



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

House of Commons Debates

Official Report
(Hansard)

Volume 151 No. 073
Tuesday, May 17, 2022

Speaker: The Honourable Anthony Rota



CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, May 17, 2022

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayer

● (1000)

[English]

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. government House leader is rising on a point of order.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Mark Holland (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I request that the ordinary hour of daily adjournment today be 12 midnight, pursuant to order made Monday, May 2.

Mr. John Brassard (Barrie—Innisfil, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I remind the Chair that yesterday I rose on a similar point of order related to Motion No. 11, which says:

a minister of the Crown may, with the agreement of the House leader of another recognized party, rise from his or her seat at any time during a sitting, but no later than 6:30 p.m., and request that the ordinary hour of daily adjournment for the current sitting or a subsequent sitting be 12 a.m.

The government House leader did that. Would he please indicate to the House which other House leader agreed to this? I ask because it was not me.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there are numerous precedents on the matter of consultation. The Chair has ruled on many occasions that the Speaker has no discretionary authority to refuse a motion if all the procedural requirements have been met. As indicated on page 676 of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, “the Chair has no authority to determine whether or not consultation took place nor what constitutes consultation among the representatives of the parties.”

Furthermore, Deputy Speaker Comartin, on March 6, 2014, indicated:

The nature of the consultation, the quality of the consultation, and the quantity of the consultation is not something that the Chair will involve himself in. That has been the tradition of this House for many years. What the Chair would have to do, in effect, is conduct an extensive investigative inquiry into the nature of the consultation. That is not our role, nor do the rules require it. Therefore, I am rejecting the request for the point of order.

Finally, if I may, I will quote Speaker Fraser, who stated on June 6, 1988:

...I do not think the Speaker has the authority, in view of the Speaker's responsibility to rule on procedural matters, to inquire as to what consultation did or did not take place.

There might be some occasion when the question of whether or not consultation had taken place on some matter comes before this Chamber. I am not in anyway suggesting what I have heard today either amounts to sufficient consultation or no consultation or any kind of consultation at all. I am just pointing out that, as I read the rule, it is not for me to get into that. I would not want any comments I made today in any way to take away from the ability of the Hon. Member for Windsor West to argue whether a certain set of conversations did or did not amount to consultation at some future time if the Hon. Member wanted to raise the matter again under this Standing Order or any other.

I am saying that I think I am bound by the rule as it is and that I cannot investigate whether consultation took place because, frankly, the Standing Order is silent as to my authority to do that.

● (1005)

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I disagree with the member for Winnipeg North often, but I agree with his point of order today. Certainly, as you are aware, we have seen repeated attempts to have these evening sessions. I will say that I regret enormously the conduct of the Conservative caucus yesterday, which I thought was simply not in keeping with the dignity required in the House of Commons.

[Translation]

Mr. Alain Therrien (La Prairie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it does not matter what happened last night in the House. That is not what we are talking about.

As House leader for the Bloc Québécois, I was not consulted about extending today's sitting. I was never consulted about that. According to the motion, the sitting can only be extended if two leaders agree. The government is not disclosing who the second leader is, which raises questions. The motion clearly states that two leaders must agree in order to proceed.

Where is the second leader?

[English]

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I think the response from the hon. member for Winnipeg North missed the connection with what the hon. opposition House leader was saying, which is that it is not the word “consultation” that is relevant, but the words “support” and “agreement”.

Routine Proceedings

Mr. John Brassard: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands for rising on this, because she quite rightly said that Motion No. 11 says “agreement” among the parties; it does not say “consultation” among the parties. The House certainly has the right and privilege to know with whom the agreement was made, or which other leader of the House of a recognized party made it, as Motion No. 11 states.

I ask for some clarity on this. It is quite clear in Motion No. 11 that agreement must be had. There was no agreement by me. Certainly the hon. member from the Bloc said there was no agreement from him. I think we need it stated clearly where that agreement came from, as Motion No. 11 dictates. It does not say “consultation”. A consultation according to the party opposite is simply sending an email around. There has to be clear agreement. Who made that agreement?

The Deputy Speaker: I want to thank everyone for their interventions.

We are all hon. members in the House of Commons, and when we say we have consulted with one another, I expect, of course, as I do with unanimous consent motions and others, that there has been consultation among the House leaders. I will continue to push to make sure that consultation does happen on a regular basis, but in this particular case, you are all hon. members and I cannot intercede in the discussion between House leaders on the floor of the House.

Pursuant to order made on May 2, the minister's request to extend the sitting is deemed adopted.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[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 six petitions. These returns will be tabled in an electronic format.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

STATUS OF WOMEN

Mrs. Karen Vecchio (Elgin—Middlesex—London, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the first report of the Standing Committee on the Status of Women in relation to Bill C-233, an act to amend the Criminal Code and the Judges Act (violence against an intimate partner).

The committee has studied the bill and has decided to report the bill back to the House with amendments.

I also have the honour to present, in both official languages, the second report of the Standing Committee on the Status of Women, entitled “Recommendations following the study of Bill C-233, An Act to amend the Criminal Code and the Judges Act (violence against an intimate partner)”. It states:

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), the committee has considered Bill C-233, an Act to amend the Criminal Code and the Judges Act (violence against an intimate partner), and wishes to make the following recommendations to the Government:

That the committee considered issues and consequences around the availability of cell service in the use of e-monitoring and recommends the Government of Canada move as soon as possible to ensure access to cell service is available across Canada, and that the committee feels strongly and recommends that when developing training for new judges, the issues of intimate partner violence, coercive control in intimate partner and family relationships, and social context be included.

● (1010)

[Translation]

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Hon. Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the first report of the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage entitled “The Rogers-Shaw Merger: Bad News for Local News.”

[English]

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

[Translation]

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Mr. John Williamson (New Brunswick Southwest, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the following two reports of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts: the 12th report entitled “Main Estimates 2022-23: Vote 1 under Office of the Auditor General” and the 13th report entitled “Lessons Learned from Canada's Record on Climate Change”.

[English]

I also have the honour to present, in both official languages, the following two reports of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts: the 14th report, entitled “Protecting Canada's Food System”, and the 15th report, entitled “Health Resources for Indigenous Communities”.

Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to each of these two reports.

* * *

PETITIONS

VACCINE MANDATES

Ms. Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, another day, another petition, and this time on behalf of 27,000 Canadians. Employees in the civil aviation sector have been on leave since last year, 2021. They were once hailed as heroes, and the government's interim order has put them out of a job. The world has moved on, so should Canada. Drop the interim order.

Routine Proceedings

CLIMATE CHANGE

● (1015)

Mr. Sean Casey (Charlottetown, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present a petition on behalf of Prince Edward Islanders who are very concerned about the climate emergency and motivated by a book written by Seth Klein called *A Good War*.

[English]

The petitioners call on the Government of Canada to enact just transition legislation that will reduce emissions by at least 60% below 2005 levels by 2030; expand the social safety net through new income supports, decarbonized public housing and operational funding for affordable and accessible public transit countrywide; create good green jobs; and drive inclusive workforce development.

[Translation]

PLAINS OF ABRAHAM

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have a few petitions to present to the House.

The first is about National Defence's excessive use of a temporary road on the Plains of Abraham that negatively impacts the quality of life of individuals, of the people of Quebec City who live near the site. It degrades the heritage site. The temporary road has been in use since 2013 and is still open.

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the second petition is from people who are concerned about the G&R recycling facility in Kanehsatà:ke.

The facility contains toxic waste being spilled into the environment, which is a threat to residents' health.

The petitioners are calling upon the federal government to secure and decontaminate the site. From a reconciliation perspective, they are calling on the government to fight environmental racism.

MACHINISTS' UNION

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the third petition is about the machinists' union.

Federal law contains loopholes that make it possible for employers to pay part-time and casual workers a lower hourly wage than they pay full-time workers doing the same work. That is discrimination.

Legislation received royal assent in 2018, but a date of effect was not given, which means this discrimination has gone on since 2018.

POLLUTION

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the final petition is from people who are concerned about pollution and, in particular, the impact of explosives in fishing waters, interprovincial waters and international waters.

The petitioners are calling for an end to the construction of all facilities used by highly polluting industries. They are also calling for meaningful consultation with indigenous communities and for impact assessments conducted by neutral third parties.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. Patrick Weiler (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country, Lib.): Madam Speaker, today I have the honour to present petition 11771830. The petition was initiated by Force of Nature, which is a non-profit in my riding and throughout the Lower Mainland of B.C. It is a strong advocate for all orders of government to take action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and build a more sustainable future.

The petitioners are calling on the government to do the following, among some other things: significantly reduce emissions with transparent accounting each year; make contributions to emissions reductions in the global south; wind down the use of fossil fuel subsidies and transition to a decarbonized economy; create good green jobs and drive inclusive workforce development; protect and strengthen human rights, workers' rights and the inherent rights and sovereignty of indigenous peoples; expand the social safety net; decarbonize public housing; and provide accessible public transit.

CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC): Madam Speaker, I rise to present a petition from many people in my riding of Edmonton West and across Canada who are concerned about the Liberal platform promise to use the CRA as a political weapon against charitable groups or religious groups that do not share the Liberal dogma. Specifically, the petition asks the House of Commons to protect and preserve the application of charitable status roles on a politically and ideologically neutral basis, without discrimination on the basis of political or religious values and without the imposition of another values test, and affirm the right of Canadians to freedom of expression.

ONTARIO LINE

Ms. Julie Dabrusin (Toronto—Danforth, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the Ontario Line is a public transit project that is going to have major impacts in my community. I fought hard at the time so that funding was provided by the federal government to Ontario for public transit and that there would be conditions.

Routine Proceedings

I am presenting a petition from members of my community who would like the minister to report to the public with a review of the Ontario government's level of compliance with the federal government's funding conditions, report to the public on the steps he intends to take to monitor and enforce compliance with federal funding conditions and release federal funds for the Ontario Line projects only when the ministers can confirm to the public that Ontario is in full compliance with the federal funding conditions.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, as we all know, it has been some time since we have been able to present petitions in this place, as Routine Proceedings became anything but routine.

However, I am pleased to stand today and present a petition on behalf of many constituents calling on the Government of Canada to recognize that this House voted in June 2019 that we were in a climate emergency, and we need to act like it. The petitioners call for reductions of emissions in Canada by at least 60% below 2005 levels by 2030; the need to accept that we are going to wind down the fossil fuel industry and its related infrastructure, as we did with asbestos; and the need to create protections for workers' rights to assist all of those dependent on the industry in a shift, over time, to a decarbonized economy. The petitioners have many bullet points in this petition, including a call for an increase in taxes on the very wealthiest to ensure we have the funds to assist the workers in the transition away from fossil fuels.

CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. John Williamson (New Brunswick Southwest, CPC): Madam Speaker, I rise to present a petition in opposition to the Liberal plan to deny the charitable status of organizations that have convictions about abortion that the Liberal Party might view as dishonest. This may jeopardize the charitable status of hospitals, houses of worship, schools, homeless shelters and other charitable organizations that do not agree with the Liberal Party on this matter for reasons of conscience. These concerned petitioners, citizens and residents of Canada call upon the House of Commons to affirm the rights of Canadians to freedom of expression and to protect and preserve the application of charitable status rules on a politically and ideologically neutral basis.

WON ALEXANDER CUMYOW

Mr. Han Dong (Don Valley North, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is my honour again to present a petition on behalf of 13,822 Canadians who signed in support of Won Alexander Cumyow becoming the face of the new five-dollar bill. In light of all the attacks, we think the history of Won Alexander Cumyow will give us a better understanding of Chinese Canadians' contributions and show appreciation of the sacrifices made by the community. Together, we call on the Minister of Finance to decide to put Won Alexander Cumyow as the new face of the five-dollar bill.

• (1020)

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, the first petition I am presenting is with respect to the ongoing genocide of Uighurs and other Turkic Muslims in China. Petitioners note various violations of human rights, in-

cluding forced sterilization, systematic sexual violence, forced abortion, arbitrary detention, separation of children from families, invasive surveillance, destruction of cultural sites and many others. Petitioners are calling on the government to finally recognize that Uighurs and other Turkic Muslims in China have been and are being subject to genocide, to use the Magnitsky act to sanction those responsible for these heinous crimes and to actually defend the rights of Uighurs.

The second petition highlights the situation of a particular Uighur Canadian activist, Mr. Huseyin Celil, who was effectively abducted from Uzbekistan and has been imprisoned in China ever since, for over a decade and a half. Petitioners note they are very pleased by the release of the two Michaels, and they want to see the government advocate for Mr. Celil with the same level of prioritization that was given the case of the two Michaels.

The asks are for the government to demand the release of Mr. Celil and the recognition of his citizenship, to state that this is a priority of equivalent significance as was seeking the release of the two Michaels, to appoint a special envoy to work on securing Mr. Celil's release and to seek the Biden administration's support and assistance in this advocacy, as was done in other cases, as mentioned.

ETHIOPIA

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, the third petition highlights ongoing concerns about violence and conflict in the humanitarian crisis in the Tigray region of Ethiopia. Petitioners would like to see more government engagement and action in support of the people of Ethiopia in the context of the conflict and violence that have taken place.

HUMAN ORGAN TRAFFICKING

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am also pleased to present a petition in support of Bill S-223, a bill that would make it a criminal offence for people to go abroad and receive an organ taken without consent. The bill that this petition is dealing with will be up for a vote in the House tomorrow.

CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, the final petition I am presenting, similar to those presented by a number of colleagues, raises concerns about the desire of the Liberal government to weaponize charitable status determination and use it to target the Liberals' political opponents. Petitioners note that determinations about charitable status should be made on a politically and ideologically neutral basis. They should be made impartially, without preference for groups that have one particular political persuasion over another, yet the Liberal platform committed to politicize and weaponize charitable status determination, so this is a great concern for charities that might be directly affected and for the entire charitable sector, which wants to see more support from the government, not these kinds of divisive approaches—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, this is not a reflection on the number of petitions the member is introducing but rather on the current petition that he is presenting, which is more of a political statement coming from the Conservative Party. I do believe that the member has the right, obviously, to read into the record some thoughts in a concise way on what the petitioners want, which is one thing, but to be taking a political, partisan position that the Conservative Party has is another.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The Speaker is not aware of exactly what is in the petition; however, I do want to remind members that they are to summarize the petition exactly as to what the petition has said. If hon. members are actually adding their position or their political views, then that is different. I would suggest that hon. members take that into consideration.

I will allow the member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan to finish.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Madam Speaker, I appreciate the point, and I think I was being faithful to the rules in that respect. I appreciate the interest of the parliamentary secretary on this important issue, or an issue that the petitioners think is important, I should say.

The petitioners ask to “[p]rotect and preserve the application of charitable status rules on a politically and ideologically neutral basis, without discrimination on the basis of political or religious values and without the imposition of another ‘values test’” and to “[a]ffirm the right of Canadians to freedom of expression.”

I commend all of these petitions to the consideration of the government and all hon. members.

* * *

• (1025)

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 448, 451, 452 and 454.

Routine Proceedings

[Text]

Question No. 448—**Mrs. Anna Roberts:**

With regard to companies that went bankrupt after receiving the Canada Emergency Wage Subsidy (CEWS): (a) how many companies that received CEWS have since gone bankrupt; (b) what is the total amount of CEWS funding received by the companies in (a); (c) how many of the companies in (a) owed back taxes to the Canada Revenue Agency when they were sent the CEWS payments; (d) what was the total amount of back taxes owed by such companies; (e) what are the names of the companies that owed back taxes; and (f) how much did each company in (e) owe when they were sent CEWS funding?

Hon. Diane LeBouthillier (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with respect to the above-noted question, what follows is the response from the CRA for the period April 26, 2020 to March 29, 2022, the date of the question.

In response to part (a), the term “employer” in this context includes, but is not limited to, the following per the CEWS eligibility criteria: corporations, partnerships, proprietorships, charities, non-profit organizations, etc.

Based on the information available to the CRA, of the 446,871 employers who received payments under the Canada emergency wage subsidy, CEWS, 750 employers, or 0.16%, have subsequently filed for bankruptcy proceedings.

In response to part (b), based on the information available to the CRA, of the \$100.65 billion in subsidies approved under the Canada emergency wage subsidy, CEWS, the total amount of CEWS payments received by the employers identified in part (a) is \$145,928,476, or 0.14%.

In response to part (c), eligible employers’ entitlement to this wage subsidy is based on a decline in their revenues and the salary or wages actually paid to employees. For the above-noted 750 employers in part (a), 352 owed back taxes to the CRA when they were sent the CEWS payments. The Canada emergency wage subsidy was a key measure to ensure that workers were able to count on a source of income through the COVID-19 pandemic.

In response to part (d), the total amount of back taxes owed by the employers identified in part (c) was \$25,926,888.04.

In response to parts (e) and (f), as the protection of the taxpayer information is of utmost importance, the confidentiality provisions of the acts administered by the CRA prevent the disclosure of taxpayer information related to specific cases.

Question No. 451—**Mr. Frank Caputo:**

With regard to the backlog of disability benefit claims at Veterans Affairs Canada: (a) what is the number of first applications where veterans are also waiting for a positive decision that will allow them access to delivery of health care treatment, as of March 29, 2022; and (b) where did the 16-week service standard related to the process for receiving disability benefits come from?

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Minister of Veterans Affairs and Associate Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in response to part (a), as of March 31, 2022, the total number of pending disability benefit applications, i.e., first applications, reassessments and departmental reviews, was 30,825. Of this total, 11,619 were beyond the 16-week service standard.

Routine Proceedings

Of the overall total, 23,181 were first applications pending for disability benefits, of which 10,956 were beyond the 16-week service standard.

In response to part (b), on September 15, 1995, Veterans Affairs Canada assumed the administration of disability pensions from the Canadian Pension Commission. The inherited turnaround time from the commission was 36 months.

Within approximately one year of assuming responsibility, Veterans Affairs Canada was able to reduce the service standard to 24 months based on improved performance.

Over time, the service standard decreased to reflect operational improvements: first to 18 months, then 12 months, then nine months, and eventually to six months or 24 weeks.

On April 1, 2011, Veterans Affairs Canada reduced the service standard from 24 to 16 weeks. The rationale was that veterans' applications were better prepared than in the past and the process had been streamlined as part of transformation upgrades. At this time, Veterans Affairs Canada began calculating the service standard from the date the applicant provided all of the required information, i.e., a complete application.

In 2014-15, Veterans Affairs Canada further reduced the service standard to 12 weeks. This was done prior to the increase in applications from those who served in peacekeeping missions and Afghanistan. The performance against the 12-week service standard was 64%.

As the department was unable to achieve the 12-week service standard and was seeing a continued rise in applications, it reinstated the 16-week service standard in 2015-16.

The 16-week service standard applies to first applications and reassessments, while departmental reviews have a service standard of 12 weeks.

Question No. 452—Mr. Frank Caputo:

With regard to the backlog of applications at Veterans Affairs Canada: what are the average and median wait times of (i) first applications, (ii) second applications, (iii) "red-zoned" applications?

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Minister of Veterans Affairs and Associate Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the following are the requested wait times for applications completed from April 1, 2021, to December 31, 2021. The wait times are measured in weeks from the service standard of 16 weeks start date to the decision date.

The average and median wait times for disability benefit applications are as follows. For first applications, the average was 41.9 weeks and the median was 26.1 weeks. For reassessments, the average was 9.9 weeks and the median was 5.7 weeks. For departmental reviews, the average was 26.2 weeks and the median was 15.6 weeks. For red zone applications, the average was 9.3 weeks and the median was two weeks. The disability benefits program does not have second applications, so the wait times for reassessments and departmental reviews have been provided.

Question No. 454—Mr. Gérard Deltell:

With regard to historical data sets available or previously available from Statistics Canada: what are the details of all data sets which have been dismantled, re-

moved or have become unavailable for Canadians to access since January 1, 2016, including, for each, (i) the date the data set was dismantled, removed or became unavailable, (ii) what happened to the data set, (iii) the summary of the contents, including the topics contained in the data, (iv) the reason the data set was removed, (v) who authorized changing the availability of the data set, (vi) whether or not there still is a way for the public to access the data, and, if so, how?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, no dataset was removed since January 1, 2016. All data remain available on the Statistics Canada website. If a data table is dismantled, the data will be included in another publicly available dataset.

* * *

[English]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, if the government's response to Questions Nos. 447, 449, 450, 453 and 455 could be made orders for returns, these returns would be tabled immediately.

[Translation]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Is it the pleasure of the House that the foregoing questions be made orders for returns and that they be tabled immediately?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Text]

Question No. 447—Mr. Frank Caputo:

With regard to the used F-18 fighter jets the government purchased from Australia: (a) what have been the total costs related to aircraft maintenance since the jets were acquired, broken down by (i) year, (ii) type of expense; (b) what are the projected costs to maintain the aircraft, broken down by fiscal year from present until 2032-33; (c) how much has been spent on improvements, either directly for or related to the jets, including (i) radar improvements, (ii) communications gear, (iii) equipment, (iv) other expenditures, broken down by fiscal year since the jets were acquired; and (d) what are the projected costs of improvements, either directly for or related to the jets, broken down by fiscal year and type of improvement, from the present fiscal year until 2032-33?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 449—Mrs. Anna Roberts:

With regard to the \$5,000 First-Time Home Buyer's tax credit, broken down by fiscal year since 2018-19: (a) what is the total number of individuals who claimed the credit; and (b) what is the breakdown of (a) by province or territory?

(Return tabled)

*Business of Supply***Question No. 450—Mr. Marty Morantz:**

With regard to the government's \$173 million agreement with Medicago to develop a COVID-19 vaccine and the decision of the World Health Organization (WHO) not to accept the vaccine for emergency use: (a) was the government aware that Medicago being partially owned by a tobacco company would cause a problem related to WHO authorization prior to the agreement being signed, and, if so, why did the government still proceed with the agreement; (b) on what date did the government first become aware that Philip Morris' ownership stake in Medicago would become an issue with the WHO; (c) has any minister made a formal request or representation to the WHO related to the Covifenz vaccine issue, and, if so, what are the details, including, for each instance, the (i) date, (ii) name of the minister, (iii) summary of how requests or representations were made, (iv) title of the WHO official receiving requests or representations; (d) what is the breakdown by country of how the 20 million Covifenz vaccine doses under contract by the government are to be distributed; (e) how many of the doses in (d) have actually been distributed to date; (f) how many Covifenz doses had the government originally planned to be part of Canada's international COVAX commitment; and (g) has the government replaced the committed doses in (f) with another COVID-19 vaccine, and, if so, which one?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 453—Mr. Gérard Deltell:

With regard to Statistics Canada (StatCan) and the note at the bottom of its Consumer Price Index (CPI) report released in March 2022 mentioning changes to the way in which the average prices of 52 products sold in Canadian grocery stores are tracked and reported: (a) what specific changes is StatCan making; (b) on what dates are these changes being made; (c) which specific products are being removed from the list and which ones are being added; (d) will the historical reports still be available in a manner where the average prices can be compared to current prices, and, if not, why not; (e) what specific measures, if any, are being taken to ensure that Canadians can still compare the current CPI prices to those from prior years; (f) were these changes authorized or signed off by a minister or anyone in any government department, and, if so, what are the details, including, (i) the dates, (ii) who authorized or signed off on the changes; and (g) what measures will be in place to ensure that Canadians can compare the new CPI average prices with those prior to the current period of high inflation, rather than the current, already inflated prices?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 455—Mr. Kelly McCauley:

With regard to the public service pension plan: (a) what is the total value of the payments made to deceased pensioners, broken down by year since 2016; (b) of the payments in (a), what is the value of the amounts recovered to date from the estates of the deceased; (c) what is the percentage and value of the amounts not yet recovered in (a) which are expected to be (i) recovered, (ii) written-off; and (d) what are the details of the government's process for recovering pension plan payments made to deceased individuals?

(Return tabled)

[English]

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

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—SUBSIDIES FOR THE OIL AND GAS SECTOR

Ms. Laurel Collins (Victoria, NDP) moved:

That, given that,

- (i) Canadians are paying almost \$2 per litre of gas at the pump,

- (ii) oil and gas companies are making record profits,

- (iii) Canada spends 14 times more on financial support to the fossil fuel sector than it does for renewable energy,

the House call on the government to:

- (a) stop using Canadian taxpayers' money to subsidize and finance the oil and gas sector, including by eliminating financing provided through Crown corporations such as Export Development Canada, and excluding oil and gas companies from the \$2.6 billion Carbon Capture Tax Credit, by the end of 2022; and

- (b) re-invest savings from both these measures in renewable energy and in help for Canadians struggling with the high cost of living.

