dollars of infrastructure in the atmospheric rivers.

We have had extreme weather events and storms that have cost lives. We talk about human lives a lot. Many in this chamber may not know that, in the heat dome in the summer of 2021, three billion sea creatures died. Residents in my community who were dealing with unbearable heat went to the ocean to cool off, only to retreat because of the stink, and they wondered why it smelt so bad. It was because three billion sea creatures died.

If we are going to be prepared, we have to talk to each other. I have talked to people such as Barbara Roden, who is the mayor of Ashcroft, B.C. She told me that, for emergency preparedness, she realized that they were going to have to evacuate the seniors long-term care homes, so she said to get the school buses organized. However, in her regional district, some school boards decided not to keep insuring the school buses when the schools were not in session and kids were not going to school.

That is the kind of information we need to share with each other because some school districts keep insuring their school buses. The federal government could set up an emergency preparedness fund that canvassed every province, territory and indigenous community to see if the school buses were insured year-round because we may need them. We may need to use them when there are extreme fire warnings or extreme flood warnings.

My argument here in this place is not partisan. We need to pull together a standing committee on emergency preparedness that would do things such as exchange stories of best practices and figure out how to better prepare. We need to be talking to people, such as those from places like the First Nations' Emergency Services Society in Kamloops and former chief of the Kanaka Bar first nation Patrick Mitchell. There are communities that figured out how to take care of themselves early and how to rebuild faster. There are communities that know where the vulnerable people are and to rescue those people.

Adjournment Proceedings

Severe wind storms, hurricanes, floods, fires and heat domes are now inevitable. We need to understand climate better. We need to understand that we need carbon pricing, policy and to reduce greenhouse emissions. We are at a point now where we cannot turn back the clock, and we cannot get back the hospitable climate we once had. We have to make sure we do not get into such a bad situation that we are in a climate in which we cannot survive, one that has become acutely lethal. We need to plan ahead for things. What happens if the power goes out at the same time that we have a heat dome? As Professor Blair Feltmate from the University of Waterloo has said, if the power had gone down during the 2021 heat dome in British Columbia, thousands would have died, not hundreds.

We are almost out of time, all of us, but there is still time to act. We need to pull together and act like this is the emergency that it really is.

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, because it is really important and I hear what the member is saying, I want to reach out and say that our thoughts are with Canadians who have been feeling the brunt of the impacts of climate change and its natural disasters, be it through wildfires, floods, droughts or other disasters that have taken place over the last decade. It is also very important that I take this moment to thank firefighters and first responders, who are literally putting their lives at risk every day to help Canadians and support us through these moments.

It is important, though, in the context of the conversation, for Canadians to know that there is a robust emergency response regime in place that encompasses all levels of government. The work starts at the municipal and provincial levels, and this allows for localized and tailored responses. However, the Government of Canada is taking the role of leadership to coordinate efforts from coast to coast to coast. We have been working with our provincial, territorial and first nations partners to bolster collaboration during times of emergencies, and we are investing massively in civilian response capacity that can leverage different capacities across jurisdictions and provide Canadians with the relief they need during the following large-scale emergencies.

We have acted decisively to be better prepared to respond to wildfires. We have funded the training of 600 wildfire firefighters and 125 indigenous fire guardians. These firefighters will be on the ground this summer to protect our communities. The training program is ongoing, and we aim to train 1,000 new wildfire firefighters this year. We are grateful for the work they do and the risks they take.

That is also why we announced, just this week, on Wednesday, that we will double the tax credits for volunteer firefighters and search and rescue volunteers. We have put in place a \$256-million fund for wildland firefighting equipment to the provinces, and we have signed agreements with 11 provinces and territories. These agreements will provide long-term funding needed to procure life-saving material and equipment. Our government understands that there is a need to build communities that are more resilient; that is why it has devised Canada's first-ever national adaptation strategy, which is a whole-of-government plan designed to increase the re-

siliency of Canadian communities and respond to the impacts of climate change.

● (3810)

Ms. Elizabeth May: Madam Speaker, I am sure that the government intends to do things better, but if any of the events I have mentioned this evening happen again, we are not prepared. We need to have a standing committee that meets every two weeks that includes federal, provincial, territorial, local governments and indigenous peoples and nations to share information.

The adaptation strategy from Environment Canada's plan around heat domes is that by 2040, no more Canadians will die in a heat dome. That is an admission of failure. By tomorrow, no Canadians should die in a heat dome if we pass on best practices for first responders and good advice for Canadians for how to survive. We have no firefighting force. We have not ordered any water bombers. Even though the De Havilland water bomber plane, which is best in class, is right now back-ordered for planes going to Europe, none have been ordered for Canada.

I am not partisan about this, but I am angry because we know better. We have some time, and we had better use it to talk to each other and to build our capacity.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: Madam Speaker, we recognize that extreme weather events are threatening the lives and livelihoods of a growing number of Canadians and straining emergency management resources across the country. However, I want to emphasize the point that while it is important that emergency management remains the responsibility of local governments, we are committed to working with our partners on solutions tailored to the needs of their communities. I have outlined some of the ways that we are doing that.

Through the humanitarian workforce program, we have invested more than \$160 million in the Canadian Red Cross, St. John Ambulance, the Salvation Army, and the Search and Rescue Volunteer Association of Canada. The funding helps these organizations develop capacity and mobilize more quickly and in bigger numbers. We are working with local communities, and we are making sure that we are partnering to help Canadians in difficult times such as during natural disasters.

Adjournment Proceedings

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès):
The hon. member for Peterborough—Kawartha's not being present to raise during Adjournment Proceedings the matter for which notice had been given, the notice is being withdrawn.

It being 2:14 p.m., the House stands adjourned until next Monday at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 2:14 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 11, 2024

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Government Response to Petitions

Mr. Lamoureux	22211
Motion	22211
Motion agreed to	22212

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Canadian Sustainable Jobs Act

Bill C-50. Report stage	22212
-------------------------------	-------

Speaker's Ruling

The Speaker	22213
-------------------	-------

Motions in amendment

Mrs. Stubbs	22213
Motion No. 1	22213
Mr. Patzer	22213
Motion No. 2	22213
Mrs. Stubbs	22213
Motions Nos. 3 to 5	22213
Mr. Patzer	22213
Motions Nos. 6 and 7	22213
Mrs. Stubbs	22213
Motions Nos. 8 and 9	22213
Mr. Dreeshen	22214
Motion No. 10	22214
Mrs. Stubbs	22214
Motion No. 11	22214
Mr. Patzer	22214
Motion No. 12	22214
Mrs. Stubbs	22214
Motion No. 14	22214
Mr. Patzer	22214
Motion No. 15	22214
Mrs. Stubbs	22214
Motion No. 16	22214
Mr. Dreeshen	22214
Motion No. 17	22214
Mr. Patzer	22214
Motion No. 18	22214
Mrs. Stubbs	22214
Motions Nos. 19 to 21	22214
Mr. Patzer	22214
Motions Nos. 22 to 25	22214
Mrs. Stubbs	22214
Motion No. 26	22214
Mr. Dreeshen	22214
Motion No. 27	22214
Mr. Falk (Provencher)	22214
Motion No. 28	22214
Mr. Patzer	22214
Motion No. 29	22214

Mrs. Stubbs	22214
Motion No. 30	22214
Mr. Patzer	22214
Motion No. 31	22214
Mrs. Stubbs	22215
Motion No. 32	22215
Mr. Dreeshen	22215
Motion No. 33	22215
Mr. Falk (Provencher)	22215
Motion No. 34	22215
Mrs. Stubbs	22215
Motion No. 35	22215
Mr. Patzer	22215
Motion No. 36	22215
Mr. Wilkinson	22215
Motion No. 37	22215
Mr. Patzer	22215
Motions Nos. 38 to 41	22215
Mr. Dreeshen	22215
Motion No. 42	22215
Mr. Falk (Provencher)	22215
Motion No. 44	22215
Mr. Patzer	22215
Motion Nos. 45, 47 and 48	22215
Mr. Dreeshen	22215
Motion No. 49	22215
Mr. Falk (Provencher)	22215
Motion No. 51	22215
Mr. Patzer	22215
Motion No. 52	22215
Mrs. Stubbs	22215
Motion No. 53	22215
Mr. Falk (Provencher)	22215
Motion No. 54	22215
Mr. Patzer	22215
Motion No. 56	22215
Mrs. Stubbs	22215
Motion No. 57	22215
Mr. Patzer	22215
Motions Nos. 58 and 59	22215
Mrs. Stubbs	22216
Motion No. 60	22216
Mr. Patzer	22216
Motion No. 61	22216
Mrs. Stubbs	22216
Motion Nos. 64, 69 and 71	22216
Mr. Patzer	22216
Motion No. 74	22216
Mrs. Stubbs	22216
Motion No. 75	22216
Mr. Patzer	22216
Motion Nos. 76 to 80, 90 to 91 and 95	22216
Mr. Wilkinson	22216