She said: Madam Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the member for Timmins—James Bay.

The climate emergency is the existential threat of our time, yet when people are worried about the cost of living, about putting food on the table and about paying rent, it is hard to focus on the climate emergency. At the same time, while Canadians are struggling with the high price of gas and the rising cost of living, big oil companies are making record profits. While Canadians pay \$2 at the pump, Imperial Oil made its highest profit in 30 years and Sunoco more than tripled its profits, raking in almost \$3 billion in the first quarter. Despite these record profits and despite promising to end fossil fuel subsidies, the Liberals continue to hand over billions of public dollars to profitable oil and gas companies, the very same companies that are fuelling the climate crisis. Canadians should not be paying big oil to pollute.

As parliamentarians, it is our job to address these pressing crises, these interconnected issues, to protect our communities and to take action. That is why New Democrats are calling on the government to stop using Canadian taxpayers' money to subsidize and finance the oil and gas sector, including through Crown corporations such as Export Development Canada and the \$2.6-billion carbon capture tax credit, reinvest those savings in renewable energy and provide help for Canadians who are struggling with the high cost of living.

Last year alone, the Liberals gave out \$8.6 billion in subsidies and public financing to the fossil fuel sector, over \$5 billion through Export Development Canada. Canada gives more public financing to the fossil fuel industry than any other G20 country, handing out 14 times more financing to oil and gas than to renewable energy between 2018 and 2020.

The Liberals have promised to accelerate Canada's G20 commitment to phase out inefficient fossil fuel subsidies by the end of 2023, but recent testimony from Finance and Environment Canada officials at the environment committee showed that the government has made very little progress on this commitment and still does not even have a clear definition of what an "inefficient fossil fuel subsidy" is, something for which the environment commissioner has consistently criticized the government.

Business of Supply

Canada also made a commitment at COP26 in November to phase out public financing of the fossil fuel sector internationally. The mandate letters for the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, the Minister of Environment and Climate Change and the Minister of Natural Resources include instructions to develop a plan to phase out public financing of the fossil fuel sector, including by federal Crown corporations. Despite this being included in those mandate letters, there has been no progress on this commitment.

In the U.S., President Biden has already introduced policies limiting public financing to fossil fuels, within a month of COP26. Earlier this month, a group of 112 environmental organizations, including Environmental Defence, Climate Action Network and Equiterre, sent a letter to cabinet outlining their concerns that the government's commitments on fossil fuel subsidies are not enough to meet Canada's climate targets. Not only that, but these environmental organizations are also worried about the new subsidies and public financing being made available to carbon capture and fossil-based hydrogen. They are urging the government to eliminate all subsidies, public financing and financial support to the oil and gas sector by the end of this year.

The Liberals say the right things, but then they fail to act. They promised to eliminate fossil fuel subsidies, but they continue to increase them. It is clear that the Liberals are going in the wrong direction with their new \$2.6-billion carbon capture tax credit, the largest so-called "climate" item in the budget. In comparison, the one fossil fuel subsidy they eliminated in the budget is worth only \$9 million over five years: \$9 million versus \$2.6 billion.

The tax credit is a massive new subsidy for a carbon capture technology that is not proven at scale and is used as an excuse by oil and gas companies to justify increased production and in turn higher emissions. Reducing the carbon intensity of oil production addresses only a fraction of the life-cycle emissions of a barrel of oil; 80% of emissions occur when the oil is burned. Therefore, using carbon capture for oil and gas production, even in the best-case scenario, which currently does not exist, prevents only 3% to 15% of life-cycle greenhouse gas emissions from entering the atmosphere.

● (1030)

The Liberals' emissions reduction plan released this spring relies heavily on carbon capture, but carbon capture projects have not been successfully deployed at the scale needed to make them part of a viable pathway to reach net-zero emissions by 2050. More than 80% of the carbon capture projects attempted in the U.S. have ended in failure, and Shell's Quest carbon capture facility near Edmonton is emitting more greenhouse gases than it captures. It is the equivalent of putting over a million cars on the road.

The IPCC has warned against relying too heavily on unproven technologies such as carbon capture to meet our climate goals. The Liberals will claim that the IPCC says we need carbon capture, but what the IPCC actually says is that while some carbon removal will be needed to reach net zero by 2050, carbon capture is one of the least effective and most expensive options. Experts have also told the environment committee that carbon capture should be reserved as an option of last resort for heavy industry sectors that are hard to

decarbonize, such as concrete and steel, but Canada and other countries pushed for carbon removal to have an increased importance in the IPCC's last report to justify their own flawed approach.

It is very clear that the Liberal government has been listening to oil and gas lobbyists instead of to the science. It ignored the advice of over 400 experts who urged it not to go ahead with the carbon capture tax credit: It refused to even meet with them, but it was happy to meet with big oil, which has lobbied the current Liberal government and met over 6,800 times. Now, despite record profits, big oil is asking for even more government subsidies. Amazingly, at the very same time as Cenovus was announcing \$1.6 billion in profits and tripling its dividends to shareholders, its CEO said that the carbon capture tax credit was not enough and that it wanted even more public dollars.

Big oil could not make it any more clear that it does not want to spend a dime of its own money. These profitable oil and gas companies that are fuelling the climate crisis can afford to clean up their own pollution. Canadians should not be paying the price. Not only do we need to stop handing out billions of public dollars to profitable oil and gas companies, but we need to start investing those billions in the real climate solutions we know are so desperately needed to secure a livable planet. Continued subsidies to the oil and gas sector delay climate action, and divert precious resources from the investments in a renewable energy transition and support for the workers and communities that will be affected.

Last month, the IPCC made it clear that the world urgently needs to move away from fossil fuels and make significant investments in renewable energy if we have any hope of keeping the global temperature rise below 1.5°C and avoiding the most catastrophic consequences of the climate crisis. Renewable energy technology is ready. It is available, and the costs have decreased significantly, but the government is not making the needed investments. The IPCC said that countries such as Canada need to boost investments in renewable energy by at least a factor of three to meet our climate goals. Instead, the government continues to throw billions at the big oil and gas companies that are fuelling the crisis. Investing in renewable energy, strengthening grids, electrifying infrastructure and having energy-efficiency retrofits will not only help fight the climate crisis, but will also create good, long-term jobs for Canadians in communities across the country and will help make life more affordable.

The Liberals need to stop the public financing of big oil companies now. It is not time for just more empty promises, but real action. If they are really serious about ending subsidies and ending public financing, they can start by eliminating tax credits for oil and gas exploration and development right away, which could bring in almost \$10 billion over the next four years. That is \$10 billion in savings that could be reinvested in renewable energy and in help for Canadians struggling with the high cost of living.

Canadians are worried. They are worried about the future for their families and future generations. They are worried about how they are going to make ends meet today. We have an opportunity to tackle some of the biggest issues of our time in a way that supports those who are struggling and a way that safeguards our climate for generations to come. I urge every MP to take a look in the mirror—

• (1035)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. member's time is up. I tried to give her a signal, but I am not sure if she saw me.

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, what we have seen over the past number of years from this administration is historical amounts of money being put into the green transition. We are talking about hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars over the past few years alone. This is a government that is committed to the green transition, and I will get an opportunity to expand on that particular point later.

In this most recent budget, budget 2022, there was a commitment to end fossil fuel subsidies by the end of 2023. I would like to hear the member's thoughts on that commitment.

Ms. Laurel Collins: Madam Speaker, in 2019 the Liberals promised to eliminate fossil fuel subsidies. Instead, they increased them. The Liberals have been in power for almost seven years and have been increasing fossil fuel subsidies to the tune of, on average, \$900 million each year. That is just the increase. Now they are providing a new subsidy of \$2.6 billion to oil and gas companies that are making record profits. It is hard to believe the Liberal

Business of Supply

promises when they continue to do the exact opposite of what they say.

Mr. Greg McLean (Calgary Centre, CPC): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague in the NDP for putting forward this motion, and I appreciate the subsidiary of the Liberal Party actually putting forward a motion we can address here in the House of Commons.

I would like to ask the member about some of the numbers. She talked about \$8.6 billion being provided by the government in subsidies, yet there is no tangibility of that \$8.6 billion actually flowing through the government's accounts. I know that EDC provides some loans: Loans are not gifts, and are market-based from EDC at this point in time.

I have been searching for the actual subsidies provided to this industry and have found virtually none to an industry that provided over \$20 billion in 2021, so I would love it if she would do that. I am going to put a definition on here. Would the member entertain a definition for what an inefficient fossil fuel, or any subsidy is, to this motion? Would she entertain that going forward so we can compare apples to apples?

• (1040)

Ms. Laurel Collins: Madam Speaker, I would encourage the member to look at the WTO's definition. It is an internationally recognized definition of what a subsidy is. It includes those kinds of loans and public financing supports to a specific sector that convey a benefit. If we take internationally recognized definitions, such as the WTO's or the UN's, we would actually be including things like the government's recent \$10-billion loan for the TMX pipeline. We would be including so many more things than the government actually deems to be a fossil fuel subsidy.

The government has not only promised to eliminate fossil fuel subsidies, but it has also promised to eliminate public financing. It has promised to phase out public financing to this sector. This sector is making record profits, and we could be taking those billions of dollars and investing them in the climate solutions that are so desperately needed.

[Translation]

Mr. Mario Simard (Jonquière, BQ): Madam Speaker, we have known about the Liberal government's unfortunate propensity for funding oil and gas for quite some time now. I am glad my colleague moved this motion.

There is one small problem, however. The NDP-Liberal marriage means that the NDP will be forced to vote in favour of the \$2.6 billion set aside for carbon capture strategies. Not only will the NDP be voting in favour, but they have asked to cut short the debate.

Does my colleague think that putting the health of the planet at risk is a high price to pay for dental insurance?

*Business of Supply**[English]*

Ms. Laurel Collins: Madam Speaker, I am incredibly proud that my NDP colleagues and I have pushed the government and used our power in a minority Parliament to not only secure the largest expansion of health care in a generation, but also to secure commitments to a just transition on low-income energy retrofits and on reducing emissions. What this means is that we are going to be pushing the government to fulfill on its commitments to eliminate fossil fuel subsidies. It is part of the reason we are bringing forward this motion today. I will continue to push the government to take real action to invest at the scale that actually meets the urgency of this crisis.

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am very honoured to rise today as the member for Timmins—James Bay on this very important issue. We are dealing with two major crises right now. One is the question of affordability and the massive prices that people are paying at the pumps, at a time when we see big oil racking up record profits and gouging consumers at the pumps.

The fact is that Imperial Oil announced its best opening quarter in 30 years, with \$1.17 billion in profits. Canadian Natural Resources doubled its year-over-year first-quarter results with a profit of \$3.1 billion, and Suncor brought home \$2.95 billion in quarter one, quadrupling last year's results of \$800 million.

Where is all that money coming from? It is coming from Mr. and Mrs. Joe Average who go to work every day and are getting gouged at the pumps. We will never hear the Conservatives talking about price gouging. They have all kinds of theories about how unfair it is for big oil to make record profits while people cannot afford to go to work. It is the same as how the Conservatives are trying to talk about high grocery prices as some kind of Bank of Canada conspiracy on inflation, when, in fact, we learned that Loblaw's made record profits this year. They are making money gouging Canadians.

At the same time, of course, big oil continues to get free money from the Canadian taxpayer. It refused to pay \$256 million in taxes to municipalities in rural Alberta. It left an abandoned oil well cleanup of over a billion dollars: abandoned wells are leaking planet killers such as methane. It expects the public to pay for that. It is calling on the government to change the basic environmental regulations that protect the Athabasca River system, a fragile ecosystem, so that it can dump the toxic waters from tailings ponds. It never talks about the huge damage that it does from every barrel taken out of the oil sands or the amount of water that is contaminated and held in these tailings ponds, which are larger than the city of Vancouver, but it expects the public to assume those costs.

Of course, we see the \$570 million for the methane cleanup. Methane is a planet killer. We all know that. This is something that big oil, with its record profits, could easily have handled, but no: It asked the public to pay to stop the leaking methane. What we saw from the Environment Commissioner's report was that this was used as a subsidy to increase production.

The issue of affordability is one factor, but there is a much bigger factor facing us. We are the first generation in history to actually be

in a position to decide whether our children have a future or whether we are going to continue to have cheap gas.

We talk about a climate emergency. It does not even come close to talking about the situation we are in. The UN has released its latest statement calling "a code red for humanity". It claims "a damning indictment of failed global leadership" on the climate crisis. UN Secretary-General Guterres says that what we are looking at is "an atlas of human suffering and a damning indictment of failed climate leadership."

He says:

Nearly half of humanity is living in the danger zone—now. Many ecosystems are at the point of no return—now. Unchecked carbon pollution is forcing the world's most vulnerable on a frog march to destruction—now.

There is nothing theoretical about this. The Economist, which is hardly a left-wing journal, says that we have to act quickly before time runs out. It gives us until 2025 to deal with peak oil. The International Energy Agency, another industry voice, says that given the emergency of the climate crisis, there cannot be any more new fossil fuel projects, yet what we see in the House, and what the Canadian people see, is that climate change denial is the fundamental cornerstone of Canadian economic policy and it is the fundamental cornerstone of the government.

We know that the Conservatives will ridicule any efforts on climate change. We hear them laughing when it is talked about. The issue is with the Liberals, though. The Liberals have made promises because Canadians want someone to do the right thing on the climate crisis. We are not seeing that.

● (1045)

We want to talk about a number of things that we need to break apart on the Liberals' arguments because they are perpetrating a scam on the Canadian people. The idea of net zero by 2050 is an absolute scam.

They went to COP26, where the Prime Minister and the environment minister claimed they would cap emissions. That certainly shocked everyone in Canada because they had not talked to anybody about this emissions cap. We are never going to see that emissions cap. It is not going to happen. Why is it not going to happen? The emissions cap is not going to happen because the Liberals are telling Canadians that they can increase oil production while getting to net zero.

It is a ridiculous proposition, and it is all based on the idea that they were somehow going to decarbonize the oil, but the problem with that is that it is not possible because what is coming out of the oil sands has one of the highest carbon emissions prints on the planet. Year in and year out, despite all the promises to lower those emissions, it has not happened. A headline in *The Wall Street Journal* refers to it as among the “Dirtiest Oil” on the planet. Those are the facts.

We can look at the environment minister's latest big green plan, which he said was planned out based on the Canadian Energy Regulator's information. The Canadian Energy Regulator predicts that, under the government's plan, in 2050 the amount of oil that will be produced and burned will be the same as the amount of oil burned and produced in 2019.

Liberals are not moving off the carbon economy. In fact, as the Canadian Energy Regulator says, they are planning a massive increase of up to 1.2 million barrels a day. We have already seen this. We have seen Bay du Nord, with an extra 300,000 barrels a day. We see the money they are pumping into TMX for an extra 800,000 barrels a day.

This is not going to help Canadians at the pumps. This is for export. The Deputy Prime Minister made it clear that the primary objective of the government is the supremacy of the market, and the market is exporting Canada's oil and increasing exports to the world market, yet the Liberals claim they are going to get to net zero.

Here is the other part of the scam: Every barrel of oil exported does not count toward Canada's emissions. They are going to come up with some hoodoo numbers to say there are no emissions costs here, but right now, even without the increase of 1.2 million barrels per day, Canada's offshore oil export emissions are more than all of the emissions in every sector in Canada today.

The government says it is not efficient to actually target the full amount of emissions. The fact is that the planet does not care who burns the oil or where it gets burned. The government is committed to driving the oil agenda and giving big oil whatever they ask for to make that happen.

This leads me to the other issue I am very concerned about, which is the so-called “just transition”. It has been very depressing to sit at the hearings on the just transition and see where the government is going on this.

I come from in Northern Ontario where we have lived through unjust transitions. When 4,000 workers lost their jobs in the uranium mines, there was not an alternative. When we lost the entire silver and iron mining economy in Temiskaming, there was not an alternative. The transition then was brutal.

We have seen the economic possibilities. We have Calgary Economic Development and Edmonton Global talking about thousands of new jobs. We also have clean energy tech talking about a 50% increase in clean energy jobs. The problem is that, to get those jobs, we need investment, and the government continues to deliberately underinvest in the new economy, so it is leaving workers high and dry, and it is making vague promises about a transition, but that is not happening.

Business of Supply

The clock is ticking. The government, Parliament, leaders in the provinces and our federal leaders are responsible to the next generation as we look at a situation of the planet overheating. The red lines are there, and we have the opportunity and the possibility to transform, but we just do not see the political will. That needs to be challenged.

• (1050)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have two points. One is in regard to the resolution the NDP are making in reference to the price of gas. I guess this would be just acknowledging that what is taking place in Europe today is having a profound impact on the cost of gas, and this is, in good part, because of Russia's invasion of Ukraine. There is a world environment and a world price for oil. I am interested in the member's thoughts on the cost of a litre of gas as a direct result.

The second point deals with the end to fossil fuels, which is a commitment the government has made to end fossil fuel subsidies by the end of 2023. I would like the member's thoughts on that. It was an item that was listed in the budget.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Madam Speaker, the Liberals did promise, in 2019, to get rid of fossil fuel subsidies, and then they amended it to say “inefficient”. Well, “inefficient” means anything they want it to, such as the \$570 million the government gave to the methane cleanup, and we have no proof that the money was actually spent on dealing with methane.

The issue here, in terms of Putin's war, has certainly exacerbated the price of oil. It has created a crisis, and that has to be addressed. However, we were told the government was going to have an electric vehicle plan. We do not even have a plan to get the charging stations. Canadians across Canada would love to buy an electric vehicle, but if they cannot plug it in, what are they going to do?

I am looking at the budget, and I see more support for oil and gas than I see for the clean energy alternatives.

Mr. John Williamson (New Brunswick Southwest, CPC): Madam Speaker, I appreciate the member's honesty in saying that he opposes affordable gasoline for Canadians. He wants high gas prices. My question to the member is this: Why will his partners in the Liberal government not also claim victory on this?

The Liberals brought in the carbon tax with the stated purpose of raising gas taxes at the pump. That is what happened. Now they are running for cover and blaming it on Russia.

I will give members one example. In my riding, a litre of gasoline is \$2.00 a litre. Across the border, 10 minutes away in Maine, it is \$1.50. That is a 50¢ difference. Now, all that gasoline comes from the same place, which is the refinery in Saint John, New Brunswick. Maine does not have a more efficient refinery with harder workers or lower input costs. It is coming from the same place. That difference is all tax.

Business of Supply

I would say it is mission accomplished, as they are driving up the price of energy in this country. Why will the Liberals not also claim credit on this and say, “Mission accomplished”?

• (1055)

Mr. Charlie Angus: Madam Speaker, I am not surprised that the hon. member has to put on a little circus act and make complete misrepresentations. This is a party that has supported convoy people supporting white replacement theory. This is a party supporting anti-vaxxers. Now, the Conservatives are claiming that we support high gas prices, when we see that they are misrepresenting the carbon tax. Do members know that if Suncor was not carbon taxed, it would pay \$830 million instead of the \$30 million it pays now?

The carbon tax is not causing this, and we see the price gouging that the Conservatives support time and time again because they are total puppets for big oil's interests.

[Translation]

Mr. Mario Simard (Jonquière, BQ): Madam Speaker, I agree with my colleague from Timmins-James Bay, whom I quite like.

Often the Conservatives are puppets of the oil and gas sector, but my colleague from Timmins-James Bay is often a puppet of the Liberal Party.

The Standing Committee on Natural Resources received an assistant deputy minister of the environment. Unfortunately, he pretended to have technical problems to avoid answering our questions on the Bay du Nord development project.

When I asked that the assistant deputy minister be invited back before the committee, my colleague from Timmins-James Bay was against the idea. He said he did not want assistant deputy minister to come back.

As far as dental insurance is concerned, does my colleague not sometimes feel trapped in the Liberal Party's puppet games?

[English]

Mr. Charlie Angus: Madam Speaker, it is pretty sad to see the Bloc members so angry because they sit in the corner and nobody listens to them any more.

The fact is, we got the largest investment in public health care since Tommy Douglas and, oh boy, does that upset a group that does not want any investments at the federal level, so now they are going to claim that us taking the Liberals on is somehow puppetry.

We are seeing that the Bloc members are not even puppets. They are just an audience, and as an audience, they are not even participating properly and doing their work. They came here to defend Quebec, but we do not see them defending Quebec. It was the New Democrats who stood up to defend the extra seats in the House. They just stood to say, “Blah, blah, blah, blah, blah.”

An hon. member: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order. Before we continue, we are starting to have other members wanting to participate when they should not be participating. I would ask parliamentarians to wait until I recognize them during questions

and comments. That is the best way for the House function properly.

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

Ms. Julie Dabrusin (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources and to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Winnipeg South.

Climate change and the environment are very important to me and my community. It guides the work that I do in this place, and that is because the threat is not theoretical. It is real. It is happening right now. Right across our country last summer we saw floods and wildfires. These events destroyed people's homes and their livelihoods. We need to take strong action as we face this reality.

Today, I will focus on eliminating fossil fuel subsidies, which we have committed to do by 2023, but I would like to begin by talking about the heavy lifting that we must do and that we are doing right now to fight climate change.

One of the most impactful and earliest steps we took was to put a price on carbon pollution. It encourages businesses and individuals to make choices that result in fewer emissions.

It is a strong market mechanism, and all of the funds that are collected through the price on carbon pollution are returned to the province where it is collected. None of it stays with the federal government. I want to be clear about that because sometimes I feel like that is lost in our conversations. It is described sometimes as a tax, but that was clearly put to bed by the Supreme Court of Canada. It is not, and none of the funds stay here with the federal government. It is all returned to individuals and the provinces from where they were taken.

I will give some good news. We have finally begun to flatten the curve on emissions. The first year when we saw the curve beginning to flatten was 2019. There was a decoupling. The economy grew, but emissions did not grow at the same pace, and in 2020, our emissions dropped. Much of that was due to the pandemic and the fact that we reduced travel. There is no doubt about that, but part of that drop was also due to the fact that we have cleaned up our electrical grid

As part of that, we are well on our way to removing coal-fired electricity from our electrical grid, which would reduce air pollution and emissions. We are investing in nature-based solutions, such as planting two billion trees and working to protect our lands and waters. We have put into law that we must achieve net zero in our country by 2050. We released the emissions reduction plan under the law for net zero by 2050, which sets projections for all sectors of our economy to reduce emissions and includes mechanisms to reduce combustion of fossil fuels, such as moving to 100% of all new vehicle sales being zero emissions by 2050.

Today's motion focuses on the narrower issue of fossil fuel subsidies and the work we are doing toward our G20 commitment to eliminate fossil fuel subsidies. The commitment began in 2009, when Canada joined other members of the G20 in agreeing to phase out and rationalize over the medium term inefficient fossil fuel subsidies while providing targeted support for the poorest. The leaders' statement from that G20 said, "This reform will not apply to our support for clean energy, renewables, and technologies that dramatically reduce greenhouse gas emissions."

Previously, we had committed to meet the goal by 2025, and over the last year we have accelerated that timeline to be completed by 2023. So far, the government has rationalized or phased out the following nine tax measures that had provided preferential tax treatment to the fossil fuel sector: the phase-out of the accelerated capital cost allowance for oil sands, which was announced in budget 2007 and completed in 2015; the reduction in the deduction rates for intangible capital expenses in oil sands projects to align with rates in conventional oil and gas sector, which was announced in budget 2011 and completed in 2016; the phase-out of the Atlantic investment tax credit for investments in the oil and gas and mining sectors, which was announced in budget 2012 and completed in 2017; the reduction in the deduction rate for preproduction intangible mine development expenses to align with rate for the oil and gas sector, which was announced in budget 2013 and completed in 2018; the phase-out of the accelerated capital cost allowance for mining, which was announced in budget 2013 and completed in 2021; allowing the accelerated capital cost allowance for liquefied natural gas facilities to expire as scheduled in 2025, which was announced in budget 2016; rationalize the tax treatment of expenses for successful oil and gas exploratory drilling, which was announced in budget 2017 and completed in 2021; a phase-out tax preference that allows small oil and gas companies to reclassify certain development expenses as more favourably treated exploration expenses, which was announced in 2017 and completed in 2019; and the phase-out of flow-through shares for oil, gas and coal activities, which was proposed in budget 2022 and will be completed in 2023.

• (1100)

As part of the process to eliminate fossil fuel subsidies, G20 countries have been pairing among themselves for a transparent review of their work. In 2018, Canada committed to undergoing a peer review process with Argentina. We are the fourth pair of countries within the G20 to undertake that process, and it is ongoing.