Motion No. 96	22216	Mr. Falk (Provencher)	22218
Mr. Patzer	22216	Motion No. 164	22218
Motion No. 97, 101, 102, 106, 108, 112 and 113	22216	Mr. Patzer	22218
Mr. Wilkinson	22216	Motion No. 165	22218
Motion No. 117	22216	Mr. Falk (Provencher)	22218
Mr. Morrice	22217	Motion No. 166	22218
Motion No. 118	22217	Mrs. Stubbs	22218
Mr. Patzer	22217	Motion No. 169	22218
Motions Nos. 119 and 123	22217	Mr. Patzer	22218
Mrs. Stubbs	22217	Motions Nos. 171 and 172	22218
Motion No. 127	22217	Mr. Wilkinson	22218
Mr. Patzer	22217	Motion No. 176	22218
Motion No. 128	22217	Mr. Morrice	22218
Mrs. Stubbs	22217	Motion No. 177	22218
Motions Nos. 129, 130 and 131	22217	Mr. Patzer	22218
Mr. Patzer	22217	Motion No. 178	22218
Motion No. 132	22217	Mr. Dreeshen	22219
Mrs. Stubbs	22217	Motion No. 180	22219
Motion No. 134	22217	Mr. Falk (Provencher)	22219
Mr. Patzer	22217	Motion No. 181	22219
Motion No. 136	22217	Mr. Patzer	22219
Mrs. Stubbs	22217	Motions Nos. 182 and 183	22219
Motion No. 137	22217	Mr. Dreeshen	22219
Mr. Falk (Provencher)	22217	Motion No. 184	22219
Motion No. 138	22217	Mrs. Stubbs	22219
Mr. Patzer	22217	Motion No. 185	22219
Motion No. 140	22217	Mr. Patzer	22219
Mrs. Stubbs	22217	Motion No. 187	22219
Motions Nos. 141 and 142	22217	Mrs. Stubbs	22219
Mr. Dreeshen	22217	Motion No. 188	22219
Motion No. 143	22217	Mr. Dreeshen	22219
Mr. Falk (Provencher)	22217	Motions Nos. 189 and 190	22219
Motion No. 144	22217	Mr. Falk (Provencher)	22219
Mr. Patzer	22217	Motion No. 191	22219
Motion No. 145	22217	Mr. Patzer	22219
Mrs. Stubbs	22218	Motion No. 192	22219
Motion No. 146	22218	Mrs. Stubbs	22219
Mr. Dreeshen	22218	Motion No. 193	22219
Motion No. 147	22218	Mr. Patzer	22219
Mr. Falk (Provencher)	22218	Motion No. 194	22219
Motion No. 148	22218	Mr. Wilkinson	22219
Mr. Patzer	22218	Motion No. 199	22219
Motion No. 149	22218	Mr. Patzer	22219
Mrs. Stubbs	22218	Motions Nos. 200 and 204	22219
Motion No. 151	22218	Mrs. Stubbs	22219
Mr. Falk (Provencher)	22218	Mr. Lamoureux	22221
Motion No. 152	22218	Mr. Angus	22222
Mr. Dreeshen	22218	Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	22222
Motion No. 153	22218	Mr. Patzer	22222
Mr. Patzer	22218	Mr. Lamoureux	22224
Motions Nos. 154, 155, 159 and 160	22218	Mr. Lemire	22225
Mrs. Stubbs	22218	Ms. Collins (Victoria)	22225
Motion No. 161	22218		
Mr. Dreeshen	22218	Official Report	
Motion No. 162	22218	Mr. Warkentin	22225
Mrs. Stubbs	22218	Motion	22225
Motion No. 163	22218	(Motion agreed to)	22225

Canadian Sustainable Jobs Act	
Bill C-50. Report stage	22225
Mr. Dreeshen	22225
Mr. Lamoureux	22227
Ms. Normandin	22227
Ms. Collins (Victoria)	22227
Mr. Falk (Provencher)	22227
Mr. Hardie	22229
Mr. Desilets	22229
Ms. Idlout	22230
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	22230
Mr. Wilkinson	22230
Mrs. Stubbs	22232
Mr. Lemire	22232
Mr. Angus	22232

Privilege

Advance Disclosure of Budget Measures

Mr. Lamoureux	22233
---------------------	-------

Canadian Sustainable Jobs Act

Bill C-50. Report Stage	22233
Mr. Morrice	22233
Mr. Lamoureux	22234
Mrs. Stubbs	22234
Mr. Lemire	22235
Mr. Lemire	22235
Mrs. Shanahan	22237
Ms. Gladu	22237
Ms. Barron	22237
Mr. Angus	22238
Mr. Steinley	22241
Mr. Lamoureux	22241
Mr. Julian	22241
Mr. O'Regan	22242

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

George Garrett

Mr. Hardie	22242
------------------	-------

Cost of Living

Mr. Allison	22243
-------------------	-------

Oral Health Month

Ms. Hefner	22243
------------------	-------

Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership

Mr. Bergeron	22243
--------------------	-------

Organ and Tissue Donation

Mr. Serré	22243
-----------------	-------

Sikh Heritage Month

Mr. Hallan	22244
------------------	-------

Jay Williams

Ms. Yip	22244
---------------	-------

World Parkinson's Day

Mr. Carr	22244
----------------	-------

Malcolm Montgomery

Mrs. Gallant	22244
--------------------	-------

World Parkinson's Day

Mr. van Koeverden	22245
-------------------------	-------

Carbon Tax

Mr. Lehoux	22245
------------------	-------

Carbon Tax

Mr. Waugh	22245
-----------------	-------

Labrador

Ms. Jones	22245
-----------------	-------

Foreign Affairs

Ms. Ashton	22245
------------------	-------

Taiwan

Mr. Savard-Tremblay	22246
---------------------------	-------

Finance

Mr. Arnold	22246
------------------	-------

Two Lebanese Philanthropists

Mr. El-Khoury	22246
---------------------	-------

ORAL QUESTIONS

Carbon Pricing

Ms. Lantsman	22246
Mr. MacKinnon	22247
Ms. Lantsman	22247
Mr. MacKinnon	22247
Ms. Lantsman	22247
Ms. Anand	22247

Intergovernmental Relations

Mrs. Vien	22247
Mr. Duclos	22247
Mrs. Vien	22247
Mr. MacKinnon	22247

Housing

Mrs. DeBellefeuille	22248
Mr. Duclos	22248
Mrs. DeBellefeuille	22248
Mr. Duclos	22248
Mr. Boulerice	22248
Mr. Duclos	22248

Veterans Affairs

Ms. Mathysen	22248
Mr. Blair	22248

Carbon Pricing

Mr. Scheer	22248
Mr. Wilkinson	22249
Mr. Scheer	22249
Mr. MacKinnon	22249
Mr. Steinley	22249

Ms. Ien	22249	Foreign Affairs	
Mr. Steinley	22249	Ms. Lapointe	22254
Mr. O'Regan	22249	Ms. Joly	22254
Mr. Berthold	22250	Public Services and Procurement	
Mr. Champagne	22250	Mrs. Block	22255
Mr. Berthold	22250	Mr. LeBlanc	22255
Mr. Guilbeault	22250	Mr. Brock	22255
Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship		Mr. LeBlanc	22255
Ms. Normandin	22250	Mr. Brock	22255
Mr. Miller	22250	Mr. Duclos	22255
Ms. Normandin	22250	Natural Resources	
Mr. Miller	22250	Mr. Sorbara	22255
Justice		Mr. Wilkinson	22256
Mr. Champoux	22250	Foreign Affairs	
Mr. Virani	22251	Ms. McPherson	22256
Carbon Pricing		Ms. Joly	22256
Mrs. Goodridge	22251	Housing	
Mr. O'Regan	22251	Mr. Morrice	22256
Mrs. Goodridge	22251	Mr. Fragiskatos	22256
Mr. MacKinnon	22251	Privilege	
Mr. Mazier	22251	Alleged Premature Disclosure of Bill C-63— Speaker's Ruling	
Mr. Wilkinson	22251	The Speaker	22256
Infrastructure		Business of the House	
Ms. Idlout	22251	Mr. Scheer	22257
Mrs. Atwin	22251	Mr. MacKinnon	22257
Indigenous Affairs		Privilege	
Mr. Bachrach	22252	Government Responses to Order Paper Questions	
Mr. Anandasangaree	22252	Mr. MacGregor	22258
Innovation, Science and Industry			
Ms. Bradford	22252		
Ms. Anand	22252		
Intergovernmental Affairs			
Mr. Généreux	22252		
Mr. Champagne	22252		
Mr. Généreux	22252		
Mr. Duclos	22253		
Mr. Martel	22253		
Mr. MacKinnon	22253		
Mr. Martel	22253		
Mr. Champagne	22253		
Housing			
Mr. Barsalou-Duval	22253		
Mr. Duclos	22253		
Mr. Barsalou-Duval	22253		
Mr. Duclos	22253		
Carbon Pricing			
Mrs. Goodridge	22254		
Mr. MacKinnon	22254		
Democratic Institutions			
Mr. Seeback	22254		
Mr. LeBlanc	22254		
Mr. Seeback	22254		
Mr. LeBlanc	22254		