The previous six countries to do a peer review have generally considered fossil fuel subsidies based on the World Trade Organization's definition of "subsidy", which is government spending, tax or

Business of Supply

non-tax, that provides a benefit. Further, countries have tailored that definition to subsidies aimed at the fossil fuel sector by focusing on those that directly or indirectly lead to increases in the production or consumption of fossil fuels.

To complete our own work to eliminate fossil fuel subsidies, Environment and Climate Change Canada in 2018 conducted an extensive review of non-tax measures. This was complemented by a consultation that ran from March to June 2019 on the government's draft framework to review measures outside the tax system. This feedback is taken into account in the work being done by Finance Canada and Environment and Climate Change Canada.

It is reasonable to expect that the question of what type of spending is aligned with a transition to net zero will change over time. In other words, government spending in support of the transition to a net-zero, reliable, affordable energy system could look different in 2023 from how it will look in the future. I will provide an example. Support for diesel use in northern and remote communities may need to continue in the short term to ensure the provision of essential energy services. However, in the longer term, as the government continues to invest in ways of moving these communities off diesel, these types of supports may no longer be considered aligned with government objectives once viable replacement options are put in place.

Before my time is up, I would like to address the motion's reference to carbon capture and storage. At a time when we need every tool at our disposal to reduce emissions, this is not the moment to remove support for carbon capture and storage. The IPCC has recognized that it plays a role in reducing emissions, as does the International Energy Agency. It is one part of what needs to be done to reduce our country's emissions and reach net zero.

Recently, at the environment committee, Professor Normand Mousseau shared the following testimony in response to a question from the member for Victoria.

He stated:

We absolutely have to implement all reduction measures, but we're also going to have to invest in capture and storage. I'm not talking about utilization, I mean storage. Otherwise, we won't be able to achieve net zero.

Business of Supply

We believe it is important to focus on how programs can support climate targets, international commitments, long-term prosperity and job creation in the face of a global energy transition. It is global. This is happening all around the world. Canada is on a journey to a net-zero future, one that will be anchored by a clean, affordable and reliable energy system. It is important to ensure that government spending and investment are well aligned with that journey. That is the work that we are doing and are committed to completing.

• (1105)

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am very interested in having my hon. colleague explain to me the fact that there was no business case for TMX. The public was told to buy it for \$4.7 billion. Then it was \$17.3 billion. Now there is another \$10 billion on top of that in loans. That is public money to export and expand oil production. That oil production of an extra 800,000 or a million barrels a day goes offshore and does not count in Canada's emissions.

My hon. colleague said this is a global issue, and I totally agree with her. Would she not agree that it does not matter where the oil is burned, as it is still affecting the planet? If we have 2025 as a target to stop increasing production, why is the government using taxpayers' money to export oil to be burned in other jurisdictions, which will not be counted on its register?

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: Madam Speaker, the way we calculate our emissions around the world, by international agreement, is by looking at what is combusted within our own countries. We are in fact, through the emissions reductions plan, putting forward strong projections for all sectors.

When we focus on oil and gas, it is not just oil and gas. In a city like Toronto, buildings are one of the largest sources of emissions. We are putting forward projections for all sectors across our economy to reduce our combustion in a very active way. That is why, when I talk about things like zero-emission vehicles, those are all part of the plan, as are retrofits for buildings. We are doing the work that we need to do, and we are providing international support for countries that need to do that work at home as well.

Mrs. Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Madam Speaker, I really appreciated the speech from the member.

Canada is responsible for less than 3% overall of global GHGs, so I really do want a real answer to this. My constituents ask, has the government determined what impact it would have on the growth of oil and gas production in the rest of the world if we were to replace all of Canada's oil and gas production, which is the cleanest, most ethical, highest-quality production in the world, and it was shut down completely over the next 20 to 30 years?

What impact would such a shutdown of Canada's resources have on the global environmental levels and the world's ability to reach net zero, and what impact would it have on the Canadian economy and on the ability of Canada to fund Canadian innovation in green technology?

• (1110)

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: Madam Speaker, I would like to begin with the first part of that. I hear this argument a lot, about Canada's foot-

print as a global player not being that large, so what does it matter what we are doing here? It matters a lot. That is what we need to do. We need to reduce our emissions, and that is what we are doing.

Let me get to the emissions piece. The emissions piece is what we are focusing on. That is what the atmosphere sees, emissions. It is not a matter of trying to focus on production. We have said very clearly that the oil and gas cap is about emissions. We have an emissions reductions plan that is geared to reducing those emissions, and we are taking the actions in investing and also supporting Canadian innovation to get to where we need to go to do that.

That is good for our economy, because that is the economy of the future. That is the economy the world is looking for, and we are going to be competitive in it.

[Translation]

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné (Terrebonne, BQ): Madam Speaker, if, and only if, the Liberal government has good economists, then it did a cost-benefit analysis of its investments, whether in capture and storage or in the oil industry through its Crown corporations. What about the cost of inaction and the consequences of climate change, which are quantifiable and priced in real money?

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: Madam Speaker, we are making investments where we need to for our economy, but also for the environment.

That is what we have talked about, that is what we are doing, that is what shows in our work. For example, currently a company in Windsor, here in Canada, is starting to manufacture batteries for all of North America. That is what we need. It is good for the economy and good for our environment.

[English]

Mr. Terry Duguid (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the motion by the hon. member for Victoria is not only timely and important, but very reassuring.

As I read the member's motion, I found much common ground across the aisle, including a shared recognition that energy security is ultimately about climate action. How so? The International Energy Agency, or the IEA, defines "energy security" as the uninterrupted availability of energy sources at an affordable price. As the motion implies, if we want to secure an uninterrupted and stable energy supply, we have to accelerate the switch to lower-emitting energy sources, and we have to do so in ways that are affordable to Canadians. Otherwise, we risk exacerbating existing equity issues and losing some of the political will that has accumulated to drive climate action.

Therefore, we are clearly on the same page with the member opposite when she talks about the need to invest in renewable sources of energy and support both energy security and affordability. In fact, that is a central focus of the 2030 emissions reduction plan that our government released at the end of March. It is a comprehensive mix of new investments, subsidies and incentives that build on the more than \$100 billion we have already committed to climate action since coming to office in 2015.

The plan also includes hard caps on emissions from every economic sector, as well as stronger environmental regulations and new sales mandates for electric vehicles, all of them aimed, ultimately, at making Canada a net-zero nation by 2050.

Put another way, our 2030 emissions reduction plan is about protecting the environment in ways that actually unlock new economic opportunities. It is about cutting pollution and creating good jobs. Where needed, it is about providing training, skills, development and other support to workers and communities, so that clean growth works for everyone in every sector of our economy and every region of our country.

Investing in renewable sources of energy is a key part of our plan. There is simply no way to reach our climate targets while ensuring our economy remains strong and globally competitive without a sustainable, low-carbon energy sector. Frankly, renewables have been part of our climate action plan since we sent our first delegation to COP 2015, which was just weeks after we formed government in 2015.

Our level of commitment to investing in renewable sources of energy has only grown from there. Just last year, we launched our \$1.5-billion clean fuels fund to support the next generation of fuel production. With this new fund, we are supporting feasibility and front-end engineering and design studies, helping to establish biomass supply chains, creating new markets for waste from forestry and agriculture, and developing essential codes and standards, ensuring that new technologies can enter the market reliably. Best of all, we expect to create more than 35,000 direct and indirect jobs through this fund and leverage an additional \$3.5 billion in other public and private investments over the next five years, all while helping to reduce our emissions by up to 12 megatonnes.

Budget 2022 further builds on that and is highlighted by a world-leading \$15-billion Canada growth fund and an expansion and extension of the low-carbon economy fund, with a further \$2.2 billion. Other measures specifically advance our capacity to produce renewable energy. Electricity is a case in point. We have committed to a net-zero electricity system by 2035, and our new federal budget includes further investments to get us there. They include \$250 million over four years to support pre-development activities of clean electricity projects of national significance, such as interprovincial electricity transmission projects and small modular reactors. These projects build on what our government is already doing to advance similar work on the Atlantic loop and prairie link projects.

There are also \$600 million over seven years for the smart renewables and electrification pathways program to support additional renewable electricity and grid modernization projects, \$2.4 million in 2022-23 to establish a pan-Canadian grid council, which would provide external advice in support of national and regional

Business of Supply

electricity planning, and \$25 million to establish regional strategic initiatives to work with provinces, territories and relevant stakeholders to develop net-zero energy plans.

● (1115)

As we invest in renewables, we are also helping Canadians to use less energy, such as with the Canada greener homes grant that was launched in May of last year. It offers grants of up to \$5,000 to help Canadians finance resiliency and energy efficient retrofits in their homes. The program has proved to be very popular, with over 150,000 homeowners applying through the national portal and another 50,000 coming in through our co-delivery partners of Quebec and Nova Scotia.

Of course, carbon capture, use and storage also figure prominently in our emissions reduction plan and our 2022 budget. Carbon capture technologies have also been a part of Canada's plan since the turn of the century, when an international team of scientists descended on an oil field in Saskatchewan to study the feasibility of injecting carbon dioxide into a geologic formation. Almost two decades later, carbon capture has emerged from the laboratory as a commercially viable option, but the sheer scale of these projects demands continued collaboration to reduce costs, which means that we cannot afford to be excluding potential partners as we try to achieve an economy of scale with the technology. That is where I part ways with the member opposite and her motion. We need all hands on deck to fight climate change. With our abundance of natural resources and skilled labour, Canada is well positioned to lead global growth in CCUS as it supports our investments in renewables.

The oil and gas industry, which contributes 26% of Canada's overall emissions but also directly employs over 70,000 people, should not and will not be excluded. That said, it is our intention that the tax credit cannot be used for enhanced oil recovery. Simply put, the tax credit would be an effective way to further mobilize substantial private capital towards clean technologies in energy, driving down costs and encouraging widespread market adoption.

Business of Supply

When it comes to climate change, I think colleagues will agree that there is no magic bullet. We need to use every tool in the tool box, and we need every partner we can get to help us achieve our goals. We have the ambition, the know-how and the plan to build a bright, healthy future for everyone.

• (1120)

Mr. Dave Epp (Chatham-Kent—Leamington, CPC): Madam Speaker, the hon. member just concluded by stating that we need to use every tool in our tool box to fight climate change. The previous parliamentary secretary stated that Canada's emissions are counted by all of the fossil fuels burned here in Canada. I assume that includes our imported fossil fuels, as well.

Can the hon. member explain then why the price on pollution applies to Canadian-generated natural gas and oil, and not to imports? Is it because they come into eastern Canada versus western Canada? I wonder if he can help me understand why every tool in our tool box does not include a price on carbon on imported fuels.

Mr. Terry Duguid: Madam Speaker, as the hon. member knows, the price on pollution applies where the fuel is combusted, as the parliamentary secretary before me said.

I would just like to point out to the hon. member that I have been watching the Conservative leadership debates, and they are still debating whether climate change is real or not. I know there are some enlightened Conservatives out there who believe climate change is real and that we need to address this existential crisis that is facing us now and will face our children and grandchildren.

Ms. Niki Ashton (Churchill—Keewatinook Aski, NDP): Madam Speaker, as we are discussing today, the climate emergency is here. It is clear that the Liberal government is not doing enough to deal with the emergency of the issue that we are facing. Peguis First Nation in Manitoba has been devastated by unprecedented flooding, which is a clear sign of the climate emergency.

As my colleague said, we need to use all tools available to us. Will his government commit to immediate investment in long-term mitigation infrastructure in Peguis, first nations and northern communities that are currently paying the price for the climate emergency? We have put a bill forward on this front, with respect to the Canada Infrastructure Bank. We need all levers of government to support communities in fighting climate change now. Will the government commit to supporting Peguis?

Mr. Terry Duguid: Madam Speaker, we are feeling the impacts of climate change up close and personal in Manitoba. My heart goes out to the good people of Peguis and other first nations communities that have been evacuated.

We have experienced two “once-in-300-year” floods in the past decade: in 2011 and 2014. As the hon. member will know, many people were evacuated from their homes. Many of them were first nations. That is why, yesterday, the minister introduced a national adaptation strategy that will help us to build resiliency for our communities. It is why we have spent \$100 billion, and an additional \$9.1 billion for the emissions reduction plan. We not only have to address adaptation, but we have to address the mitigation issue: that is causing these flooding issues the hon. member has brought to our attention.

[Translation]

Mr. Denis Trudel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am so fed up with the Liberals' hypocrisy on fighting climate change. I have been listening to them for two to three years in this place. They keep using the words “green transition” and “sustainable development”.

At least my Conservative friends do not lie. They are not interested in fighting climate change. They just ignore it. At least they do not pretend.

The Liberals could not care less either, but they pretend to be interested. Let us look at their spending. That would be \$4.5 billion to buy the Trans Mountain pipeline, \$12.6 billion to expand Trans Mountain, \$2.7 billion for an accelerated investment incentive, and \$750 million for the new fund. Those are the subsidies the Liberals have been handing out to the fossil fuel industry for a few years now. We have never managed to reach the target.

Canada is one of the worst performers in the world when it comes to climate targets. That is scandalous. I condemn my Liberal friends' hypocrisy.

• (1125)

[English]

Mr. Terry Duguid: Madam Speaker, like the hon. member for Timmins—James Bay, the Bloc thinks this government is doing absolutely nothing. We have invested \$100 billion in climate action. We flattened the curve. The hon. member from Timmins mentioned his view was that the emissions reduction plan was a scam. The World Wildlife Fund, David Suzuki and Andrew Weaver from the Green Party have all praised our plan. They are a little more objective than the member opposite.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Before I go to resuming debate, I did not want to interrupt during questions and comments because it takes time away, but I want to remind members they should not be thinking out loud. I would ask them to hold on to their thoughts until they are recognized during questions and comments.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Grande Prairie—Mackenzie.

Mr. Chris Warkentin (Grande Prairie—Mackenzie, CPC): Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this motion.

I should just mention I am splitting my time with the member for Calgary Centre.

I think today it is important for us to be clear about what is being debated. The NDP has a motion that references the high cost of gasoline, but it does not suggest what could be done. They are actually suggesting that we should see the prices increase.

I think it is good, and I think it is important, for the NDP to be transparent about its position. I think New Democrats have been abundantly clear as to what they want to have happen. They have said that they believe the oil and gas sector in the country of Canada should be shut down. They have been very clear. There is no ambiguity. They have said that the 500,000 jobs should be done away with, and they have an idea as to how they can get them employed in coffee shops or maybe art studios, but they want to see those jobs eliminated. They want to see the energy sector shut down.

They also want to see the price of gasoline driven up even further. They have been abundantly clear in that regard, but I think this is a bad strategy. I think this is a path to destruction and hardship for the vast majority of Canadians. The folks I am hearing from in my constituency are desperately concerned about the high cost of living and, over the past number of months, the devastating impact of high fuel prices on household budgets.

I live in a rural community. My constituency is a rural and northern community, so many of the folks who are employed in my constituency live in rural communities or they work in rural communities. They drive pickup trucks to get to work. Those are essential vehicles. They cannot take the subway, Uber or a Prius. They have to get into their pickups and they have to get to work, and many of these people are paying up to a day's wages to fill the tank of an essential vehicle to get to their jobs.

The NDP and the Liberals have worked together over the past number of months not only to maintain these high prices, but to elevate the price through their additional carbon taxes. As a matter of fact, it is estimated that taxation on gasoline amounts to about 50¢ a litre. Many politicians have talked about how bad it is that there is a high cost for gasoline. It is amazing. There is something we, as politicians, could actually do. As a matter of fact, the Province of Alberta, for a temporary period of time, did something. Its government eliminated some of the gas taxes, which brought relief to households in the province of Alberta. I believe the federal government should take a lesson from that, do what is the right thing to do and make life more affordable for Canadians from coast to coast.

Not only does the NDP want to see the price of gasoline go up, as I mentioned, but it wants to eliminate the industry altogether. Let us just think about that for a period of time. If we eliminate the sector in the country of Canada, a number of things would happen. Canadians would continue to need to use oil and gas, so we would import it. From where would we import it? We would import it from the same places every country does that does not import Canadian oil and gas. This means countries such as Russia, Saudi Arabia and Venezuela.

I can tell members, Canadians and you, Madam Speaker, this, and I am hopeful my colleagues in the NDP and the Liberal Party are listening.

I know that Canadians do not want to see oil and gas flowing into Canada from places like Russia, Saudi Arabia and Venezuela, which have far lower human rights records and environmental stewardship records. I can tell members that, while the NDP may want to shut down the industry here in Canada, we have seen what happens when other countries attempt this. It means they become

dependent on other countries and places for their fuel needs, and they become less able to diversify their own economies.

The price of fuel is at an all-time high, and the NDP is suggesting that the solution should be that we shut down the industry. New Democrats say we should shut down the subsidies.

• (1130)

As has been articulated by the government, and as has been articulated by the industry, these are actually not the subsidies the NDP would suggest. There are subsidies that take place within Canada relating to the oil and gas sector, and those are the significant subsidies the industry makes to the Canadian population. The taxes collected from the industry to the government in Canada amount to nearly \$20 billion.

The NDP solution to the challenges that we face today is to shut down the industry, continue to see prices of gasoline rise and shut down the \$20 billion in revenue that the industry pays into municipal, provincial and federal coffers. That \$20 billion pays for roads, maintenance of our communities, health care systems, schools and universities, as well as the important services that the federal government provides. The NDP's suggestion is that, if we just eliminate this industry, all would be harmonious and we would happily continue on our merry way. The NDP gives no regard to the \$20 billion that is invested from the industry every single year.

More importantly, the NDP talks about shutting down the industry, and it never talks about the important jobs that the industry creates, whether it is the 500,000 jobs the industry creates directly or the indirect jobs that are created in every community across this country. In the old days, the NDP used to be the defender of the blue-collar worker. It used to be the defender of rural communities. It used to be the defender of the little guy. The vast majority of the people who work in the energy sector in the province of Alberta and throughout the country are exactly the people who the NDP used to represent. Unfortunately, the NDP have now completely abandoned those folks.

In a community like mine, where we have a very diversified economy, with oil and gas, agriculture, forestry, a good service sector and a good retail sector, everybody in close proximity understands that their well-being is connected to everybody else's well-being. The retailer knows that if we shut down the energy sector, their energy costs would skyrocket, which they are of course opposed to, but they also understand the importance of their success being connected to the jobs that are created within in our community and the spinoff benefits within our community.

The thing the NDP conveniently likes to forget, when they talk about the environment and the need to transition from oil and gas to new energies, is that it would be following the path Kathleen Wynne's government took here in the province of Ontario. It spent billions of dollars—

An hon. member: Now, that is a dirty personal attack.

Mr. Chris Warkentin: Madam Speaker, my hon. colleague from the NDP—

Business of Supply

• (1135)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order, order. I would like to remind members that it is not time for questions and comments. The hon. member has one minute and—

An hon. member: Do not ever call me Kathleen Wynne.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. member for Timmins—James Bay will come to order. There is one minute and six seconds left. The NDP has the first question on this, and I am sure he will be able to get up to ask questions and make comments.

An hon. member: Madam Speaker, I am just hurt.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. member for Grande Prairie—Mackenzie has the floor.

Mr. Chris Warkentin: Madam Speaker, I never would have accused the hon. member for Timmins—James Bay of having been a Liberal until recently, when he made that dirty deal with the Prime Minister to continue to drive up gasoline prices and follow the path of Kathleen Wynne, who was trying to shut down the oil and gas and resource sectors, while investing billions of dollars in these concepts of green energy that never came to fruition. The money was wasted in Ontario. The taxes went up to pay for those wasted experiments, and Ontarians still have to rely on traditional energy sources.

However, that is exactly what the NDP suggests. As a matter of fact, not only is the oil and gas sector an important investor in our communities, our governments and all the rest of it, but it is also one of the largest investors in clean tech in the country. The unique difference between the oil and gas sector and government investment in clean tech is that the oil and gas sector invests in clean tech that actually results in something beneficial for our communities, whereas there is waste in the government spending on these fronts.

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Madam Speaker, I listened to my colleague with great amusement. I have great respect for him. It was getting kind of out there, but that is okay. He has a job to do.

I would like to ask him about some work we did together while he was committee chair trying to get accountability on the Kielburger brothers because this issue has been brought back up in the public media. I am very concerned about the fact that, in 10 months of trying to get the basic financial information of how many corporations there are, who had the finances and who owned what, we could not get a single clear picture. This was a parliamentary committee and what was obstructing us the whole time was their chief financial officer, Victor Li. We kept being told that he was off sick some place, but they had nobody else to replace them.

The hon. member was the chair of that committee, and this was the frustration he faced. This is a children's charity. Children's charities should have pretty clear books. Why were we not able to get basic answers from their chief financial officer, Victor Li, and the rest of that group?

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I do want to remind members that the questions on the debate should be focused on the motion before the House. I will allow the hon. mem-

ber to answer, but I do want to remind members that they are to make sure there is relevancy.

Mr. Chris Warkentin: Madam Speaker, clearly the member was swayed by my speech because he is now changing the subject. I commend him for that.

He is right that we were stalled not only by the WE organization but also by the Liberal government in its unwillingness to be transparent. They moved heaven and earth to ensure that the secrets remain secret. I know that the member believes there was information the Canadian taxpayer deserves to know. The corruption that was alleged, and the corruption that was starting to be exposed, never got to see the light of day because of the work of the Liberal Party. That is why I am so concerned about the deal the NDP has struck with the Liberal government to keep the corrupt government in power.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, many Conservatives kind of live in the past, and we see that in their attitudes toward climate change. The member made reference to the idea of trucks. He gets into the truck, and he takes his drive. It is all that kind of stuff. He says that is what his constituents want.

I think that the Conservatives have the mentality of not really understanding the importance of the climate change issue. To get a lesson from Ford Canada, if we want to buy a brand new Ford half-ton truck that is electric, we will be waiting for four years. Even his constituents realize that the need for transition, change and going to hybrids and electric vehicles is there.

When does he believe the Conservative Party is going to catch up with the rest of Canadians in regard to the transition?

• (1140)

Mr. Chris Warkentin: Madam Speaker, that is the kind of disrespect and disgusting behaviour of "Ottawa knows best" that we see in the House. Saying to my constituents to turn off their pickup for the next four years and wait until there is an electric truck available to them, and suggesting that they are living in the past because they will not immediately transition to a vehicle that is not yet available to them, is disgusting and despicable. The member should apologize.

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Madam Speaker, let us come back to the topic at hand. In his speech, my colleague mentioned that, although the oil industry is heavily subsidized, it also brings in a lot of revenue and that that money is used for other things. The figure he mentioned was \$20 billion a year.

Did he forget about the \$10 billion that we are paying into the industry? Did he forget about the \$10 billion invested in Trans Mountain? Did he forget about the \$2.4 billion the government just promised for carbon capture, a technique that we know does not work? Most importantly, did he forget about how much climate change is costing? We only have to think about what happened in British Columbia last year.

At some point, the government needs to start getting serious and move forward in the right direction. It needs to stop name-calling and saying that there are dishonest people.

I understand that members work for their constituents. We must continue to put money into those ridings as we are doing now, but that money should be used for the energy transition. Is it not time to do that?

[*English*]

Mr. Chris Warkentin: Madam Speaker, I hate to imagine that the Bloc has joined the course of MPs and parties that want to drive up fuel prices at a time when we are seeing record high fuel prices.

I have come here today to fight for my constituents who are finding it impossible—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Chris Warkentin: Madam Speaker, the NDP is heckling me, because I am asking for fuel prices to be reduced—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Chris Warkentin: Madam Speaker, it is amazing. The NDP is heckling and suggesting there are record profits. Do members know who is enjoying record profits from the high price of fuel right now? It is the Government of Canada and governments across this country, and those are being invested in health care, our roads and the infrastructure across this country. The NDP does not suggest for a second that those should be reduced. They are just saying—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): We have run out of time. I have allowed for more time than was permitted.

I would like to remind members again that heckling and sharing their thoughts out loud is disrespectful when someone else has the floor. I would again ask members, because it has happened a lot this morning, to please hold onto their thoughts or write them down so they do not forget them. They will be able to ask a question or share their comments during questions and comments.

We will resume debate with the hon. member for Calgary Centre.

Mr. Greg McLean (Calgary Centre, CPC): Madam Speaker, I appreciate being able to get up and speak to the motion the NDP has put forward. However, as I was drafting my speech, I had to ask myself where I could start here today.

When I look at the motion, in the preamble it says, “(i) Canadians are paying almost \$2 per litre of gas at the pump,” which is true. They do pay that. It then says, “(ii) oil and gas companies are making record profits,” and we will analyze what that actually means. The preamble then continues, “(iii) Canada spends 14 times more on financial support to the fossil fuel sector than it does for renewable energy,” which is complete hogwash, and I will address that item first.

The preamble itself is a mulch of misinformation, and the NDP is very good at that. The NDP is very good at putting misinformation on the table and saying, “Here's what's going to happen here.” They then repeat a narrative that is completely false. I tried to participate last week at a forum hosted by my colleague who put this motion

forward. I noticed that my party was the only party that was not invited to that forum, and that is because the other parties in the House have members who buy into this nonsense narrative about the way the transition happens.

Now, my party and I have very good ideas about how we actually transition and decarbonize our economy, all of which are based on reason and outcomes, and none of which I have seen from the Liberals, the Bloc, the NDP nor the Green Party. Getting somewhere on the environmental equation is essential, and none of the other parties have presented anything that advances the environmental equation for the world. All they do is kneecap the Canadian industry.

I did some research after that forum. I went to look for where this figure came from of subsidies in Canada for our oil and gas industry being 14 times more than what we fund for our alternative energy industry, and it comes from a group called Oil Change International, which is a proxy organization for Greenpeace. Its leadership comes from Friends of the Earth, and it is funded by the Tides Foundation. It is a splash of the same voices producing louder and more dissonant narratives about how we can actually decarbonize the world.

Frankly, I will take licence on this, Madam Speaker, and you may have to slap me here, but it is a lie. It is something that this misinformation is based upon, and frankly, it needs to be called out for what it is whenever we see it here. As parliamentarians, our job here is to speak the truth and only the truth. When we foment misinformation by repeating lies from the Internet, we are going towards that confirmation bias, which we buy into and which our people buy into. We must get the real facts on the table here. We must ignore these groups, such as Oil Change International, which are just rent-seekers putting money in their own pockets at the expense of Canadians.

I actually asked if there were—

● (1145)

Ms. Elizabeth May: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point or order. I followed the member for Calgary Centre as closely as I could. He expected to have his wrist slapped, and if I understood him correctly, he called this motion from one of the hon. members of this place a “lie”, which is the same as saying that the hon. member for Victoria is a liar, unless I misheard him. Perhaps he can clarify.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I believe when the hon. member is asking for clarification it is actually more of a point of debate. I want to remind members to be judicious with the words they are selecting.

The hon. member for Calgary Rocky Ridge.

Mr. Pat Kelly: Madam Speaker, I want to speak to the point of order that was raised. To be clear, I was listening as well and I do not think there is any reason why the member for Calgary Centre should have expected to have his wrist slapped at all. He did not call any member of this chamber a liar; rather, he brought attention to the fact that lies are repeated, and that is a—

Business of Supply

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I actually ruled that this was not a point of order. Now it is becoming more a point of debate. The hon. member mentioned that he thought he might get his wrist slapped, which I did not do because of the way it was said, so I want to indicate that what is going on right now is more a point of debate.

The hon. member for Calgary Centre.

Mr. Greg McLean: Madam Speaker, it is the first time I have used that word in the House. I was wondering if it was a usable word in the House or a three-letter word that disguised a four-letter word. Thank you for the clarification.

Yes, the information being fomented by Oil Change International is a lie. I will repeat that in the House, because it is the truth.

Let us go back to the analysis and look at the real numbers. I have been looking at the oil and gas industry and how much it has contributed to Canada over the past 21 years, which is \$505 billion. That is more than half a trillion dollars it has given in economic rent to governments across Canada. That \$505 billion is even a number in the real Liberal world, when it runs its deficits. Let us look at what that buys. How much health care does that buy? How much schooling and old age security does that buy? That buys the lifestyle Canadians have enjoyed for decades here, thanks to a prosperous natural resource industry led by Canada's oil and gas industry. The GDP number I have here is \$128 billion, and \$120 billion is our trade surplus in the oil and gas industry. That is balanced by about \$30 billion of imports, so it is about a \$90-billion surplus we are talking about for this industry, and 522,000 jobs.

I know the New Democrats would like to see those 522,000 workers have their legs cut out from under them and not be able to provide for their families, but I do not think they understand the impact that has on families, because the impact it has on families—

• (1150)

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

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. As you know, when we speak in the House we have to have at least some connection with the truth, and the member is straying far from any semblance of relying on the truth here.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Unfortunately, my focus was somewhere else at the time. I will have to review what the hon. member said and come back to decide whether or not this is an actual point of order.

I want to remind members to make sure when they are debating that what they say is relevant and that they hopefully provide factual information.

The hon. member for Calgary Centre.

Mr. Greg McLean: Madam Speaker, it is the first time that anybody in the NDP has actually challenged me on the truth because the motion they put on the table here is riddled with misinformation, so let us get to the heart of the matter. Do we realize the cost when we lose 522,000 jobs in Canada? It would be devastating for families across this country and there would no longer be any social

support provided through that industry, which funds our country more than any other industry in Canada right now.

My colleague pointed out that \$20 billion was supplied by this industry as economic rent to governments across Canada last year alone, in not that prosperous a year for oil and gas companies in Canada. That \$20 billion would be in addition to the \$52-billion deficit, plus all of the economic dislocation that would happen if we actually tried to change this industry more than it is actually already changing itself.

Industry has its own job to do and it is doing it very well. I am going to move to where we are actually looking at this whole notion of profitability. There is something called the reinvestment ratio. When the government came to power, the reinvestment ratio, which is the amount of money the oil and gas companies were spending to drill and develop new resources versus the amount they were actually paying back, was 1.82. That means for every dollar that they earned, they put \$1.82 back in the ground to develop a future resource for Canada. It was a development industry.

That number now, members would be surprised to learn, is actually down to 0.29, so 29% of the money that comes through the industry actually gets put into development. That is because there is no line of sight on what happens to the money in the future, and that is a result of extremely poor policies from the government. There is no line of sight. Yes, the government has had to step in and buy infrastructure that should have been built by the private sector, but its policies punished those private sector organizations by asking how we invest in a country where there is no line of sight on how we actually earn money on our investments.

Government investment is fine. Private sector investment actually looks to make sure it gets a return on its investment. It is a concept most of my colleagues, in all four parties in the House, have almost no concept about: a return on investment. That is required around the world, not just in Canada.

Let us talk about the environment a bit. Let us talk about carbon capture, because my colleagues here will know it is one of my premier pieces about how we actually decarbonize the world. Somebody referenced the International Energy Agency. The International Energy Agency, an international organization, of course, says that 7% of our decarbonization will come from carbon capture, utilization and storage over the next 20 years.

However, 7% is not enough. Let us find more ways to decarbonize this industry. When we think about methane reductions in Canada, we lead the world on our environmental practices and how we are actually getting to a better environmental outcome for the world. The industry's production of hydrocarbons is down 30% in its carbon intensity over the past 15 years. That leads every Canadian industry in its decarbonization.

That leads every country in the world, as far as oil and gas industries go. The only two countries we need to compare ourselves with in this regard are the United States and Norway. They are our only two peers. We are far better than the United States and we are on par with Norway, both of which have better carbon capture regimes than we do. We need to do better and make sure that our environmental practices match those of the most advanced countries in the world. We need to be the most advanced country in the world on these decarbonization initiatives.

I am going to deviate now, because I think in the spirit of productivity and in actually working with my colleagues across the aisles, I am going to propose an amendment to this bill where we add at the bottom:

(c) the Government of Canada identifies and eliminates inefficient energy industry subsidies by 2023. It should clearly identify, quantify and phase out programs for the Canadian energy sector that subsidize compliance with existing regulations.

1. Inefficient subsidies shall be deemed as those government grants or payments below market, provisions of capital, contracts for differences, social financing, unequal capital cost allowance allocation differentials, trade access, program funding and expenditures to reduce delayed taxation, such as flow-through financing mechanisms, as provided by all levels of government;

2. Further, “inefficient” shall be interpreted to mean the incentives granted under such programming shall result in fewer funds being provided to all levels of government as a result of the programming. That is, the economic rent received by the various levels of government must be less than that received had the subsidy not been implemented;

• (1155)

3. In addition, as energy is an essential input to society and human development, and the source of the energy is fungible with respect to its social utility, the common measurements be applied across all energy sources that receive any government subsidies or programming from all levels of government. Common comparison elements must include full cycle costing, including purchase and disposition of capital equipment and common depreciation schedules, capital cost allowance rates and accredited capital costs. The level of comparison in costs and benefits is essential to determining relative efficiency of subsidization;

4. Such inefficient allocation of government resources shall not be applied to programming that aims to obtain societal objectives beyond the aim of sourcing safe, secure, affordable energy for Canadians, specifically programming applied for scientific advancements in environmental technologies to better the outcomes—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I'm sorry, I think there is probably a problem with interpretation.

The hon. member for Shefford.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Andréanne Larouche: Madam Speaker, the interpreter said that she did not receive the member's amendment, so it is harder for her to provide an interpretation of it.

Business of Supply

[*English*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): It seems that the interpretation did not get a copy of the amendment ahead of time, so I would just maybe ask the hon. member to slow down.

[*Translation*]

I invite the hon. member to repeat point number four.

[*English*]

Mr. Greg McLean: Madam Speaker, 4. Inefficient allocation of government resources shall not be applied to programming that aims to attain societal objectives beyond the aim of sourcing safe, secure, affordable energy for Canadians; specifically, programming applied for scientific advancements in environmental technologies to better the outcomes of energy sources that are by design inefficient, particularly at the early stages of development, which is when government action through programming is most importantly applied to derive better societal outcomes.

It is an amendment that is meant to allow the government the ability to fund these new environmental technologies that are always more expensive for industry at the front end and actually continue to kind of compare a base level about what the subsidy is in this industry versus these other industries where the government is shovelling money out the door right now, to try and say this is more important for us than others. I am hoping—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. member can table his amendment, but to elaborate on it is a point of debate. I want to remind the member and all members in the House that if they have something in writing, whether it is their speech or whether it is amendments or motions, it is always best to ensure that interpretation has access to that and that it is provided to interpretation in order to ensure that every member in the House is fully aware of what is being said. I just wanted to remind members again.

It is my duty to inform hon. members that an amendment to an opposition motion may be moved only with the consent of the sponsor of the motion or, in the case that he/she is not present, consent may be given or denied by the House leader, the deputy House leader, the whip or the deputy whip of the sponsor's party. Since the sponsor is not present in the chamber, I ask the NDP House leader if he consents to this amendment being moved.

The hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby.

• (1200)

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, it is another muddled mess of an amendment from the Conservatives, so no I do not.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Questions and comments, the hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby.

Business of Supply

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Madam Speaker, I always enjoy listening to the member for Calgary Centre. This time, though, it was so unrelated to the facts that it was quite unbelievable. Here we have a situation where we know we are talking about \$8.6 billion in subsidies last year alone. There were record profits in the oil and gas sector and at the same time, people were being gouged at the pumps. The Conservatives do not seem to recognize any of those realities.

I came out of the oil industry and worked at the Shellburn Oil Refinery in Burnaby, British Columbia. I also worked in social enterprise and won a number of business awards. I understand return on investment, but when Canadians are investing \$8.6 billion in subsidies, and we are seeing the increasing cost of climate change now reaching billions of dollars a year that impact Canadians right across the country, why do the Conservatives continue to deny the reality of climate change? Why do they continue to deny the reality of subsidies? Why do they deny the reality of the important issue that is before the House today?

Mr. Greg McLean: Madam Speaker, I appreciate that my colleague asked a question, although it was a bunch of hyperboles. Let me respond very adroitly: \$8.6 billion is not a subsidy number provided. If he wants to understand the definition of what a subsidy is, perhaps he can look it up before he comes in this House and accuses me of an ad hominem like not believing in climate change. That was a ridiculous comment and he should stand down immediately.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member for Timmins—James Bay on a point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Madam Speaker, I do not want to challenge the Conservatives on whether they believe in climate change, but the member should get some better acting skills if he is going to pretend he believes in climate change.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): 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, it is worth noting that within the Conservative Party, even within the leadership of the party, there is serious concern about some members being climate change deniers. That is just a reality. It might not necessarily be the member who just spoke, but it is an issue within the Conservative Party.

Can the member explain to the House why, when the Conservatives were in administration of the Government of Canada for 10 years, they failed in getting resources to tidewaters on either one of the coasts when it came to pipelines?

Mr. Greg McLean: Madam Speaker, I am not here to litigate what happened over 10 years ago. I do know a handful of pipelines were built in the previous administration, contrary to what the Prime Minister puts on the floor of the House of Commons, which is again complete misinformation. This seems to be allowed in this House, which surprises me and my constituents.

If the member across who asked the question actually wants to look at what is being built in Canada right now, can he tell me why TMX is taking so long to get built? It is because of irregularity of process that his government has introduced in actually getting

projects built in Canada. That is why capital is fleeing Canada and why projects do not get built here. It is why there is no investment from private capital.

[Translation]

Mr. Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Madam Speaker, I hope that my colleague from Calgary Centre was not offended by my little joke earlier. I loved his speech, and I barely missed a second of it.

The Conservative members spoke earlier about the billions of dollars the oil industry reinvests in society, and we have also heard about the extraordinary profitability of the sector. The first quarter of 2022 does show record profits for Canadian oil companies. At the same time, however, consumers are paying exorbitant taxes at the pump and then paying huge subsidies to the industry through their taxes.

I have a very simple question that should be easy to answer. Given the situation, would it not be better to reduce or even stop the subsidies—which I think would be even better—and redistribute the money in assistance to Quebecers and Canadians? Our fellow citizens are having a hard time with the price of gas, but also with the constantly rising inflation and the impact of the price of gas on the economy overall.

● (1205)

Mr. Greg McLean: Madam Speaker, I agree with my friend. It is very important to understand that the recent hike in gas prices is partly a result of the cost of the carbon tax applied by the federal government, currently in Liberal hands.

We have often said that it was time to reduce or defer the carbon tax for Canadian consumers. This tax is now almost 12¢ a litre for Canadian consumers—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Resuming debate, the hon. member for Jonquière.

Mr. Mario Simard (Jonquière, BQ): Madam Speaker, before I begin, I would like to mention that I will be sharing my time with the mischievous member for Mirabel.

What to say about this motion?

First, I will tell my NDP colleagues that the Bloc Québécois will support their motion, since putting an end to subsidies for fossil fuels is something we have long defended.

When it comes to the issue of oil and gas in Canada, it seems to me that many stakeholders become irrational, so irrational that it feels like this has to do with culture or identity. I do not want to play the “us and them” game, but everyone is familiar with the two solitudes. Many Canadians identify with the gas and oil industry. I could compare that with guns, in the United States, which I see as a symbol of a certain right-wing identity. In Canada, oil is a symbol of a certain Canadian identity. Consider what happened in the last Parliament, and I will not hide the fact that I was blown away. A motion moved by the Conservatives stated that oil is irreplaceable and that we should set aside a day to celebrate it.

The first time I sat in the House and heard some of my colleagues shouting “build a pipeline”, I was taken aback. As a Quebecer, I wondered whether I should be shouting “build hydro towers”. Really, I was not sure what to do. I will go further. On many of my Conservative colleagues’ phones and even on their pins, I see the famous slogan “I love oil and gas”. On my computer, I have a Quebec flag. I admit that I do not feel as invested in the gas and oil sector.

More recently, in March if I remember correctly, the hon. member for Abbotsford said during an opposition day that we should cut gas taxes by 5%. I think that he must be biting his tongue today, since it really is not a good idea to cut taxes by 5% when oil companies are making record profits, as I will show later. However, I do not blame the Conservatives, because at least they are doing it openly. When I hear a Conservative give a speech on the oil and gas sector, I know what to expect.

It is a little more difficult with the Liberals, who keep promising an energy transition, who keep promising to stop subsidizing fossil fuels, but then do the exact opposite. We only have to look at Bay du Nord.

At the Montreal Climate Summit, the Minister of Environment and Climate Change said, “I am an activist and an environmentalist. . . . I must represent all Canadians and I have to accept that I won’t be able to win all my battles... I know you are disappointed with the Bay du Nord decision”. I wondered why he said that he represented all Canadians. Does that mean that all Canadians disagree that the oil and gas sector poses an environmental problem?

From reading his quote, I get the impression he is making a decision that goes against his beliefs. I am not questioning the environment minister’s beliefs: he has shown that he has a strong environmental ethic. However, in his opinion, what makes sense for Canadians is to accept oil and gas projects. This is what makes me say that talking about the oil and gas industry in Canada is something almost irrational that can paralyze our political process.

We in the Bloc Québécois are somewhat less affected, I admit. Until very recently, we could count on the NDP. However, with the happy and consummated marriage between the NDP and the Liberal Party, the New Democrats will be obliged, and my friend Charlie will like what I say next, even if they condemn the \$2.6 billion—

• (1210)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Order. The hon. member knows that he cannot name his colleagues in the House.

Business of Supply

[English]

The hon. member for Timmins—James Bay.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Madam Speaker, my colleague personally called me out, and I do not think he is allowed to do so. If he wants to attack the New Democratic Party for doing its work in general, he can, but he is not supposed to use my name. I am more than proud—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The point is well taken.

[Translation]

I just reminded the hon. member for Jonquière that he cannot name his colleagues in the House.

The hon. member for Berthier—Maskinongé on a point of order.

Mr. Yves Perron: Madam Speaker, my colleague was focused on his speech. People were shouting at him while he was speaking, which is why he simply responded without thinking—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Order. That is a matter for debate. Nevertheless, members cannot name their colleagues in the House.

The hon. member for Jonquière.

Mr. Mario Simard: Madam Speaker, I apologize: I should have said “my friend”, or simply “the hon. member for Timmins—James Bay”.

We could count on the NDP on issues concerning the oil and gas sector. However, they will be obliged to support the budget, which earmarks \$2.6 billion for carbon capture strategies. I will get back to that later.

That prompted the mischievous member for Mirabel to say that the NDP is spending so much time at the Liberals’ feet that they are going to get oral thrush, which he thinks explains the dental care plan. I would not go that far, not being as ungenerous as my colleague from Mirabel, of course.

When I look at the Conservatives, the Liberals and the New Democrats, I see that, when it comes to the oil and gas sector, our political process is stalled. It is impossible to have a rational debate, as I have witnessed in the past three years. All the same, debates are necessary. To sum all this up in one short sentence, the oil and gas sector is a bottomless pit for public funds.

Business of Supply

Earlier, I spoke of the \$2.6 billion in the budget for carbon capture and storage. A total of 400 academics signed a letter saying that this technology is not feasible. Several witnesses told the Standing Committee on Natural Resources that, from a technical standpoint, it might work for a cement plant or heavy industrial processes, but not for the oil and gas sector. It is a mirage, yet the government will be investing \$2.6 billion.

To add insult to injury, people from the oil and gas sector told us that \$2.6 billion might not even be enough, and that they would like to be reimbursed for 75% of the associated costs. They are trying to make us believe in low-carbon oil, which is not a real thing. Moreover, they want taxpayers to pay for this low-carbon oil. That is confusing to anyone who is the least bit rational.

The result is that what we are seeing in Canada is the opposite of what we are seeing in every other country. Instead of a “polluter pays” policy, Canada has a “polluter gets paid” policy.

I will conclude by saying that there are two carbon capture projects in Alberta, costing about \$2.5 billion, 57% of which comes out of public funds. Canada supports fossil fuels 14 times more than all of the G20 countries. For every \$14 billion invested in fossil fuels, Canada invests only \$1 billion in clean energy. We know that EDC costs \$14 billion a year. The proportion in all the G20 countries is a mere 2.5%. That is completely unacceptable.

Now there is the Trans Mountain project, which was initially presented as an economic project. In my opinion, it is not an economic project; it is a project meant to appease western Canada. It is completely irrational. The cost started at \$12 billion, then ballooned to \$21 billion, and now, with the government loan, it has gone up to \$31 billion. As my colleagues know, in the 1990s, the automotive industry was given a \$10-billion loan that was later forgiven. That means that \$31 billion in public funds is going into Trans Mountain.

In the past few weeks and months, we have watched wealth being transferred from the middle class to the oil multi-billionaires. This is going to have consequences. Suncor reported net earnings of \$2.95 billion, while Imperial Oil reaped \$1.17 billion, its highest quarterly profit in 30 years. TC Energy made \$1 billion in profit, and Chevron was able to quadruple its profits.

This money comes from taxpayers who are paying too much for gas at the pump. The refining margin was 9.4¢ in 2008, but it is 48¢ in 2022. Our Conservative colleagues tell us that we need to reduce the carbon tax, and they often bring up random constituents, like Gilberte Larouche in the backwoods of Alberta, who is having trouble paying for groceries. However, Gilberte Larouche is also having trouble paying for gas, and I do not think that reducing the carbon tax will help her.

● (1215)

I will try to summarize, because I do not have much time left. We need to move as quickly as possible to end the fossil fuel subsidies. What the government is proposing, namely identifying inefficient subsidies, will not work. We need to find a solution to reduce the obscene profits being made in the oil and gas sector.

[English]

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my hon. colleague for his support of this motion. I must say that in my 14 years of Parliament, I have never seen the Bloc side with the Conservatives more than I have this Parliament, so it is a pleasure to see it supporting a progressive cause.

I cannot understand how anybody in the House concerned with facts could possibly oppose the motion. It says, “Canadians are paying almost \$2 per litre of gas at the pump”, and it is more than that in B.C., actually. It also says, “oil and gas companies are making record profits”, which they are, and “Canada spends 14 times more on...support to the fossil fuel sector than it does for renewable energy”.

Those are all facts, and the motion calls on the government to switch money away from subsidizing oil and gas, whatever the figure is. I understand there may be some differences about what the figure is, but there is no question that the federal government is subsidizing oil and gas, whether it is purchasing the TMX pipeline or otherwise. It also talks about reinvesting that money into renewable energy.

My question for my hon. colleague is this. How can any policy-maker in 2022 deny the urgency of dealing with the climate crisis and oppose measures to transition as swiftly as possible to sustainable forms of energy and reduce our dependence on fossil fuels?

[Translation]

Mr. Mario Simard: Madam Speaker, I understand my colleague's question, but I would like to come back to what he said by way of introduction. He said that he has never seen the Bloc side with the Conservatives more.

What I have seen over the past few weeks is my colleague from Timmins—James Bay refusing to allow the deputy minister of the environment to come back to talk to the committee about Bay du Nord. I cannot understand that. How can someone who claims to support the energy transition not want to question a deputy minister on a decision as appalling as Bay du Nord?

Sometimes there is a lot of bluster in the House. However, when it comes time to take action, many people back down. We are not backing down on our core values just because we agreed with the Conservatives two or three times.

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, colleagues know that as a government we have invested literally hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars, going into the billions, in support of a green transition. Historical amounts of funding that we have never witnessed before have been spent on that issue in the last six years alone.

It is important to recognize that there are technologies out there that could provide great benefit to the world and to us here in Canada. The idea of carbon capture is very real.

The member opposite and the Bloc seem to have an opinion, which is why I am asking this question. Does the Bloc party believe there is a need for any investment in the concept of carbon capture?

• (1220)

[Translation]

Mr. Mario Simard: Madam Speaker, I am wondering whether my colleague from Winnipeg North believes himself when he speaks. I really wonder about that.

With regard to investments in the energy transition, let us not forget the much-touted \$17-billion green recovery plan. The government is investing \$17 billion for its entire green recovery plan, but it is investing \$30 billion in a single oil project, Trans Mountain.

Your green recovery plan includes the hydrogen strategy. You want to make hydrogen with the oil and gas industry, with strategies—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I would remind the hon. member to address his comments through the Chair.

The hon. member for Jonquière.

Mr. Mario Simard: I understand, Madam Speaker.

The government's plan includes Canada's hydrogen strategy. The government plans to invest a ton of money to produce hydrogen from natural gas, which is what the oil and gas sector is calling for.

The only natural resources industry that captures carbon naturally is the forestry industry. In my region, Saguenay—Lac-Saint-Jean, this industry contributes more to the government than the government invests in all of Quebec.

Mr. Greg McLean (Calgary Centre, CPC): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his speech.

I heard him repeat that nonsense from Oil Change International about the NDP's motion. Has my colleague reviewed the figures that this organization provided to prove that the oil industry receives 14 times more subsidies than—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member for Jonquière for a brief response.

Mr. Mario Simard: Madam Speaker, what Oil Change International says is that, year after year, the government, through EDC, invests a minimum of \$14 billion in the oil and gas sector. What is worse, the Canadian government is not prepared to define what it

Business of Supply

considers a subsidy, so we will never have a real sense of what is going on.