GOVERNMENT ORDERS	
Canadian Sustainable Jobs Act	
Bill C-50, Report stage	22258
Mr. O'Regan	22258
Mr. Small	22259
Mrs. Goodridge	22259
Ms. Normandin	22259
Mrs. Goodridge	22260
Ms. Jones	22261
Ms. Bérubé	22262
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	22262
Ms. Jones	22262
Mrs. Stubbs	22263
Mr. Trudel	22264
Ms. Mathysen	22264
Mrs. Gray	22264
Mr. Lamoureux	22266
Ms. Normandin	22266
Mr. Masse	22266
Mr. Lamoureux	22267
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	22268
Mr. Kurek	22268

Mrs. Block	22269	Motion No. 36 negated	22299
Mrs. Atwin	22270	Motion No. 37 agreed to	22301
Ms. Bérubé	22270	Motion No. 41 negated	22302
Ms. Mathysen	22271	Motion No. 42 negated	22303
Privilege		Motion No. 44 negated	22305
Government Responses to Order Paper Questions		Motion No. 49 negated	22306
Mr. Lamoureux	22271	Motion No. 51 negated	22308
Advance Disclosure of Budget Measures		Motion No. 52 negated	22309
Mr. Julian	22271	Motion No. 53 negated	22310
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	22272	Motion No. 54 negated	22312
Canadian Sustainable Jobs Act		Motion No. 59 negated	22313
Bill C-50. Report Stage	22273	Motion No. 60 negated	22314
Mr. Sorbara	22273	Motion No. 61 negated	22316
Mrs. Gallant	22274	Motion No. 64 negated	22317
Division on Motion No. 1 deferred	22275	Sitting Suspended	
Division on Motion No. 2 deferred	22275	Mr. MacKinnon	22317
Division on Motion No. 5 deferred	22275	Motion	22317
Division on Motion No. 25 deferred	22275	(The sitting of the House was suspended at 12:21 a.m.) ..	22317
Division on Motion No. 37 deferred	22275	Sitting Resumed	
Division on Motion No. 41 deferred	22275	(The House resumed at 9:16 a.m.)	22317
Division on Motion No. 52 deferred	22275	Motion No. 79 agreed to	22318
Division on Motion No. 59 deferred	22276	Motion No. 91 agreed to	22320
Division on Motion No. 79 deferred	22276	Motion No. 96 agreed to	22321
Division on Motion No. 91 deferred	22276	Motion No. 102 negated	22322
Division on Motion No. 96 deferred	22276	Motion No. 108 agreed to	22324
Division on Motion No. 102 deferred	22276	Motion No. 113 negated	22325
Division on Motion No. 108 deferred	22276	Motion No. 117 agreed to	22326
Division on Motion No. 113 deferred	22276	Motion No. 123 negated	22328
Division on Motion No. 155 deferred	22276	Motion No. 127 negated	22329
Division on Motion No. 160 deferred	22277	Motion No. 138 negated	22331
Division on Motion No. 172 deferred	22277	Motion No. 142 negated	22332
Division on Motion No. 178 deferred	22277	Motion No. 143 negated	22333
Division on Motion No. 183 deferred	22277	Motion No. 155 agreed to	22335
Division on Motion No. 199 deferred	22277	Motion No. 160 negated	22336
Official Report		Motion No. 161 negated	22337
Mr. Scheer	22277	Motion No. 162 negated	22339
Motion	22277	Motion No. 163 negated	22340
(Motion agreed to)	22277	Motion No. 164 negated	22341
Canadian Sustainable Jobs Act		Motion No. 172 negated	22343
Bill C-50. Report stage	22277	Motion No. 176 agreed to	22344
Motion No. 1 negated	22279	Mr. MacKinnon	22344
Motion No. 2 negated	22280	Motion	22344
Motion No. 3 negated	22282	(Motion agreed to)	22344
Motion No. 4 negated	22283	Mr. MacKinnon (for the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources)	22344
Motion No. 5 negated	22284	Motion for concurrence	22344
Motion No. 10 negated	22286	Motion agreed to	22346
Motion No. 11 negated	22287		
Motion No. 16 negated	22288	ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS	
Motion No. 17 negated	22290	Oil and Gas Industry	
Motion No. 21 negated	22291	Mr. Morrice	22346
Motion No. 25 negated	22292	Ms. Dabrusin	22346
Motion No. 26 negated	22294	Emergency Preparedness	
Motion No. 27 negated	22295	Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	22347
Motion No. 28 negated	22297		
Motion No. 35 negated	22298		

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>