Given the \$14 billion a year invested through EDC and all of the money spent on the Trans Mountain pipeline, I think I would stop talking. I would almost be ashamed if I were from the west.

Mr. Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ): Madam Speaker, I thought it was a nice day today when I got up, obviously because you are presiding over our proceedings. It was also because, when I looked at the NDP's motion, I was pleased to see that it contained the Bloc Québécois's platform. Therefore, this will not be complicated, we will be able to support the motion and everything will go smoothly. In fact, I am certain that the Conservatives and the Liberals will also support it.

However, as we all know, this is not regular practice. The NDP, which has formed a coalition with the government, will probably vote in favour of a budget that is chock full of subsidies for the oil companies. It is a very important vote.

It goes without saying that the motions moved on opposition days are important. The Bloc Québécois takes this seriously, but we know what the government does with our motions. For the government, Parliament appears to be optional. When we move motions about our nation, the French language, and so on, the government listens with one ear and then does whatever it wants.

The real vote will therefore not necessarily be about today's motion, but about the budget, which we know the NDP is going to support. If I were in their shoes, my beard would be much longer, because I would not be able to look at myself in the mirror in the morning to shave, a little like the member for Jonquière or the Minister of Environment and Climate Change.

It goes even further than that. The motion asks that the government exclude oil and gas companies from the tax credit included in the budget that the NDP is voting for. As my colleague from Jonquière mentioned, Quebecers and Canadians are being short-changed by the budget, because they are paying twice. First, they are paying the price of gas at the pump, and we know that the oil industry is currently benefitting from geopolitical circumstances. Second, they are paying for the subsidies.

Let us talk about our Conservative friends. I like them a lot when they say that they want a small government, that we need less government, more freedom, and so on. However, when it comes to the oil sector, we are dealing with oil Stalins and oil Mao Zedongs. All of a sudden, these people sitting here start telling us that government is important and that it should have a big role.

Lenin, here, in Canada, is being asked to set aside \$2.4 billion in subsidies for carbon sequestration this year, next year, the year after that, and for five years, along with another \$1 billion or so for the five years after that. When all is said and done, we will have gone past the 2030 greenhouse gas emission reduction target, but that does not bother the Conservatives.

Business of Supply

It goes even further than that. For example, the hon. member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan rose in the House to say, without a hint of embarrassment—which should not surprise us—that these are not even subsidies. We then had to rise to explain to him that, when an oil company invests \$1 in the technology and the government reimburses 30¢, so that the oil company is paying only 70¢, that is pretty much a subsidy. The Conservatives are so embarrassed to admit it. These oil communists are so ashamed that they want to redefine the words in the dictionary and rewrite the economics textbooks. However, these are typical examples of subsidies.

The last I heard, the Liberal government will be granting Trans Mountain a loan guarantee of over \$10 billion. The Conservatives and the Liberals believe what they are saying. They are telling us that this assistance is not funded by taxpayer dollars because there is no public money involved. I am telling the Liberals and the Conservatives to forget the Fraser Institute and check Cambridge University's catalogue. It contains a landmark book on megaprojects entitled *Megaprojects and Risk*, a scientific tome that very clearly explains that government guarantees for megaprojects are subsidies.

The reason for this is that, when these companies ask for money at the bank, the bank does not risk getting involved in the project on the pretext that it is so flawed that it will cost too much, and the bank will then have to charge a prohibitive interest rate because there are too many risks involved. That is why the companies ask the government to guarantee their project.

One of the main criteria for determining whether a project is flawed and too risky is cost overrun. Consider a project that is supposed to cost \$4 or \$5 billion, but that needs \$12 billion a little later and ends up costing \$22 billion in 2022, or even more later on. It has happened many times that projects guaranteed by the Crown ended up being paid for by taxpayers. That is Economics 101.

• (1225)

Let us talk about inefficient subsidies. Since the Harper era, we have been told that inefficient subsidies will be eliminated, but we still do not know what inefficient subsidies are. I think the government looked at the problem, decided that all subsidies were inefficient and thought about what to do. It opted to not define the term “inefficient subsidy” for the Auditor General so that it could hide behind it. The government did not define it for the opposition or for the Parliamentary Budget Officer to buy time. For the first time this year, they are reducing inefficient subsidies. As everyone knows, they are reducing them by \$9 million.

As a percentage, \$9 million is 0% of the budget. The government is going to pay out \$2.4 billion, but it is reducing funding by \$9 million. It is obvious that they are not taking this seriously. The Liberals tell us that they want to reduce all subsidies, but they are announcing new ones. They forgot to mention that they have been in power since 2015 and have done nothing. All of the subsidies are still there. We are faced with a government that does nothing, and we are faced with a band of oil Stalins who are happy that the government is continuing to invest. That is exactly what is happening.

It is bad news on top of bad news. The oil companies come to committee and we ask them why they do not pay for their own carbon

sequestration technology if it is so good. The oil companies say they have no money, they cannot afford it, they cannot do it. They tell us this straight-faced. The oil companies have good lobbyists. They must be highly trained because they do not even crack a smile.

We have seen it and my colleague mentioned it, as well: quarterly profits of \$3 billion for Suncor, \$1.17 billion for Imperial and \$1.1 billion for TC Energy.

Where can I apply to get problems like that? There are seniors in my riding. The governments of Quebec and the provinces are waiting for transfers. Everyone would be happy with problems like that. Where can I apply? I would like that. My constituents would like that.

The Liberals keep saying that they are investing in the transition, but we should look at their record. We should keep in mind that they were a majority government in 2015. They had four years to do something. Since they have been in power, there has been \$4.5 billion for Trans Mountain and \$2.6 billion for the Trans Mountain expansion, and, as I said, the spending is expected to reach \$22 billion by the end of the year. Incentives for investment in the oil sector in 2018 amounted to \$2.7 billion. Meanwhile, as I keep reminding the House, there is no money for health.

They allocated \$750 million to the emissions reduction fund, but that is not what they are hiding. Since they came to power, the Liberals have done worse than Stephen Harper. The financial support granted to the oil industry by Export Development Canada has reached \$51.7 billion, an amount so large that it is hard to imagine.

That amount is greater than the entire economy of El Salvador or Gabon, which is also an oil country. That amount is greater than the economy of Honduras this year and that of Macau. It is greater than the economy of Madagascar. The money given to oil companies is equivalent to countries' GDPs. It is equivalent to Lebanon's GDP last year. That is what the Liberals are, the great defenders of the transition.

The motion contains nothing for our people. There is nothing for those who need support in the very short term. There is nothing for seniors. There is nothing for farmers. There is nothing for our businesses. On one side of the House, people are talking about the GST. Members opposite vote one way while saying the opposite. There is nothing for our people.

I am pleased that we are studying this motion. I will be voting in favour of it because I agree with the substance, but I believe that we should take this opportunity to reflect on what is written, what we are voting for and also what we will be voting for when the time comes to vote on the budget.

• (1230)

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Madam Speaker, I listened with great interest to the speech by my colleague from Mirabel.

It contrasts with what the Conservatives said earlier about the same motion. They denied that climate change is real. We lived it in British Columbia last year. We experienced the flooding. We experienced the heat—

[English]

Mr. Greg McLean: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, the NDP member is saying something that never actually transpired in this House in this debate at all.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby.

[Translation]

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, the Conservatives denied that climate change is real, and they continue to deny it.

My colleague from Mirabel and the Bloc Québécois recognize that climate change is real. What can we say to members who systematically refuse to acknowledge reality? Canada and the entire planet are suffering the consequences of climate change.

Mr. Jean-Denis Garon: Madam Speaker, climate change is real. It is a documented scientific fact. It is a measurable reality from which none of us will be safe if it gets any worse. That is why every person, member of Parliament, Canadian and citizen of the world must take action.

That is why the Conservatives must acknowledge it. Once they have recognized it, they will have to act accordingly.

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the Bloc is treading a very dangerous line with its coalition partners in blue. They are at opposite ends. I point that out because, quite frankly, it is interesting.

We have the Conservatives who say, “Build more. Do more for oil.” Then we have the Bloc, which seems to recognize that the oil industry and the energy industry as a whole have no place in Canada.

Would the member not acknowledge that there is an energy sector that plays an important role in Canadian society in terms of jobs and so forth, and that within this budget is a green transition, which has historical amounts of money so that we can in fact be respectful and work towards a healthier planet?

• (1235)

[Translation]

Mr. Jean-Denis Garon: Madam Speaker, my grandfather had a fantastic saying: “Be careful not to squeeze the toothpaste out of the tube, because it is awfully hard to get it back in.”

Once again, the hon. member for Winnipeg North is telling us that the future of the oil sector is growth and the extensive use of carbon capture. In his head, that is the solution. He is squeezing the tube of toothpaste so hard that there is toothpaste all over the walls and trying to make us believe he can get it back in the tube.

I am happy not to be the one who has to clean his mirror.

Mr. Greg McLean (Calgary Centre, CPC): Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from the Bloc for his speech.

I would like to know whether he is aware of the amendment to the motion I introduced earlier. The NDP refused to consider the amendment, which would allow us to improve the motion and re-

Business of Supply

view how subsidies are granted in Canada, to one industry rather than another, for example.

Will he support the amendment?

Mr. Jean-Denis Garon: Madam Speaker, I did not read the motion because there was no French version available during the reading and I was unable to consult it.

I see that my colleague is very sensitive to the matter of subsidies and that he spends a lot of time asking how they are calculated. He is wondering whether it is 14:1. One day, I would like him to tell me which he would prefer: 13:1, 12:1 or 11:1. How long will he continue to be an oil Mao Zedong and a communist when it comes to subsidizing the oil industry?

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, this is the first time today that I have had an opportunity to contribute to this debate, which is crucial for the Green Party of Canada.

I totally agree with the hon. member for Mirabel and with the points he raised. I would like to say that only the Quebec government has remained true to the IPCC's principles and concerns. The Quebec government is the only government to have said no to fossil fuel energy and GNL Quebec. I will continue in English.

[English]

It is only Quebec that has signed the Beyond Oil and Gas Alliance globally. I am proud to be a Canadian, but the only part of this country that is trying to protect my future is in Quebec City.

[Translation]

Mr. Jean-Denis Garon: Madam Speaker, no one is perfect, but I am obviously very proud of the efforts made by Quebec and Quebecers.

I am even more proud that you, too, are a member from Quebec, Madam Speaker. When we achieve sovereignty, you will be with us in Quebec's National Assembly.

[English]

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleagues from Victoria and Timmins—James Bay for bringing forward this important motion today. I would like to start off by saying I will be sharing my time with the terrific member of Parliament for Churchill—Keewatinook Aski.

I appreciate the opportunity to rise on this motion. This is an important motion because of what Canadians are living through and what the planet is living through. I would like to start with my personal experience, because I come from the oil and gas sector. I was a refinery worker in Burnaby, B.C., at the Shellburn oil refinery, so I understand the important role oil and gas play in our country's history and the important role they continue to play in our economy.

That being said, also as a British Columbian, I witnessed, as so many other people in British Columbia witnessed last year, the direct and tragic impacts of climate change. We are not talking about years from now; we are talking about a real danger that is manifesting itself now, today.

Business of Supply

Last summer in my riding and across the Lower Mainland, for the first time ever, we had the heat dome that impacted our communities; 600 British Columbians died in that terrible wave of heat. These were seniors, people with disabilities and lower-income people who were in apartments, often with no access to air conditioning. As the heat rose, so did the death toll. Over the course of days, we heard ambulances constantly, throughout our city. In talking with ambulance technicians and paramedics, we know that they were simply overwhelmed by the death toll as the heat dome had a greater and greater impact. People died in their apartments; people died in their beds; people died struggling for air.

This heat dome had a catastrophic impact in the Lower Mainland. Firefighters were brought in because the paramedics were overwhelmed. In both Burnaby and New Westminster, firefighters do an extraordinary job of providing a remarkable service to people in our communities, and they said that if the heat dome had continued for another day or two, the entire emergency response services simply would have been overwhelmed and would have collapsed. That is how bad it was.

We lived through that heat dome, and there is anticipation that it is going to happen again this summer. Climate change is not something we can deny; climate change is not something we can simply set aside. Climate change is real, and it is killing people now in this country, let alone when we talk about around the world and the impacts of climate change. Coming right back to Canada, there is an impact on Canadians that is real and profound.

Following the heat dome, we also lived through a number of other catastrophic climate events, including atmospheric rivers that flooded massive parts of the Lower Mainland, as we well know, and high winds, as well. Terms like “heat domes” and “atmospheric rivers” were unknown to us prior to the climate crisis, but those impacts are felt now and they are felt profoundly.

We are no longer talking about something of which the impacts will be felt maybe in 10 or 20 years. Maybe that was an excuse for inaction, both from previous Conservative governments and the current Liberal government, but there is no excuse now. The impacts are real, and we are feeling them now. The impacts are on lives. The impacts are on crumbling infrastructure. The impacts are on our economy, and those impacts are growing.

There were over \$5 billion in economic costs last year alone, and that number will continue to rise, so when we look at the motion today and the reality of today, with climate change having a profound impact right now and killing Canadians right now, what is the government's response? The response of the government has been to increase oil and gas subsidies to the tune of \$8.6 billion. It does not even make sense, when we know the impact of climate change, to have a government that says this is business as usual and it is going to increase those subsidies.

• (1240)

I do not know what is worse, the climate denial of the Conservatives or the complete climate inaction of the Liberals. Both are bad, and both have had a profound impact. The government's refusal to act, either because it is in denial or because it simply does not want to act, has a profound impact on our country.

We talk about a situation in which there are massive subsidies to the industry. At the same time as there are massive subsidies to the industry, the kinds of actions that would help us contend with the climate crisis are not being taken. This is probably the key aspect of the motion that is before us today, that Canada spends 14 times more on financial support to the fossil fuel sector than it does for renewable energy.

Other countries around the world are making that transition now. As I have seen in the past as an energy worker, they are putting into place just transition strategies so that energy workers are trained for the clean energy jobs of tomorrow. That is not happening in Canada because of the massive subsidies going to the oil and gas sector, to the detriment of everything else. I have met with companies that are innovating in clean energy and workers who want to go into clean energy, and the big obstacle in Canada is that all of these sectors are starved for funding because 14 times more is going to oil and gas CEOs than is going to the clean energy sector. Companies have to move out of Canada; they are simply not getting the financing, because the current government, like the previous government, refuses to put just transition in place and refuses to adequately finance clean energy and the clean energy sector.

Therefore, we have a situation in which massive amounts of money, a firehose of money, \$8.6 billion last year alone, are trained on oil and gas CEOs while the clean energy sector is literally starving for funds in the midst of a climate crisis that is killing Canadians, including my constituents. This makes absolutely no sense at all.

Let us add another element. At the same time as we are seeing these massive subsidies being given to the oil and gas sector and record levels of profit, we see the gouging of Canadians at the pump. We have seen this before. Every time there is an international crisis in the oil and gas sector, curiously all the prices rise. As the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives has pointed out numerous times, in numerous credible and well-documented studies, what we see when there is an international crisis is that the price goes up at the pump even when the price per barrel has remained stable on old stock. Then, when the crisis is over, the prices come down and the new stock has a reduced barrel price, we still see the high level of gas prices and millions of dollars taken out of the pockets of Canadian consumers each and every year by gas price gouging. The NDP has spoken to this. The member for Windsor West has proposed a gas prices review board. There are numerous ways we can tackle this, but both the previous Conservative and current Liberal governments absolutely refuse to defend consumers against this gas price gouging that takes place.

All of these elements are in the motion today. What we are suggesting is that we end the subsidies. We have to provide supports for Canadians struggling with the high cost of living, including my constituents, and we need to put into place investments in renewable energy.

• (1245)

[Translation]

We need to stop subsidizing the oil sector. We need to implement and invest in clean energy. Canada lags far behind other countries in this respect.

We need to help Canadians who are fighting unjustified price hikes in a sector that is used to doing whatever it wants. Neither the Liberals nor the Conservatives really want to defend Canadian consumers.

That is why it is important to adopt this motion. I support it fully and I ask that all members of the House vote in favour of it. It is a major shift that will help consumers and our planet.

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would ask my colleague to provide his thoughts on something Andrew Weaver said. We hear a lot about what the government's performance has been like. Andrew Weaver, the former leader of the Green Party in B.C., commented on the 2021 platform that the Liberals put forward to Canadians: "I am a climate scientist and a parent, and I have spent my life working on climate science policy and solutions. The science is clear. Urgent action is required to mitigate the worst aspects of the climate crisis and to get to net-zero emissions by 2050. The Liberal Party of Canada's climate plan is both bold and thoughtful. It is the only credible science-aligned climate plan put forward by any political party at the federal level to date."

We, as a government, have invested historic highs. We are talking about hundreds of millions, going into multiple billions of dollars, into a just green transition. I wonder if my colleague could provide his thoughts on how important it was that the Government of Canada invested those billions of dollars for a green transition.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, that is exactly the point. I am so pleased that the member asked the question. It is exactly the difference between having a piece of paper that says good things and actually doing what is required. It is the action, not the words. It is not about the Liberals having a great platform; it is about the reality. If Mr. Weaver had been told that after the election the Liberals would jack up those oil and gas subsidies and starve the clean energy sector to death, giving 14 times more to oil and gas than to clean energy, Mr. Weaver would not have been on that podium at that event.

It is not the words, but the action that counts, and we need action now because the planet is burning.

• (1250)

Mr. Greg McLean (Calgary Centre, CPC): Madam Speaker, in his speech, my colleague talked about the subsidies given to the oil and gas sector, and then he talked about the investments the government makes, including in dental care, which his party is taking a grand foray saying that it is responsible for in a \$52-billion deficit that the government is foisting on Canadians and that our children are going to have to pay for. I would like the member to tell this House what the difference in his mind is between a subsidy and an investment and whether they are fungible in some respects.

Business of Supply

Perhaps he could reconsider the amendment to the motion that I put on the table and say that maybe we need to compare these things so that there is no more language that muddles the two in this respect.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, let us talk about subsidies. Let us talk about TMX. The private sector was walking away from it, but the Liberals, with the support of the Conservatives, said that in 24 hours they would come up with \$4.5 billion to buy the pipeline. It turns out, as the PBO said, that it was \$1 billion more than it was even worth. Subsequent to that, we have seen tens of billions of dollars poured into TMX, and the Parliamentary Budget Officer again said this is simply not a project that will ever return on investment the money that has been poured in from the public sector. Now we have a loan guarantee of an additional \$10 billion, so over \$30 billion has been poured into TMX, which will never return that money to taxpayers. Why do the Conservatives not speak out against that abuse of public funds?

[Translation]

Ms. Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from New Westminster—Burnaby for his speech. I really feel for the people of British Columbia who have had to deal with the terrible, direct effects of climate change.

The member says he wants to go the extra mile to protect our environment, so how can he support a budget and a government that continue to perpetuate greenwashing, trying to convince us that "environment" and "Bay du Nord" go hand in hand and that "green oil" exists? This is brainwashing, and it is wrong.

If my colleague really wants to do something for the environment, perhaps his party should stop supporting the budget. I marched with Mothers Step In on Mother's Day this year. They are very disappointed with the Conservatives for denying climate change, with the Liberals for not doing enough and with the party supporting it.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, that is precisely the point. We have forced the government to introduce a just transition bill.

We are an opposition party, but we are forcing the government to act. That is why we have brought forward this motion today, to force the government to act. That is our role in this Parliament.

[English]

Ms. Niki Ashton (Churchill—Keewatinook Aski, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise to debate our NDP motion to call on the Liberal government once again to end subsidies to its buddies in big oil. The best time to do this was years ago. The second best time to do it is today.

Business of Supply

Time is running out, yet the Liberals continue to hold on to the strange idea that we are just another couple of billion dollars to big oil away from solving the climate crisis. It is wrong, and they know it is wrong, but they continue to maintain this fallacy and hope no one will notice that they are doing the opposite of what they are saying.

They may say they care about reversing catastrophic climate change, but they do not get to say they care while propping up the same companies that are wrecking our environment with our tax dollars to fund their bonuses. They do not get to say they care when Cenovus recently announced its best first-quarter profit ever, raking in almost a billion more than it did one year ago, or Imperial Oil tripling its 2021 earnings, or Suncor quadrupling its. These companies are not self-made. They are doing it with the government's help and with our tax dollars.

Meanwhile, it is workers, indigenous peoples, young people and northerners who are paying the price in every way while the government sits back. These are the people who are getting ripped off at the pump and may no longer be able to even afford to drive to their jobs, or are struggling to pay rent or pay for groceries, people who are consistently left behind by a government that likes to cosplay as the plucky hero saving the environment.

It is not heroic to give billions to big oil. It is not brave. It is not challenging the status quo. It is the status quo, and it is going to get our planet destroyed.

It is funny. The government regularly talks about listening to science, but it rarely does so when it comes to climate change. The IPCC has been clear on the need to end oil subsidies, yet the government pretends that this is not the case. The IPCC has said that countries like Canada need to increase investments in renewables by at least a factor of three to meet our climate goals, yet the government still has not done this.

It goes without saying that I would never accuse members of the government of misleading the House or even Canadians while in the chamber, but it does beg the question, what would we call a government that says it is tackling climate change by giving billions to big oil? What do we call a government that presents itself as an environmental champion on the international stage and to the public while consistently missing every target it has ever set? I will leave that question to Canadians.

The facts are clear. Canada has the worst record in the G20, handing out 14 times more financing to the oil and gas sector than to renewables. It is no surprise that big oil has always had the ear of the government, which I guess is easy to do when the government has had 6,800 recorded meetings with big oil. It has worked, having successfully lobbied the Liberals for a \$2.6-billion tax credit for unproven carbon capture technologies that allow them to justify increased production and higher emissions.

In total, the government gave \$8.6 billion last year to oil companies already raking in record profits. It is always the same with the government: help for those at the top and nice words for everyone else.

Those words have been nice. In 2019, we heard about the just transition act. The government failed to deliver, and the environ-

ment commissioner recently had to call it out over its lack of a plan to support workers and communities through the transition to a low-carbon economy.

At COP26 in November, we heard nice words again from the government, to phase out public financing of the fossil fuel sector. We heard nice words in the mandate letters for the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, the Minister of the Environment and Climate Change and the Minister of Natural Resources. Every single one had nice words about phasing out public subsidies for big oil, but recent testimony from Finance and ECCC officials at the environment committee showed that it is not much more than nice words.

Let us be clear. Nice words do not help people afford their basic needs. Nice words will not stop the climate catastrophe.

My home is here in northern Manitoba, where long drives between communities are a daily reality of life. People here in Thompson regularly drive eight hours to our capital, Winnipeg, to pick up supplies and things they need. For many surrounding communities, Thompson is where many people come in for health care, to access other services, to pick up groceries and to shop for necessities. This morning, the cost of gas here in Thompson was \$1.85; in Cross Lake, \$1.89; in Lynn Lake, \$2; in Churchill, \$2.56.

● (1255)

How are people expected to have money left over for anything else when gassing up costs this much? Where do these people turn? Who is standing up for them?

A better way does exist. It is not too late for the government to reverse course from the path toward climate disaster it has put us on. It starts with ending subsidies to big oil and reinvesting that money toward both renewable energy and help for Canadians struggling with the cost of living. This is what our motion calls for today.

There is no reason the Liberals cannot start by eliminating tax credits for oil and gas exploration and development immediately. This would bring in almost \$10 billion in the next four years. We ought to include profitable oil and gas companies in the Canada recovery dividend to tax their excess profits and redistribute that money to help Canadians struggling to get by. We must suspend the GST on residential energy bills, double the GST tax credit and increase the Canada child benefit for all recipients now.

I urge this House to support our motion, but there is so much we need to be doing. We must go further. We must do more.

My other question is, why have we not activated all the tools at our disposal, like our Crown corporations, and used public ownership in the fight against climate change? Why have we not made the types of investments necessary to support communities in need to fight back?

Indigenous peoples and northerners are already paying the price for climate change. How many catastrophic floods or fires before we take it seriously? How many evacuated communities, destroyed homes and livelihoods gone before we finally do what we need to do to save people, communities and our planet?

It seems that every year somewhere in the country there are record temperatures, floods or forest fires. Every evacuation, every destroyed community is a proverbial canary in the coal mine of climate change. Communities are crying out as they are being destroyed by our indifference. The worst part is that as long as we continue to give billions of dollars to big oil, we are subsidizing our own destruction. Every climate disaster, flood or fire is on our hands. We are doing this.

Today we are witnessing here in our part of the country the devastating flooding in Peguis First Nation, a community to which the current government and governments before it promised they would fund flood mitigation efforts, a promise unmet. Now, Peguis is dealing with the catastrophic impacts: a total evacuation of the community of over 1,870 members, and more than 700 homes impacted. We are talking about a community that has flooded five times in the last 16 years. It knows how to deal with floods, but it is getting worse.

The feds and the province may show up with sandbags, but when it comes to long-term support, the federal government has been nowhere to be seen. When asked about this by the CBC, the federal government refused to commit to long-term supports, leaving communities like Peguis in the lurch. Why? Imagine if there was a place for communities like Peguis to turn to in order to get the funding they need for the infrastructure they know they need that would help with climate change adaptation and mitigation efforts.

My bill, Bill C-245, an act to amend the Canada Infrastructure Bank Act, is motivated by the communities in my riding and across the country that have nowhere to turn to get the support they need to survive climate change. This is about standing with communities. It is ultimately about saving lives.

If this House is truly serious about supporting indigenous and northern communities, if we are truly serious about taking on catastrophic climate change, I invite all members to stand with communities like the ones I represent by supporting this bill when the time

Business of Supply

comes. For too long, this House, the government, has shown its loyalty to those at the top, those who need the least amount of help.

It is time this House, the government, stood with everyone else. It is time the government stopped being part of the problem and started being part of the solution. It is not too late, but soon it will be. Let us get to work now.

● (1300)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, throughout the debate thus far I have often made reference to the hundreds of millions of dollars invested by this government into the green transition. The member made reference to the Canada Infrastructure Bank, which has done some fantastic work. One of the things is in the community of Brampton, for example, where a considerable amount of money is flowing through the Infrastructure Bank that will enable electric buses to that municipality, and there will be more projects toward a green transition over the next number of years.

Does the New Democratic Party support the efforts of the Canada Infrastructure Bank?

Ms. Niki Ashton: Madam Speaker, it is pretty rich to hear the Liberals defending the Canada Infrastructure Bank. Not one of its projects has seen completion. It is sitting on \$35 billion and has been around for over five years now. There is not much to point to, except for projects that it is interested in or is approving.

As I expect my colleague to know, the reality is that first nations and northern communities have been consistently left out from many pockets of infrastructure funding, including at the Infrastructure Bank, and they are paying the highest cost of climate change. We can look at Peguis First Nation. It knows what it needs and it has been clear with the federal government, but the federal government is nowhere to be seen when it comes to long-term mitigation efforts. This is not acceptable.

The Infrastructure Bank ought to be part of the solution, and the federal government needs to step up with some sense of urgency to support Peguis and first nations and northern communities that are already paying the price of climate change.

● (1305)

Mr. John Williamson (New Brunswick Southwest, CPC): Madam Speaker, I have a question for the member. We are hearing the NDP speak out of both sides of its mouth. The member, maybe in a moment of honesty, said she is concerned about high gas prices. This morning, I asked the member for Timmins—James Bay about gas after he said we cannot have affordable gas prices, and he got up and he said that was wrong—

Business of Supply

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I have to interrupt the hon. member for a point of order.

The hon. member for Timmins—James Bay.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Madam Speaker, I ask the member to show some dignity and not lie in the House. I did not say—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): We do not use such words in the House of Commons. The hon. member is asking a question and referring to an earlier question in the debate.

The hon. member for New Brunswick Southwest.

Mr. John Williamson: Madam Speaker, this is what qualifies as not being honest in the House, apparently. One moment the member says that we cannot have affordable, cheap gasoline, and when he is called on it, he says that he did not say that. In fact, it is exactly what the NDP is saying.

What is the NDP's position? Does the NDP want high gasoline prices, which means Canadians are going to pay, or does it want gasoline prices to come down so that Canadians get a break and we have affordable prices?

Ms. Niki Ashton: Madam Speaker, I would welcome the Conservative member to take a closer look at our opposition day motion and what we are proposing. I invite him to support our motion, which is standing up for Canadians in the face of the affordability crisis and climate crisis they are facing.

I am not surprised, and am highly unimpressed, by the theatre we are seeing from the Conservative Party, a party that consistently refuses to accept the reality of climate change. It is 2022. It is here. It is ravaging our communities, including communities that Conservatives represent. It is time to get on board and support solutions in the face of climate change that are focused on saving lives. I invite them to join us right now to get to work.

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Madam Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for her speech.

I really enjoyed the message she conveyed, but some of the technical details do not add up.

My colleague talked about the fact that the government is a good friend to the oil companies. She also talked about all the nice words and the fact that action is needed. It is such a shame, but I am going to have to tell her about her friends in the government and advise her that she is now part of the nice words club.

We are going to see lots of great clips on the NDP members' social media about their amazing motion. We support the motion because it reflects our values. However, in a few days, they are going to vote in favour of a budget that gives billions of dollars to the oil industry and that approves the Bay du Nord development project. What is more, the budget will invest \$2.4 billion in GHG capture projects that do not even work.

I would like her to explain why she supports the budget.

Ms. Niki Ashton: Madam Speaker, today's motion clearly demonstrates the NDP's position.

We hope that the Bloc Québécois will support us. It is clear that the Liberals' actions are not only disappointing, but also part of the problem. That is for sure. Canadians expect more than just nice words; they want real action on climate change.

[English]

Mr. John Aldag (Cloverdale—Langley City, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I will be splitting my time today with my hon. colleague from Beaches—East York.

I would like to thank our hon. colleague from Victoria for this opportunity to discuss Canada's climate plan. It is a plan that, as Canadians, we should be very proud of.

I will say at the outset that we as Liberals share the member's objective: a clean and just energy transition that does everything possible to shield our planet from the climate change threat. However, her motion's wording illustrates where we differ, and I will be speaking about that today.

As the member opposite knows, our government is committed to achieving a 40% to 45% emissions reduction by 2030 and reaching net-zero emissions by 2050. We have also promised to phase out inefficient fossil fuel subsidies. This is our first area of disagreement, because we do not consider inefficient subsidies to be any of the measures we are using to cut emissions.

This brings me to our second difference of opinion. Unlike her party, the NDP, we support the development of carbon capture, use and storage technology. This technology involves the removal or capture of carbon from industrial processes or even directly from our atmosphere in order to make our planet livable.

However, first, I will put my comments in proper context, because carbon capture is just one tool among many in our climate plan's broad tool box to cut emissions across Canada's economy.

Our plan starts with putting a price on pollution. It also includes using regulatory investment and tax measures to incent the transition to cleaner options, like electric vehicles. The bottom line is that we are looking at all options, because despite wishful thinking in some quarters, there is no single, magical solution that will appear to resolve this existential challenge. Even clean energy sources such as wind and solar, while crucial, are not enough to get us to net zero. That is why we are encouraging all tools, including carbon capture technologies, which will be especially important for major pollution sources like the oil sands or chemical industries.

Carbon capture technologies have been developing through most of the century, but they remain expensive and are only used on a relatively small scale. I will cite some promising examples in Canada shortly. However, first I want to make the point that our government is far from alone in supporting this innovation.

Let us consider the latest report from the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the one that came with a stark warning from the UN Secretary-General that without urgent action now, the planet is on a “fast track to...disaster”. The IPCC made clear that carbon capture technology is particularly important, and not just to get the planet closer to net zero. It also noted that even if the world reaches our net-zero 2050 objective, direct removal from the atmosphere may be needed to limit global warming.

I will cite a comment from The Guardian newspaper by Robert Gross, director of the United Kingdom's Energy Research Centre. He said, “We will need not just net zero but to start to remove CO₂ from the air. We cannot do one instead of the other, but we have reached the point where it is likely that humanity will need to do both to avoid dangerous climate change.” This illustrates how important it is for us to invest in carbon capture technology.

The IPCC's position is echoed by other respected organizations. Just consider the Paris-based International Energy Agency. Its net-zero road map would require carbon capture to account for roughly 15% of global emission reductions.

Another respected global voice on climate is the International Renewable Energy Agency. It has stated that even a very aggressive ramping up of renewables will not be sufficient. That is why it considers carbon capture essential.

Finally, I will point out the Canadian Climate Institute. It also views carbon capture and removal as playing a potentially significant role in our net-zero pathway.

This is why carbon capture is a part of our recently published 2030 emissions reduction plan. It is a blueprint that outlines the technology's economy-wide applications in its sector-by-sector path for Canada to reach our targets. The fact is, we believe that carbon capture can help tackle emissions from the toughest-to-abate but crucial sectors of Canada's economy, such as oil and gas and heavy industry. More importantly, it also opens the door to low-carbon pathways, such as hydrogen, green concrete and low-emissions power.

Carbon capture also presents a multi-billion dollar market opportunity. In hydrogen alone, I note that Germany's ambassador recently described Canada as a potential hydrogen superpower. Carbon capture will play a key role in helping us produce clean hydrogen.

● (1310)

As I indicated earlier, this is not just about potential. Canada has long been an innovation leader. In fact, Canada is already home to leading carbon capture companies, five of which made the 2022 Global Cleantech 100 list of innovative global clean-tech firms.

We have to push harder, and that is why Canada is implementing measures that will help drive the carbon capture market here even further. Budget 2021, for instance, included \$319 million to support research, development and demonstrations of carbon capture, use and storage technologies. Budget 2022 includes a proposed new investment tax credit for companies that invest in these projects. The credit is a key part of our government's broader plan to work with industry toward the goal of decarbonization. This plan was de-

Business of Supply

signed after consultations with the public, stakeholders and the provinces and territories. It is intended to drive the growth of Canadian carbon capture, use and storage technologies in industries from steel and plastics to fuels and hydrogen.

In addition, our government has been engaging with key partners and stakeholders to develop a comprehensive carbon capture strategy for Canada. We plan to release this strategy in the coming months.

I indicated earlier that I would cite some real-world examples, and in doing so I will note that our government has worked arm in arm with the Alberta government and the private sector to make inroads in this area.

One is the Alberta carbon trunk line capture and storage project, the world's largest of its kind. The Government of Canada is supporting the project with \$30 million through the clean energy fund, as well as \$33 million from the ecoENERGY technology initiative.

Another success story is Shell Canada's Quest project. Since 2015, this project, which received early funding from Natural Resources Canada, has been reducing emissions at Shell's Scotford upgrader by 1.1 megatonnes per year. Quest remains one of the most successful carbon capture projects in the world.

I would also draw members' attention to our \$8-billion net-zero accelerator fund. It contributed \$25 million to support Svante, a B.C. company developing carbon capture technology for industrial applications like cement and blue hydrogen.

Canada's petroleum industry is one of the most innovative in the world. It found a way to extract oil from sand in northern Alberta and to tap wealth under the ocean floor in the treacherous North Atlantic. I believe carbon capture holds similar potential for world-class innovation, allowing Canada's economy to thrive by helping us deliver cleaner energy while driving toward our net-zero target.

That is why I believe we need to continue to work on developing carbon capture, use and storage technologies in Canada, and it is why I am proud of the plan the government has to support this important innovation to get us to the net-zero 2050 plan.

Business of Supply

• (1315)

Mr. Greg McLean (Calgary Centre, CPC): Madam Speaker, that was a great speech. I am really glad that my colleague on the other side of the House gave a speech that talked about the importance of carbon capture, utilization and storage in our economy, and how important a part of the budget it is. However, I will remind him that it goes nowhere as far as making Canada competitive with carbon capture regimes around the world, including the United States and Norway, with whom we compete.

Why are we not competitive with those two very important environmental jurisdictions? Also, why is this carbon capture credit not in the budget implementation bill? That is what we are debating in the House. If it is so important, why are we not advancing this more quickly and in a more competitive way than we are currently?

Mr. John Aldag: Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my hon. colleague for the work he does on our natural resources committee. He is a huge advocate for the oil and gas sector and has made many great contributions to our discussions about the transition we are making to green and clean technologies and a net-zero economy.

To his question, through the investments we are making, we are trying to advance Canada's innovation so that we can be a leader on the global front. We want to be the most competitive and most innovative so that we can sell these technologies to help solve a global crisis. It is through the investments we are making, and that I hope we will continue to make, that we will be able to make the achievements and inroads that are needed.

As far as funding goes, I will be advocating for it, as I think members across the House will be, to make sure the government delivers on the commitments we are making so that we have the investments to fuel the innovations we really need.

[Translation]

Mr. Mario Simard (Jonquière, BQ): Madam Speaker, I listened closely to my colleague, and I have some reservations. I do not think it is right to use science only when it serves one's purposes.

A group of 400 academics wrote that carbon capture is not a good idea for the oil and gas sector. A number of experts told us in committee that carbon capture could meet the needs of cement factories or heavy industrial processes, but it is a pipe dream for the oil and gas sector.

I would like to know whether my colleague agrees with these 400 experts that carbon capture should apply only to very specific sectors but not the oil and gas sector.

• (1320)

[English]

Mr. John Aldag: Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague across the aisle for his work on the natural resources committee. He is a huge advocate for the many files that we are working on at that committee.

To his point, we need to look at the science and the evidence and to listen to the experts out there, but we also need to continue to push on innovation. It is something that Canada has demonstrated: that we have the know-how to solve world-class problems. Al-

though there may be challenges right now with the technology on the kind of mass commercial scale we need in the oil and gas sector for carbon capture, I do not think we need to give up and throw our hands in the air and say it cannot be done.

This is where government support for that continued innovation can happen. There are other experts who say that we can get there. It is going to take time and investments and collaboration across industries, and perhaps even countries, to land where we need to be. This is the sort of support we need and direction that our government is headed in.

Mr. Nathaniel Erskine-Smith (Beaches—East York, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I want to begin by saying that I appreciate the spirit of the motion and, for the most part, I also agree with it in substance. There is one particular point of contention that I will get to, but first I will start with where I agree.

The motion notes that oil and gas companies are making record profits at the same time as Canadians are paying more than ever for gas at the pumps. We have seen Suncor's profits more than triple in a year. Canadian Natural Resources more than doubled its year-over-year first-quarter numbers, and Imperial Oil saw its best first quarter in 30 years. It goes on and on. The shortage of global crude oil, driven by the Russian invasion of Ukraine, has led to significant new profit for these companies.

In answer, the motion highlights the need to speed up our transition to clean energy and also to help Canadians struggling with the high cost of living. It seems reasonable enough, and there are many specific ways to accomplish these general goals. We could see additional financial support for clean energy infrastructure and additional support for skills training for the jobs we will increasingly rely upon. There are many ways to support Canadians in need, and I would highlight the need to deliver on the Canada disability benefit as one example. To pay for some of this, including skills training and clean energy infrastructure, I would have supported a call for a windfall tax on oil and gas profits.

As the environment minister has rightly said recently, for example, these companies are making record profits and they should be investing some of them into ensuring that they have a future. Instead, the motion calls for the government to stop using Canadian taxpayers' money to subsidize and finance the oil and gas sector and to reinvest that money in the transition and in supporting struggling Canadians. Again, in general this is certainly worthy of support.

The motion rightly calls out the public financing provided through Crown corporations such as Export Development Canada. Let us pause for a moment to delve into the work of the International Institute for Sustainable Development. It has acknowledged that federal financing via subsidies amounts to about \$2 billion a year, but there is a very large sum that is contributed via public financing. In a recent scorecard ranking G20 levels of support provided to fossil fuels, Canada ranked last among OECD countries by providing the highest amount of support. The IISD estimate is that Canada provides an average of \$13.2 billion in support for oil and gas every year via EDC, representing over 12% of the financing committed by that institution. About 30% of that financing goes toward domestic operations of Canadian oil and gas companies. That obviously needs to change.

EDC, in its Canada account, has financed the government's acquisition and construction of TMX, which should also change and, frankly, should not have happened the way it has. It is impossible to see how TMX is economically feasible at this point, with the total project cost ballooning to well over \$20 billion. Even back in December 2020, the PBO briefed parliamentarians and noted that the Trans Mountain expansion would not be profitable if we took additional climate action. Subsequently, there has been a lot of additional climate action, including much greater stringency around our carbon pricing. There is no clear explanation as to how the project is a worthwhile financial investment in a world that reduces emissions consistent with net-zero. It is past time we put a stop to public financing and, unfortunately, recently again, we have seen an additional \$10-billion loan that is an effective subsidy in the form of protection against credit risk. If Canada expended the same sum toward renewable energy that we have and will expend on TMX, we would all be better off, including workers who will inevitably be affected by the global transition.

Despite my frustration with public financing, including of TMX, it is impossible to ignore the progress we have made since 2015. When this government took office in 2015, projected 2030 emissions were 815 megatons. Fast forward to the first-ever emissions-reduction plan and, if all of the policies hold and if a future government does not roll them back, those projected 2030 emissions have moved from 815 megatons to 443 megatons. There is still more work to be done, including phasing out fossil fuel subsidies and addressing public financing.

In our most recent platform, and in the mandate letters of the ministers, Canadians will see that we have committed to accelerate our G20 commitment to eliminate fossil fuel subsidies from 2025 to 2023, and we have also committed to develop a plan to phase out public financing. It is not soon enough, but important nonetheless, to phase out public financing of the fossil fuel sector, including from Crown corporations, consistent with our commitment to reach net-zero emissions by 2050. We have also committed to a more stringent cap that I would say we take more seriously on oil and gas sector emissions.

Where I part ways with the motion's sponsor is with respect to carbon capture utilization and storage. The motion casts the CCUS investment tax credit as a problematic fossil fuel subsidy by calling for the government to exclude oil and gas companies from the \$2.6-billion budget allocation: a budget allocation that is over five years.

Business of Supply

The CCUS investment tax credit is not universally supported. There are some legitimate criticisms to consider and take seriously.

• (1325)

At the same time, there are many thoughtful experts who support encouraging investment in this space. The Canadian version of the policy has rightly excluded enhanced oil recovery, such that eligible projects cannot be used to squeeze more oil out of the ground. According to the Grantham Institute, CCUS could be an essential technology for tackling climate change. The recent IPCC report includes a specific section on the emerging technology. The committee on climate change in the U.K., a model for our net-zero advisory body in a serious way, has called it “a vital technology essential to reducing greenhouse gas emissions across the economy”.

Carbon capture may not be a cure-all for the global climate challenge, but it has a major role to play in decarbonizing heavy industry. In Canada, where industrial emissions make up over a third of total emissions, it can play an even greater role than in other countries.

Those are not my words. Those are the words of a research associate at the Oxford Institute for Energy Studies.

The International Energy Agency, in its net-zero report of last year, notes that CCUS can facilitate the transition to net-zero CO₂ emissions:

by tackling emissions from existing assets, providing a way to address emissions from some of the most challenging sectors; providing a cost-effective pathway to scale up low-carbon hydrogen production rapidly; and allowing for CO₂ removal from the atmosphere...

This is again from the report:

Government R and D spending needs to be increased and reprioritized. Critical areas such as electrification, hydrogen, bioenergy and carbon capture, utilization and storage (CCUS) today receive only around one-third of the level of public R and D funding of the more established low-carbon electricity generation and energy efficiency technologies.

In that same report, in its 1.5° scenario, the IEA estimates that the world will still use about 25 million barrels per day, or a quarter of current usage. However, these are not for combustion purposes, but for non-combustion applications such as petrochemicals, lubricants, solvents, waxes, etc. The IEA forecasted the demand for natural gas in 2050 would be half of what it is today, again for non-combustion.

Business of Supply

Yes, unquestionably, we need to reduce fossil fuel use. Unquestionably, we need to remove public financing from the fossil fuel sector, especially as it relates to combustion, but we also need to ensure that the extraction and production of oil and gas, to the extent that it is going to continue, is net-zero. It will continue even up to 2050.

I want to dismiss objections here. Many experts, led by Canada research chair and University of Victoria professor Christina Hoicka, said:

Deploying CCUS at any climate-relevant scale, carried out within the short time frame we have to avert climate catastrophe without posing substantial risks to communities on the front lines of the buildout, is a pipe dream...

Perhaps they will be proven right. It may be that the technology ultimately fails, and that the \$2.6 billion in public financing over the next five years goes with it. My own view is that we need to take every moon shot that we can, given the scale of the crisis. We are doing so much, and this is another arrow in our quiver.

While the policy is designed for clues, and enhanced oil recovery ensures that companies invest a significant amount of their own capital and will require anyone who claims the policy to complete a climate-related financial disclosure report, I can also appreciate the frustration when federal funds are encouraging investment from companies that are currently flush with cash, even if the investment is for a worthwhile end. For me, the objection that lands most seriously is that a CCUS-specific tax credit pushes companies to invest in that particular technology over others that may well be more deserving of support and it may distort investment decisions away from other decisions that make more sense, whether company-specific, sector-specific or economy-wide.

I think there are challenges we want to take seriously, but when it comes to federal support for tackling climate change, we have the carbon pricing regime, our effort to phase out coal-fired electricity, our efforts to reduce methane emissions, including increasingly stringent policies to do so and, finally, our effort in the most recent platform and in mandate letters to cap oil and gas sector emissions. We have our investments: historic investments in public transit, and on and on. There is so much that we are doing and so much more, of course, that we need to do, but emphasizing and battling around the CCUS is, I think, misplaced. Absolutely, we should address public financing. We should do some more seriously and criticism is warranted there, but let us not fight about the CCUS investment tax credit, which is encouraging investment in a space that sorely needs that investment.

To close, I would just say that if the motion were amended to remove that specific element, it would be worthy of my support.

• (1330)

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Madam Speaker, I listened with great interest to my hon. colleague. I guess I question some of the assertions he is making, given the \$20 billion his government has put into building the TMX pipeline because there was no case for it in the private sector. This is to export oil, which will not be counted as part of Canada's net-zero emissions.

The Canadian Energy Regulator estimates that the amount of oil being taken out of the ground and exported in Canada in 2050 will

be equivalent to what it was in 2019. I do not see how the Liberals can talk about an emissions cap when they are actually talking about an increase in production of \$1.2 million barrels a day, from a sector whose oil sands are considered to have the highest carbon footprint on the planet.

How does he justify TMX, exports and the fact that the Liberals are looking to have more than a million barrels a day coming out of the ground, right up to 2050?

Mr. Nathaniel Erskine-Smith: Madam Speaker, I am not going to justify federal investment in TMX. I am not going to justify EDC's role in financing TMX and other fossil fuel infrastructure.

What I will emphasize, though, is the importance of the overall emissions reduction plan and the serious climate action that we have seen over the last six and a half years. This is such critical action that climate experts overwhelmingly endorsed the Liberal plan in the last election. As an example, Andrew Weaver, the former B.C. Green Party leader and climate scientist, called the recent emissions reduction plan tabled just last month, an "outstanding plan", saying "Canada [has reclaimed] international leadership on climate file."

There are reasons for criticism, but overwhelmingly, I think there are reasons for optimism.

Mrs. Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Madam Speaker, I really appreciate the conversation around carbon capture and underground storage. As the member may know, in Estevan, Saskatchewan, this whole process, the very first in the world, was developed, and it was done with coal, which is the hardest to function with. Since its opening, 4,402,000,073 tonnes of carbon dioxide have been stored underground just from that one location. Now the knowledge is there and the innovation has been done, so to go forward and do this in other areas of resources will cost far less.

I just do not understand. I would ask the member to clarify for me why, in light of the facts that the reality is the world will still need oil for the next, as they say, 20, 30 or 40 years, and the best product, the most ethical and clean, is in Canada, why would we not want to draw what still exists from oil wells, rather than increase carbon emissions by creating more wells and get more oil from other sources than what is already there?

Mr. Nathaniel Erskine-Smith: Madam Speaker, I would say that there will be a role for oil and gas. I noted that by 2050, that role will be for non-combustion purposes principally. Certainly we are going to see a steady decline over the coming decades in the production and use of oil and gas, especially for combustion purposes.

I suppose my answer is simply to say that I do not have the same challenges with our country as a producer as I would with a regime like Russia, for example. We are rightly prohibiting Russian oil and gas for good reason, but we also need to transition very quickly. We need to support that transition and make sure that we support our workers and our society in a future that is ultimately going to be net zero by 2050.

• (1335)

[Translation]

Mr. Mario Simard (Jonquière, BQ): Madam Speaker, I listened closely to my colleague, and I picked up on some serious contradictions.

He concluded his speech with the assertion that we should not challenge the \$2.4 billion set aside for carbon capture. However, during his speech, he said that, from a technical perspective, carbon capture may not be feasible, as many experts have said, but that we need to roll the dice anyway. I have not seen a whole lot of \$2.4 billion die rolls in my time.

Does my colleague agree that it would be much more responsible to invest that money in clean energy, such as green hydrogen, wind energy and hydroelectricity, which are all low-carbon power sources that have proven their worth?

[English]

Mr. Nathaniel Erskine-Smith: Madam Speaker, the best argument is around opportunity costs and saying we should invest this money elsewhere, but my point is that there are many experts who do support CCUS technology, and when we look at the scale of the challenge, we should be examining and embracing every single opportunity to address climate change and reduce emissions. CCUS is one such option. We should not ignore it, and we definitely should not undermine it.

Ms. Heather McPherson (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Madam Speaker, I will be splitting my time today with the member for South Okanagan—West Kootenay.

I would like to start by thanking the member for Victoria for bringing forward this motion and the member for Timmins—James Bay for the incredible work he has done on fossil fuel subsidies.

Canadians spend more tax dollars propping up the fossil fuel industry than any other country in the developed world, with an average of around \$14 billion per year in subsidies before the massive COVID-19 orphan well bailout. The question is why. What do we as Canadian taxpayers get for all of this money? Where does this money go?

From 2014-21, corporate profits in the oil and gas sector in Canada rose steadily, seeing an all-time high of \$445 billion in 2021. Public subsidies were a significant factor in those record high profits, adding nearly \$100 billion over this time to these multinational corporations' bottom lines.

In March 2022, Topaz Energy announced an 8% increase to its quarterly dividend, the company's third such increase since launching its dividend program in 2020. In October 2021, Suncor doubled its quarterly dividend for shareholders, and just last week the oil

Business of Supply

sands company announced a more than threefold increase in profits in the first three months of this year.

While this is great news for the Americans, the Chinese and other shareholders who own these companies, it is not good news for Albertans. It is not good news for Canadians. While Canadian taxpayers are underwriting these corporation dividends to shareholders, they are laying off workers. During this same period of time, while these massive multinational corporations were soaking up Canadian taxpayers' largesse, the fossil fuel sector was laying off 53,000 Canadian workers. That is 53,000 families, most of them in Alberta, who are facing the worst of times, while their former employers are relishing in the best of times.

What are Canadians getting for this unprecedented public investment? Surely we are at least getting some environmental protection, or some environmental mitigation from emission reductions. The answer is no.

In 2020, the government provided \$1.7 billion to the governments of Alberta, Saskatchewan and British Columbia to fund the cleanup of inactive oil and gas wells as part of the COVID-19 economic response. The member for South Okanagan—West Kootenay and I wrote to the minister at the time and begged him to attach strings to that money so we would know that it would go to workers, and that it would not just go to corporations that would then not clean up their wells. Can members guess what happened? The money went to the corporations, and the wells have not been cleaned up. In short, this \$1.7 billion handout to the oil and gas industry did nothing to create jobs or mitigate pollution. It merely allowed these companies to replace the costs they were obligated to cover with government money.

At the same time that these companies were reaping billions in subsidies, recording record high profits and asking for public dollars to underwrite their own obligations to reduce emissions, they are refusing to pay their local and municipal taxes. In Alberta, rural municipalities are now facing \$253 million in unpaid taxes owed by delinquent oil and gas companies. These taxes pay for the roads and the water systems that the companies are relying upon. These taxes support the communities who own the resources, yet the companies are pocketing the profits, walking away from their local tax obligations, just like they walked away from their emissions obligations and their orphan well obligations.

Business of Supply

It does not have to be this way. We know what we get with billions in fossil fuel subsidies. We get layoffs. We get devastated communities. We get pollution, and we get climate change. We get to prop up a sunset industry whose days are numbered, whether we as taxpayers like it or not, and oil and gas companies get massive profits.

● (1340)

Why would we continue this cycle? There are much better things we could be spending these public dollars on. In Alberta, we have lived through the boom and bust cycles of an economy that is chained to the fossil fuel industry. We need to break this chain. We need to make sure that Albertans, the people in my province, have a future. We need to diversify the economy before it is too late.

For Alberta, the climate crisis is an existential crisis, just like it is for the rest of Canada and the rest of the world. We see an increase in devastation from wildfires, and an increase in droughts and floods. We feel the impacts on our agriculture and forestry sectors. However, for Alberta, it is different.

A transition from fossil fuels is also a matter of economic survival. Instead of \$100 billion in public dollars padding fossil fuel's bottom line, and instead of throwing this money at foreign investors, the government should be investing in Alberta, and elsewhere in Canada, to help workers and to create jobs of the future.

More than 50,000 Canadian oil and gas workers have lost their jobs to automation over the past decade, and experts expect layoffs to continue. Why are we not investing to help these workers and apply their skills to other sectors? Why are we not investing to create the jobs they need now, and that their children will need in the future?

Today, approximately 140,000 Albertans work directly in the sector, and hundreds of thousands more rely on jobs from it, but we know that subsidizing the industry is not going to save those jobs. We have decades upon decades of experience demonstrating that. How much longer are we going to keep doing this?

Alberta is uniquely positioned to be a global leader in renewable energy. My province has abundant solar, wind and geothermal resources, and it would have abundant jobs in these areas, if only there were substantial investments in the means necessary, and if only we were not pouring those billions of dollars into subsidizing the fossil fuel industry.

However, there are also opportunities outside of energy, opportunities that develop sectors of our economy based on strategic advantage, such as biomedical research, engineering or artificial intelligence, just to name a few, but these require investment. These opportunities require investment from the federal government. The government should be leading the way when it comes to diversifying Alberta's economy.

Canada has benefited for decades from the oil and gas development in Alberta. I am proud of that. I am proud that Alberta helped build this country. Now, it would be to every Canadian's advantage to help Alberta out of its reliance on oil and gas, and the government has the means to do this. It just needs the will.

I have said this before in the House, but I will finish by saying that I come from an oil and gas family. My grandfather worked in oil and gas. My father was a trucker in the oil and gas sector. My brother washes trucks in the oil and gas sector, and my husband works in the pipeline sector. Members would be hard pressed to find anyone in Alberta who does not have a link to the oil and gas sector. It is our history, and it is a history I am proud of.

I am proud of being Albertan, and I want to make it very clear that Albertans know climate change is real, and we know our future cannot depend on fossil fuels. We do not love our children any less, and we do not want any less for our communities, but unlike other provinces, and unlike folks in other areas of this country, Albertans have so much more to lose if we do not get this right. It is our families and our livelihoods we will lose, if we do not get the just transition right.

We know we cannot depend on the fossil fuel sector. We simply cannot continue along this path of losing jobs, polluting our province and destroying our planet any longer. Whether we want to or not, we know we must change, but we need the government to reverse course, live up to its climate commitments and invest in diversifying our economy before it is too late.

● (1345)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, in many ways, this government has, in fact, been very progressive on its measures dealing with the whole idea of a green transition. It is something that is not new. We have literally invested over the last six years hundreds of millions of dollars, going into multiple billions of dollars, into a green transition. We have been recognized by the former leader of the Green Party in the province of British Columbia for the efforts that we have presented to Canadians.

My question, specifically, is in regard to the issue of carbon capture. What is the official NDP position on the technology and advancing the technology on carbon capture?

Ms. Heather McPherson: Madam Speaker, if I were a worker in Alberta, I would have zero trust that the government has any interest in supporting me, because it has not shown any interest in supporting Alberta workers. I mentioned in my speech that we asked the government to tie a string so that workers were supported, not big business, and it refused to do it.

In terms of carbon capture, here is my question for the member. Why would taxpayers need to subsidize carbon capture? Why can industry not pay for the carbon capture that it is so proud of and would like to see happen? It should be responsible for funding it.

Mr. Greg McLean (Calgary Centre, CPC): Madam Speaker, I have some questions about the member's figures, but I am going to get to something that I think is more important.

We are talking about 53,000 families in Alberta that were suffering during the oil and gas downturn. It is no longer in a downturn, I will point out. The Court of Appeal of Alberta came out last week and indicated very clearly that Bill C-69 was ultra vires of the federal government. That being the case, the NDP leader in Alberta indicated that the main cause of the layoffs in Alberta was a punitive regulatory regime as a result of Bill C-69.

Would the member agree with her party leader in Alberta that it is the Alberta Court of Appeal's decision on Bill C-69 that led to those 53,000 families being laid off in Alberta?

Ms. Heather McPherson: Madam Speaker, I would like to give my colleague my deep sympathies, because the Flames are going to lose the next round in the playoffs.

To answer that particular question, I would say there are many things that have contributed to the layoff of Alberta workers. One of the things that I pointed out in my speech is the automation of the oil and gas sector. Even if the oil and gas sector was not causing climate damage and was something that we could continue to go gangbusters with, it does not have the jobs. They are not there. Talk to any worker in the oil and gas sector and they know that. They know the jobs are not staying. There has to be something else.

The longer the Conservatives fail to take that action, the more coverage they give to the Liberals doing nothing. They are helping the Liberals do nothing.

• (1350)

[Translation]

Mr. Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Madam Speaker, I very much enjoy listening to my colleague from Edmonton Strathcona talk about Alberta. When we hear her talk about Alberta, we see that there is another type of Albertan, one who is more concerned about the environment and less concerned about oil, one who sees that there are solutions for breaking our dependency on oil and who is open to a transition to renewable energy.

We are voting in favour of the motion moved by our NDP colleagues today. In the motion there is a paragraph that I think is very important regarding re-investing savings from the elimination of fossil fuels subsidies to help those Canadians who have been hit the hardest by the high cost of living. What measures would the NDP want put in place? Practically speaking, what measures are the NDP proposing to help Quebeckers and Canadians?

[English]

Ms. Heather McPherson: Madam Speaker, I have worked very well with the member on committee and enjoy his interventions a great deal.

This ability to take these dollars and investing them in communities is very important. One of the areas that I would love to see bet-

ter investment in is infrastructure for first nation and Métis communities in Alberta.

Right now, we are looking at a situation in northern Alberta where communities have to make a very difficult choice of whether or not to allow the release of tailings ponds into their ecosystem, because they have not been dealt with. There are communities that do not have the resources they need for clean drinking water and for schools. I would love to see those resources going into—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Before we resume debate, the hon. member for New Brunswick Southwest is rising on a point of order.

Mr. John Williamson: Madam Speaker, earlier today, when I attempted to state what I thought was the NDP's position clearly, the member for Timmins—James Bay yelled that I was lying. He told the House that Canada can decide whether our children have a future or whether we are going to continue to have cheap gas.

I should not have to point to his words or my words to request an apology. I would like him to withdraw the remark that he made that somehow members of this side, myself in particular, are lying for pointing out what the NDP is in fact saying today in the House of Commons.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member for Timmins—James Bay.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Madam Speaker, I really appreciate that my hon. colleague put on the record once again the issue that the Conservatives continue to misrepresent, which is that they believe our children do not need a future as long as they get cheap—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): We have a request for a withdrawal.

An hon. member: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): It could lead us into debate, and we do not have that opportunity.

There was a request for an apology. Is the hon. member not ready to make that apology?

Mr. Charlie Angus: Madam Speaker, I am more likely to say that my hon. colleague probably did not understand the difference. I withdraw the word “lying”, but the fact that the Conservatives would use this on—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): That was all that was required. I thank the hon. member for Timmins—James Bay.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for South Okanagan—West Kootenay has about three minutes.

Business of Supply

Mr. Richard Cannings (South Okanagan—West Kootenay, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am happy to rise today to speak to the NDP motion before us. The NDP has always focused entirely on helping Canadian families. The most important issues for Canadians right now are the affordability crisis, the impossibility of the housing market, the rising cost of groceries, the soaring price of gas and the more existential crisis of climate change that asks what kind of planet we are going to leave our children and our grandchildren.

The NDP motion today asks the government to stop subsidizing highly profitable oil and gas companies once and for all. We are talking billions of dollars every year. Instead, it should invest those funds in relief for the millions of Canadians who are struggling right now with the high cost of everything, as well as renewable energy and other initiatives to deal with the climate crisis.

I would like to start by talking about fossil fuel subsidies. Canada and its G20 partners promised 13 years ago to phase out inefficient fossil fuel subsidies by 2025. Four years ago, I was at a G20 meeting in Argentina where that promise was reaffirmed and a peer review of the subsidies was initiated. That review is now years behind schedule. Finance officials recently admitted that they will not even finish the self-review portion of that until the summer of 2023, which is five years later. Most of the other countries finished their peer review within 18 months.

A couple of years ago, the environment commissioner could not even do a proper audit of our commitment to end subsidies, because the government admitted it did not yet have a clear definition of what an inefficient fossil fuel subsidy was.

Only last year, the Liberals forked out over \$8.6 billion in subsidies and public financing to the multinational oil and gas companies. Over \$5 billion of that was provided by Export Development Canada. Canada gives more tax dollars to oil and gas companies than any other G20 country, handing out 14 times more taxpayer dollars to that sector than it did to renewable energy companies between 2018 and 2020.

Canada paid \$4.5 billion for the Trans Mountain pipeline when the private company building it said it was no longer a viable project. We are now facing a \$21-billion cost for the expansion of that pipeline. It is an expansion that assumes and depends on an increasing demand for oil, when everyone realizes we must drastically cut our oil consumption worldwide.

We will never recoup the cost of Trans Mountain, so if there ever was an inefficient subsidy, I would say that buying a pipeline that a private company did not want and then spending \$20 billion to expand it to provide capacity for expanded oil production that the world will not need and cannot withstand is—

• (1355)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but can members keep it quiet? It is already very noisy in the courtyard. If people have conversations in the House, I cannot hear the hon. member's speech.

The hon. member may continue.

Mr. Richard Cannings: Madam Speaker, in the latest budget, the Liberal government promises over \$2 billion for carbon capture and storage projects for fossil fuel companies. That is more taxpayer dollars to companies that are doing very well. Imperial Oil is making more money than it has for 30 years. Suncor made a profit of almost \$3 billion in the last quarter alone.

Again, is this an inefficient subsidy? Even if carbon capture projects can be developed that actually work, and there is a lot of evidence that most do not, using them to clean up an industry whose *raison d'être* is providing oil and gas for the world to burn to create more carbon dioxide is a highly inefficient way to wean the world off fossil fuels.

What do Canadians get for this multi-billion dollar propping-up of oil and gas multinationals? They get record-high prices for gasoline. The oil barons are doing well, but ordinary Canadians are not. What Canadian families need is help during these times of increasing costs. We all need help transitioning to a low-carbon future. Let us imagine a future where our car, truck and home heating costs were not left to the vagaries of world markets and the international price of oil.

Canada has committed to reducing its greenhouse gas emissions to net zero by 2050. We cannot achieve this goal if we continue to pour 14 times the number of taxpayer dollars into the fossil fuel industry than we provide to the development of renewable energy.

The latest IPCC report had a stark warning. Either we take action now on mitigation and adaptation for climate change, or we risk suffering even more severe consequences from extreme weather events, wildfires and floods.

António Guterres, the UN Secretary-General, said some government and businesses have not entirely been truthful in claiming to be on track. In his words, he warned, "Some governments and business leaders are saying one thing but doing another...And the results will be catastrophic."

Greenhouse gas emissions must be cut in half by 2030, and the good news from the IPCC report is that this can be done. The final cost of necessary actions will be minimal, but will require a massive effort by governments around the world.

Wayne Gretzky once said that a good hockey player plays where the puck is, but a great hockey player plays where the puck is going to be. For Canada's energy future, the puck is going to be with renewable energy. Canada is uniquely positioned for becoming a renewable energy superpower. Our nation is rich in hydro, wind, solar power and the rare earth minerals that are needed for that low-carbon future.

• (1400)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member will have four minutes after question period to resume his speech.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

CAPE BRETON MUSIC INDUSTRY HALL OF FAME

Mr. Mike Kelloway (Cape Breton—Canso, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I rise in the House today to congratulate both the Cape Breton Music Industry Cooperative and the Nova Scotia Community College for launching the first annual Cape Breton Music Industry Hall of Fame induction gala, which will occur in the spring of 2023.

I would like to take this moment to congratulate the 2023 inductees, who, as a point of pride, all hail from my riding of Cape Breton—Canso: two individuals, Rita MacNeil and Matt Minglewood; *The Men of the Deep*, my dad's favourite; and a song induction, *Getting Dark Again* by Buddy MacDonald.

We Cape Bretoners are recognized nationally and internationally for our musical talents, and I could not be prouder of the inductees. Hey, with iconic musicians like that, it is about time we began to recognize them with a hall of fame induction gala.

On behalf of my colleagues and myself, congratulations to the organizers, NSCC and CBMIC, and to all of the inductees, for making the event possible and sweet-sounding.

* * *

[Translation]

DIFFUSE BRAIN STEM GLIOMA

Mr. Joël Godin (Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, CPC): Madam Speaker, five-year-old Florence Gagné has lost her battle with diffuse brain stem glioma. This cruel form of cancer primarily affects children between the ages of five and seven. It is inoperable and incurable.

This adorable and delightful princess touched the hearts of thousands of people in Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier and elsewhere. This cause became close to everyone's hearts. Her parents, Stéphanie and Sébastien, like many others, want to do something to help our young children heal.

They saw that resources were lacking and that the medical community could not do anything about it. We need to take action and find a way to get results.

Statements by Members

I invite everyone to sign the new e-petition 4021 to declare May 17 as the national DIPG day of awareness across Canada. We must draw inspiration from this princess and work together to find treatments to save our little angels.

* * *

[English]

JOHN HALANI

Hon. Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honour the memory of John Halani, a friend, a businessman and a benefactor who helped immigrants settle in Canada.

John came to Canada in 1972 as part of the Ismaili exodus from Uganda, expelled by dictator Idi Amin. He worked as a salesman, but was an entrepreneur at heart and later became a hotelier and head of the Ethno Business Council of British Columbia.

John was a community activist and, in 2007, received the title of “Rai”, the respected one, from the Aga Khan. He was named one of Canada's top immigrants in 2009, and he served for many years as the honorary consul for Uganda.

To his wife, Anar, I send my love and condolences. John's kindness, generosity and passion for politics and the Liberal Party earned him an enduring place in our hearts. We will miss him.

* * *

[Translation]

PORT OF TROIS-RIVIÈRES

Mr. René Villemure (Trois-Rivières, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to mark the 140th anniversary of the Port of Trois-Rivières.

On this date in 1882, the newly formed Chamber of Commerce convinced the federal government to set up the Trois-Rivières Harbour Commission with the mission of modernizing the harbour facilities and integrating them into the rail network to stimulate the region's economy. A number of significant events in the first half of the 20th century contributed to the port's development, such as the arrival of major paper mills and the two world wars, which meant increased demand for grain transportation.

The opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway in the late 1950s also gave the port a considerable boost. Growth continued during the 2000s as our urban port continued to develop and increase its socio-economic influence while reducing its environmental footprint. For all these reasons, we are proud of the Port of Trois-Rivières.

Today, I would like to congratulate Danielle St-Amand and Gaëtan Boivin who lead the board of directors and wish them a year of festivities worthy of their institution.

Statements by Members

SUPPORT FOR UKRAINE

Mr. Stéphane Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, while millions of Ukrainians have had to flee their homeland, people, associations and organizations from across the country are coming together to provide support. In Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation, we have done our part.

Paul Hénault made a \$10,000 donation on behalf of the 84 members of the Lachute Lions Club, which then raised an additional \$18,250 in record time for projects that will help Ukrainian refugees.

The director of the Séminaire du Sacré-Cœur, Christian Lavergne, along with his colleagues and friends, gave of their time to renovate a floor of the former student dormitory at the seminary in Grenville-sur-la-Rouge. Eight of the 11 rooms were updated.

Diane Gagné from Thurso went directly to the airport to pick up Ukrainian families she is housing for the next few months.

It is acts like these that help Canada to have a strong presence on the international stage. *Slava Ukraini*. Glory to Ukraine.

* * *

● (1405)
[English]

COVID-19 RESTRICTIONS

Mr. Dean Allison (Niagara West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the last two years have been a traumatizing time for many Canadians, and the NDP-Liberal coalition continues to make the situation much worse. It supported draconian rolling lockdowns, which contributed to a mental health disaster. It supported and is still keeping unscientific and now notorious vaccine mandates, which angered and divided Canadians more than any other policy we have ever seen.

By keeping these vindictive mandates, the government continues to punish more than six million Canadians who choose to remain unvaccinated. The Liberals are also supporting the pointless ArriveCAN app, which does nothing to protect Canadians. This app is just another overreach by a government obsessed with surveilling Canadians. ArriveCAN must be scrapped immediately: not tomorrow, not next month, but today.

Rather than try to save face, the NDP-Liberal coalition must finally face reality. Its ArriveCAN app and notorious vaccine mandates must be done away with immediately.

* * *

AFGHAN FAMILIES IN HAMILTON

Ms. Lisa Hepfner (Hamilton Mountain, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it was an honour to host the Prime Minister once again in my riding of Hamilton Mountain, where we greeted two families who recently settled in Hamilton after escaping Afghanistan.

Last year, Ahmad and Marghana fled their home country, clutching their newborn daughter. They now have a home and work in their chosen fields, and their daughter, Harir, who is not yet two years old, will go to school and have opportunities that sadly will not be afforded to many of her peers in Afghanistan.

Eight-year-old Atresa, six-year-old Zoya and their little brother Haris, who also recently fled Kabul with their parents, Mirwais and Zuhal, are thriving academically and making lots of friends.

These families were overwhelmed with emotion to thank the Prime Minister for helping them get here and start new lives as Canadians, but as the Prime Minister so rightly noted, we are the lucky ones to have them join our community.

* * *

CITY OF VAUGHAN, ONTARIO

Mr. Francesco Sorbara (Vaughan—Woodbridge, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have always stated, the entrepreneurial spirit and can-do attitude that exist in the city of Vaughan are second to none and are inspiring. Driven by the decade-long leadership of His Worship Maurizio Bevilacqua, and based on the three core values of readiness, resilience and resourcefulness, the city of Vaughan exits the global pandemic as an economic powerhouse.

Vaughan is the largest economy and employment centre in York Region, accounting for nearly 39% of all jobs and an annual economic output estimated at \$25 billion. Critical investments in Vaughan's infrastructure, including the Yonge North subway extension, the development of the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre, the Cortellucci Vaughan Hospital, the Highway 427 extension and the opening of the YMCA's flagship site, are examples of the city's transformation and key partnerships.

Vaughan's growth is remarkable and the future for its residents is bright. We are making the city of Vaughan the city of choice to work in, to invest in and to live in.

* * *

CALGARY NAGAR KIRTAN

Mr. Jasraj Singh Hallan (Calgary Forest Lawn, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Dashmesh Culture Centre, including its president, Amanpreet Singh Gill, the entire executive committee, and the whole Calgary Sangat for a very successful and well organized Nagar Kirtan.

More than 100,000 people attended, and this was the first Nagar Kirtan since 2019. I commend the City of Calgary, Calgary Police Service, the EMS, Calgary Fire Department, Parks and recreation and Alberta Health Services for all their efforts in planning this very successful event. Special thanks to Calgary Transit for providing free transit to anyone in Calgary for the day.

It was a great honour to meet Bibi Paramjit Kaur Khalra, the wife of human rights activist, the late Jaswant Singh Khalra. She was recognized by the Gurdwara Sahib for all of her advocacy.

Kanwar Grewal also took time to attend the Nagar Kirtan. This event would not have been possible without the *sewa* of hard-working volunteers like the United Hawks Sports Club and others, who ensured the grounds were kept clean.

I thank everyone who made the Calgary Nagar Kirtan a massive success.

* * *

● (1410)

CELIAC DISEASE AWARENESS MONTH

Ms. Sonia Sidhu (Brampton South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I am wearing my green ribbon for Celiac Disease Awareness Month. Celiac disease affects more than 400,000 Canadians.

Yesterday, I met with Melissa Secord from the Canadian Celiac Association to speak about the importance of early detection of celiac in our community. Some people with celiac do not have symptoms at all, which makes diagnosis difficult. This is why getting screened is so important. Untreated celiac can lead to symptoms of autoimmune disorders, like type 1 diabetes and other chronic conditions. As well, those living with celiac need to follow a gluten-free diet for their whole lives.

Researchers are working to advance the science, but more needs to be done. I encourage everyone to learn more about this disease and get screened to reduce the long-term effects.

* * *

COVID-19 RESTRICTIONS

Mr. Mark Strahl (Chilliwack—Hope, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in an interview with Reuters last year, the Prime Minister said that his government had no plans to implement vaccine mandates because they could have knock-on, undesirable effects in our communities. He also said that bringing in vaccine passports could have real, divisive impacts on Canada. Even though he knew the harms they would cause to our country, the Prime Minister went ahead with his political choice to divide Canadians with his vaccine mandates, and we have all seen the results of his decision to divide.

It will take years for our country to heal from the divisions that the Prime Minister has created, but that process cannot begin until his discrimination ends. Federal workers who have been fired because of their personal medical choices should get their jobs back immediately. All Canadians, regardless of vaccine status, should be allowed to travel freely within their own country again. It is time to stop the division, get back to prepandemic normal and let the healing begin.

* * *

OKANAGAN FOREST TASK FORCE

Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in many parts of my riding and across beautiful British Columbia, we are blessed with truly pristine forests. Sadly, many of our forests are increasingly being violated by illegal dumping and other unauthorized uses of Crown land. The garbage and filth left behind is simply alarming.

Statements by Members

Today I would like to recognize a man named Kane Blake, who decided to do something about it. Mr. Blake founded the Okanagan Forest Task Force. He gathered like-minded volunteers and sponsors to work together to remove this illegal garbage and scrap metal and to restore our forests. I ask members to please listen to this next part very carefully.

The Okanagan Forest Task Force has now removed closed to 200,000 pounds of garbage and a further 230,000 pounds of metal waste from our forests. Combined, that is over 430,000 pounds of garbage from our Okanagan forests. I am sure there are members in this place who can speak of similar initiatives that do much in their areas.

I would ask this chamber to please join me in thanking Kane Blake and the many volunteers and sponsors for all the work they do on behalf of our forests.

* * *

[Translation]

ADDICTIONS PREVENTION AND TREATMENT

Mrs. Élisabeth Brière (Sherbrooke, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, although alcohol consumption is legal and socially acceptable in Canada, it can have significant health and safety implications for Canadians and can exacerbate a number of social problems, such as homelessness.

That is why our government is committed to supporting researchers in Sherbrooke and all across the country who are leading the way when it comes to addictions prevention and treatment research.

On Friday, I had the pleasure of announcing federal funding of nearly \$200,000 for Dr. Ouimet and Dr. Wagner, who are both affiliated with Université de Sherbrooke. I am very proud to have seen how much their two projects will help prevent impaired driving and make it easier for the people of Sherbrooke and all Canadians to access the support they need.

I wish them much success in their research endeavours.

*Statements by Members**[English]***INTERNATIONAL DAY AGAINST HOMOPHOBIA, TRANSPHOBIA AND BIPHOBIA**

Mr. Blake Desjarlais (Edmonton Griesbach, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today, on International Day Against Homophobia, Transphobia and Biphobia, I want to recognize the courageous work of the 2SLGBTQ community in my city of Edmonton. The corner of Whyte Avenue is notorious for its hateful street preachers, who spew homophobic and transphobic messages, making our community unsafe. However, our Edmonton 2LSGBTQ community pushed back, organizing counter-protests weekly, whenever the preachers showed up. Just this weekend, hundreds of members of our community gathered at the very same corner of Whyte Avenue for the official proclamation of “Pride Corner” in recognition of our community’s continued fight for dignity and safety and to simply remain ourselves.

Although we celebrate this achievement, many in Canada and around the globe continue to face overt hatred, injustice and discriminations for who they are and who they love. This must change. Let us commit to ending homophobia, transphobia and biphobia here in Canada and across the globe.

* * *

● (1415)

*[Translation]***INTERNATIONAL DAY AGAINST HOMOPHOBIA AND TRANSPHOBIA**

Ms. Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the couple was on their way home from a breakfast out: croissants, yogurt and lattes.

Smiling, the first woman said to the other, “I love you, my darling.” Her girlfriend smiled while taking a sip of coffee and responded, “I love you too.” They left the small café. The sun was shining as they walked along happily, hand in hand. Behind them someone yelled, “Hey lesbians, aren’t you ashamed to be seen in public?” They turned around in surprise, and one of them felt a glob of spit land on her face.

The evening before, coming out of a bar, a gay couple had been kicked, punched and beaten while insults rained down on them.

This casual violence happens every day, involving words, baseball bats and boots. It happens everywhere, all the time. It needs to be brought to light.

On this International Day Against Homophobia and Transphobia, I want to tell all members of the LGBTQ community, on behalf of the Bloc Québécois, that they are not alone. We are with them, and we will never let them down.

Say no to homophobia and transphobia.

* * *

*[English]***BILL C-5**

Ms. Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, last night, Toronto Maple Leafs star Mitch Marner became the latest

victim of violent crime in the GTA. According to reports, Marner was the victim of a carjacking near Queensway and Islington in Etobicoke. At almost the exact location, just two days ago, a woman was a victim of an attempted carjacking, so we know this is not an isolated incident.

Instead of preventing these violent attacks and cracking down on thugs and gangs, the Liberals’ soft-on-crime Bill C-5 rewards violent perpetrators and reduces the penalties for these very types of crimes. It is time for the Liberal members in the GTA to speak out against the dangers of their kid glove approach. We should remember that the bill they support eliminates mandatory jail time for major violent and firearms offences. They should be behind bars.

Maybe Mitch Marner will get their attention and convince them to stand up for victims instead of criminals.

* * *

ATTACK IN BUFFALO, NEW YORK

Ms. Arielle Kayabaga (London West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Pearl, Ruth, Margus, Andre, Geraldine, Katherine, Roberta, Aaron, Celestine and Heyward, these are the names of the sons and daughters of a strong community who were senselessly gunned down while getting groceries this Saturday. Next week, a community in Central Park will not receive the food that Pearl Young fed them every Saturday for the last 25 years.

No one is born hating; people learn how to. Ideas are powerful. Words matter. When we feed into conspiracy theories and legitimize hate to score a few political points, it creates irrational fears that breed racial hate and discrimination. Racism and white supremacy have once again robbed us of brilliant people.

This happened in Buffalo, but it happens here too. I know this because it happened in my riding of London West when last year three generations of people in one family were taken from us. We still remember. We are still mourning and we are still very traumatized.

I mourn today with the community in Buffalo, but I also mourn with the Black communities across the world. I have to ask this question: When is enough enough? Where do we draw the line? When do we get tired of counting dead bodies? When do we stop saying that it does not happen here in Canada? Thoughts and prayers are no longer enough.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[English]

JUSTICE

Mr. Blaine Calkins (Red Deer—Lacombe, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government's approach to justice reform has been an abject failure. It prioritized the wants of offenders over the needs of victims. There has been a consistent increase in the amount and severity of crime since the government took office, especially in Liberal ridings.

Bill C-5 continues to gut our justice system by removing minimum penalties for criminals who commit serious gun crimes. When will the Prime Minister finally admit his plan is not working, change course and stand up for victims instead of criminals?

• (1420)

Mr. Gary Anandasangaree (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government is committed to a criminal justice reform. It is a promise we made to Canadians, and we intend to keep it. This is about criminal justice policy that actually keeps our communities safe. A justice system that targets, unfairly, indigenous peoples and Black and marginalized communities is not effective, does not keep us safe and must be changed.

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mr. Blaine Calkins (Red Deer—Lacombe, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is mind-boggling that the Prime Minister thinks that gangsters who use guns on our streets do not deserve jail time.

Conservatives know for a fact that law-abiding firearms owners are among the least likely people to commit an offence with a firearm. The original long-gun registry was a \$1-billion boondoggle that did nothing to enhance public safety. This new Liberal backdoor registry will not either.

Why will the government not focus on criminals and smugglers and leave law-abiding Canadians alone?

Hon. Marco Mendicino (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, coming out of the events last weekend in Buffalo and seeing this country suffer from numerous tragedies involving gun violence, we took the extraordinary step of banning AR-15s, because they are designed to do one thing and that is to kill people. We have banned those assault rifles, and now we are committed to buying them back. Our plan was backed by the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police.

What is the Conservatives' plan? It is to make those AR-15s legal again. It is shocking. On this side, we will continue to make sure that we take the steps necessary to keep Canadians safe.

Mr. Blaine Calkins (Red Deer—Lacombe, CPC): Mr. Speaker, a database with Canadians' personal information attached to a unique identifying number attached to the serial number of a firearm and administered by the firearms registrar is a gun registry.

We know the Prime Minister does not think much about Canadians who support legal firearms ownership, but we are not fools.

Oral Questions

What is foolish is gutting penalties for criminals who steal firearms, possess stolen firearms, traffic in firearms or smuggle firearms.

Could the Prime Minister explain why he has such a vendetta against target shooters in Estevan while he lets gun-wielding criminals run free in ridings his backbenchers represent?

Hon. Marco Mendicino (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, just last week, we introduced a stronger ID verification for gun purchases and require businesses to keep records of gun sales, which they are already doing. We have heard from some of those businesses, and they say this is common sense. Now police will be able to better investigate fraud and locate criminals who steal or try to engage in straw purchasing, which is a legitimate concern.

The Conservatives can spin all they want, but Canadians see through it because they have no credibility when it comes to fighting against gun crime.

[Translation]

JUSTICE

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government is currently in power.

There were three shootings in Laval last week. A man was killed in broad daylight in Montreal. Laval police say that today's criminals are impulsive and disorderly.

What is the Liberal government doing? It is proposing to eliminate minimum mandatory sentences for firearms possession offences with Bill C-5. Essentially, the Liberal approach consists of letting armed criminals continue to walk the streets.

Can someone explain to the Prime Minister that his approach is irresponsible and that it will only make things more dangerous than they were before?

Mr. Gary Anandasangaree (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, those who commit serious offences will continue to receive stiff sentences.

*Oral Questions**[English]*

Our bill is about getting rid of the failed policies that filled our prisons with low-risk first-time offenders who needed help, not to be put in jail. These failed policies do not deter crime and did not keep us safe. They target the vulnerable and racialized Canadians.

[Translation]

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like my colleague to tell that to Laval's chief of police, who stated, "The people who are willing to commit such offences are hardened criminals. It is fine to be an idealist, but they will not stop when they get out of jail."

Here is what one person had to say. "We can no longer go out. My wife is very nervous and she is afraid."

Another stated, "My daughter was lucky, but in broad daylight with children.... There could be a stray bullet the next time".

Here is another fact. With Bill C-5, the Liberals want to leave these criminals on the streets with the support of the Liberal MPs from the Montreal area.

Why is the Prime Minister defending criminals and not victims?

• (1425)

Hon. Marco Mendicino (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with all due respect for my colleague, that is not true. We have a solid plan to prevent criminals from getting their hands on guns. We implemented more rigorous criminal background checks, which the Conservatives opposed. We invested over \$350 million in policing to crack down on gangs and put an end to trafficking at the border. The Conservatives opposed that too. That is unacceptable.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Mr. Alain Therrien (La Prairie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, you must be wondering why gas is so expensive. That is such a good question that Radio-Canada analyzed where every penny people spend on a litre of gas goes, and the answer is: into oil companies' pockets. They are the gluttons here.

Their refining margin has climbed steadily since 2008 from 9¢ to 48¢. That is over five times more. Meanwhile, the federal government has been subsidizing them like there is no tomorrow. In the budget, it gives them \$2.4 billion of public money. When will it cut these gluttons off instead of fattening them up?

Hon. Randy Boissonnault (Minister of Tourism and Associate Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is the Government of Canada, the Liberal Party, that is taking care of the issue of affordability for Canadians and Quebecers. On this side of the House, we have a plan to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and we have a plan to bring down the cost of living. We are going to put \$6,000 back into the pockets of students, \$500 back into the pockets of seniors and \$1,000 back into the pockets of families who pay a price on pollution.

This side is all about affordability. That side just wants to bicker.

Mr. Alain Therrien (La Prairie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the greedy executives are laughing it up. They are sucking us dry at the pump while making record profits. They are taking even more taxpayers' money through federal subsidies. Glug-glug go the gluttons. Every new coin they see is more golden than the last.

Suncor made \$3 billion in profits last quarter. These fat cats do not need public money. Rather than fattening them up any further, why will the federal government not give that money to the less fortunate or put it towards the energy transition?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for the question. As he well knows, we have committed to eliminating fossil fuel subsidies by 2023, two years sooner than our G20 partners. We are the only country to have made that commitment, and the subsidies have already been reduced by more than \$3 billion a year since 2018.

[English]

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the cost of gasoline is over two dollars a litre across this country. That is hurting families. At the same time, these very same oil and gas companies are experiencing massive profits and continue to receive fossil fuel subsidies to the tune of billions of dollars from the government.

Will the Prime Minister support our plan to end the fossil fuel subsidies immediately and reinvest them back into people by doubling the GST tax credit?

Hon. Randy Boissonnault (Minister of Tourism and Associate Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when we are talking about economic drivers in this country, we talk about the oil and gas sector, we talk about aerospace and we talk about the auto sector. It is an important sector for this country, and if we are talking about the rise in gas prices, this is the time when everybody in this House should be focused on getting Vladimir Putin out of Ukraine, not playing cheap politics. That is the real mission. We will keep working on affordability and not worrying about economic engines for this country.

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the government is subsidizing profitable companies while they are making massive profits. It does not make any sense.

[Translation]

Gas is over \$2 a litre, and that is hurting families. Meanwhile, these companies are making massive profits and continue to receive billions of dollars from the Liberal government.

Will the Prime Minister support our plan to eliminate oil subsidies immediately and reinvest the money in helping families by doubling the GST/HST tax credit?

• (1430)

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for the question. I have two pieces of good news for him.

We are investing record amounts in the energy transition, more than has ever been spent in the history of Canada, more than every G7 and G20 country. We are investing more in the green transition as part of our economic recovery plan than any other G20 country.

We committed to eliminating the fossil fuel subsidy by 2023, two years sooner than all our G20 partners.

* * *

JUSTICE

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we are seeing more and more shootings by street gangs. There were three in Laval last week.

The Quebec association of police chiefs does not support Bill C-5, and for good reasons. In addition, the Montreal police service reports that there has been an incident involving a firearm every two days since the beginning of 2022.

Does this mean that the Prime Minister follows expert advice only when it suits him?

Hon. Marco Mendicino (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I agree with my colleague that there are many tragedies caused by firearms. That is precisely why we want to take real action and why we are doing more.

Last year, the CACP seized a record number of firearms, and this is partly due to the federal government's investments at the border. All that the Conservatives did was oppose these investments. It makes no sense.

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the minister is deliberately conflating two different matters. We are talking about Bill C-5, which would change the law so that the offences of using a firearm during a robbery, discharging a firearm with intent or being in possession of an unlawful firearm will no longer carry a minimum sentence.

Street gangs are making fools of us all. This is sheer hypocrisy. Can the minister talk about Bill C-5 and stop talking about the other gun problem?

[English]

Mr. Gary Anandasangaree (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, those who commit serious offences will continue to receive serious sentences. Let us not get this confused. Our bill is about getting rid of the failed policies that filled our prisons with lower-risk first-time offenders who need help, not to be put in jail. These failed policies did not deter crime and did not keep us safe. They targeted the vulnerable and racialized Canadians.

Hon. Rob Moore (Fundy Royal, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is Victims and Survivors of Crime Week, but the Liberals refuse to do even the bare minimum to support them. The government has abandoned its responsibility to victims of crime, but it remains a champion to its friends, the criminals. The Liberals' Bill C-5 would mean lighter sentences for violent gun crimes and that offenders charged with human trafficking and sexual assault would be able to serve their time from the comfort of their own homes.

Oral Questions

Why will the Liberals not provide the same sense of security to victims and survivors of crime?

Mr. Gary Anandasangaree (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to respond to this question again.

I want to be very clear: Those who commit serious offences will continue to receive serious sentences. Our bill is about getting rid of the failed policies that filled our prisons with lower-risk first-time offenders who needed help, not to be put in jail. These failed policies did not deter crime and did not keep us safe. They targeted the most vulnerable and racialized Canadians.

* * *

PUBLIC SAFETY

Ms. Raquel Dancho (Kildonan—St. Paul, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the fact is that violent crime and gun crime have gone up significantly. Gangs and criminals are running rampant in our streets. Canadians are seeing it with their own eyes on the news every day.

What is the Liberals' response to this? On one hand, they are eliminating mandatory prison time for criminals who commit dangerous crimes with guns, and on the other hand, they are doubling down on restrictions for licensed, trained and vetted law-abiding Canadians, with a new backdoor registry that will do nothing to deal with the real problem, which is gun smuggling and gang activity in our cities.

When will the Liberals start focusing on the real problem?

Hon. Marco Mendicino (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am wondering when the Conservatives are going to understand what it takes to keep Canadians safe as it relates to gun violence. That means introducing common-sense measures to make sure that guns do not fall into the hands of the wrong people. That means making sure that we support law enforcement so we can stop illegal trafficking at the border. That means making sure that we invest in our communities so we can prevent gun crime from occurring in the first place. The Conservatives are weak, weak, weak on all of those measures.

● (1435)

Mr. Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's targeting of law-abiding firearms owners is actually making our country less safe. Since becoming Prime Minister, we have seen an increase in gang-related homicides committed with firearms and a decrease in penalties for those convicted of gun crimes. Instead of going after the bad guys, he is going to spend limited taxpayer dollars to rebuild the Liberal long-gun registry that goes after the good guys.

Oral Questions

Why does the Prime Minister continue to target law-abiding Canadians instead of criminals?

Hon. Marco Mendicino (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I wonder why the Conservatives do not support common-sense measures when it comes to making sure that guns do not fall into the hands of the wrong people, including criminals.

Why do the Conservatives continue to—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Deputy Speaker: Order. There are a lot of great questions and a lot of great answers. If members want to be on the list, I am sure they can talk to their whips and get on the question list.

The hon. Minister of Public Safety can start again.

Hon. Marco Mendicino: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, I am wondering when the Conservatives are going to support common-sense measures that make sure guns do not fall into the hands of the wrong people, including criminals.

I am wondering why the Conservatives think that the way to keep Canadians safer is to make AR-15s legal again. These are firearms that were designed for one purpose and one purpose only, and that is to kill people. That is why we banned them. That is why we will buy them back to protect Canadians.

Mr. Glen Motz (Medicine Hat—Cardston—Warner, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government's ideological failure on firearms and public safety continues. Their misguided targeting of law-abiding and legal gun owners is now focused on the implementation of another attempt at a gun registry rather than on criminals who illegally obtain firearms that are smuggled into this country to kill on our streets.

The government has shifted from their self-proclaimed evidence-based decision-making to decision-based evidence-making. When will the minister finally wake up to the fact that his failures are costing Canadians lives?

Hon. Marco Mendicino (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with respect, I have visited my hon. colleague's riding. I have met with the law-abiding shooters and hunters, and we have great respect for those individuals because we know they value safety.

The measures we have introduced are common sense. They are about making sure that guns do not fall into the hands of the wrong people, including criminals. The measures we have introduced on this side of the House ensure that AR-15s have no place in our communities. The measures we have introduced on this side of the House are to invest in communities and prevent gun crime from occurring in the first place. I wish my hon. colleague would support those measures. It is the right thing to do.

* * *

[Translation]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we recently saw a number of Liberal MPs protesting against Quebec's language laws and calling them discriminatory.

However, the real discrimination is at the federal level, and francophones are the victims. Francophones are systematically under-represented in the federal public service, where anglophones hold 81% of the positions. At the very highest levels, everything is done in English. Interestingly, there are no Liberal MPs out in the streets condemning that.

Why?

Hon. Mona Fortier (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, respect for official languages is not only an obligation and a priority for our government, but it is also essential for the effective delivery of federal services.

We are committed to providing these services in accordance with our official languages obligations. We will ensure that public service positions are designated bilingual, where appropriate, and that an appropriate level of bilingualism is required. This is essential to creating and maintaining a workplace that encourages the use of both official languages.

• (1440)

Mr. Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this government appointed a unilingual anglophone as Lieutenant Governor of New Brunswick, the only bilingual province in Canada.

A New Brunswick court has ruled that this appointment is unconstitutional, but—surprise, surprise—the federal government has announced that it will be appealing the decision. The Liberals want to spend public money to preserve their right to make unilingual English appointments in Canada's only bilingual province.

Instead of castigating Quebec, will the Liberal government stop its war against French?

Hon. Ginette Petitpas Taylor (Minister of Official Languages and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for his question.

Our government remains firmly committed to protecting and promoting French across the country.

The decision to appeal the ruling of the Court of Queen's Bench does not in any way compromise our commitment to protecting and promoting linguistic duality, which includes our modernization of the Official Languages Act.

Going forward, our government is firmly committed to ensuring that all of New Brunswick's lieutenant governors are bilingual.

Mr. Denis Trudel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals who were protesting Bill 96 on Saturday are not upset today to learn that 81% of jobs in the senior federal public service go to anglophones.

They never criticized the appointment of a unilingual anglophone lieutenant governor in New Brunswick. They said nothing when their government threatened to take to court francophones from British Columbia who were calling for services in French. They never spoke out about their government's 80% refusal rate for French-speaking students from Africa.

Where were these superstars when it came time to stand up for francophones?

Hon. Ginette Petitpas Taylor (Minister of Official Languages and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have said this many times. As the Minister of Official Languages, promoting and protecting French is a top priority.

That is why I was so pleased when we reintroduced our bill to modernize the Official Languages Act on March 1. This bill has teeth and will make a real difference in the lives of Canadians.

I hope that the Bloc Québécois and all parties in the House will work with us to ensure that we can pass Bill C-13 as quickly as possible.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Mrs. Dominique Vien (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC): Mr. Speaker, rising gas prices are directly impacting all Canadians.

A recent survey indicated that two-thirds of Canadians will forgo travelling far from home this summer. The impact is also being felt on store shelves. Goods cost more to produce and transport and, of course, consumers are the ones who end up paying the price.

Who is actually profiting? The government. For every litre of gasoline sold, more than 60 cents goes into the government's coffers.

My question is simple. When will the government lower taxes?

Hon. Randy Boissonnault (Minister of Tourism and Associate Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let us be realistic. There is no evidence that cutting taxes will benefit consumers.

Here are the facts. The government created the Canada child benefit, and the Conservatives voted against it. The government introduced indexing for seniors' health, and the Conservatives voted against it. The government put \$6,000 in students' pockets, and the Conservatives voted against that.

They vote against Canadians; we vote for Canadians. Those are the facts.

[English]

Mr. Adam Chambers (Simcoe North, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as gas prices soar across the country, the government's response is tone deaf and even at times condescending. It shrugs off astronomical gas prices, even though federal taxes contribute to inflation. It says the carbon tax rebate outweighs the cost, but we know that is just not true. The majority of Ontario families are worse off, businesses that ship goods are worse off and farmers do not get a rebate. They are worse off by thousands of dollars a month.

Oral Questions

As we listen to the government talk about how good high gas prices are, the question is simple: How high does it want them to go?

Hon. Randy Boissonnault (Minister of Tourism and Associate Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let us look very carefully at what the Parliamentary Budget Officer has said: Eight out of 10 Canadians are better off with a price on pollution. I do not know why the Conservatives are so against a market mechanism that even Preston Manning said was the best way to reduce emissions.

We are focused on affordability. The Conservatives are playing politics. Canadians know that.

• (1445)

Mr. Tako Van Popta (Langley—Aldergrove, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Vancouver has the highest gas prices in all of North America. The gas station at the Vancouver airport is advertising regular gas at \$2.34 a litre. The Minister of Finance keeps saying that inflation is a global phenomenon, yet we know it is the current government's policy to actually drive up gasoline prices through its taxation policy.

When will it quit blaming others, take responsibility and give us a break at the gas pumps?

Hon. Randy Boissonnault (Minister of Tourism and Associate Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is no evidence that removing the tax would be passed on to consumers. The House should be focused on getting Vladimir Putin out of Ukraine to restabilize energy markets. Canadians know that gas prices are higher because of the illegal war in Ukraine.

While the other side wants to play politics, we are focused on affordability, the CCB, child care and putting money in the pockets of Canadians. That is our job. The Conservatives can scream all they want. We are doing the hard work.

Mr. Rick Perkins (South Shore—St. Margarets, CPC): Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of gas coming from the government.

Lobster bait costs have more than doubled because of the decisions of the minister. Average fishing fuel costs have gone up 140% since the fall. The government's disastrous policies are increasing bait and fuel costs for fishing, making it more difficult to earn a living. Because of these increased costs, fishermen are now only able to go out every second day. In Nova Scotia, 70¢ from each litre of diesel goes to governments.

It is time to lower gas taxes. When will the government do the right thing and lower gas taxes?

Oral Questions

Hon. Randy Boissonnault (Minister of Tourism and Associate Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will tell the House exactly which tax we lowered: on the middle class, twice. The Conservatives voted against it. We raised taxes on the wealthiest 1%. We created the Canada child benefit indexed to inflation. Now, a single mother with two children will receive up to \$13,666. We increased the OAS by 10%, which is also indexed to inflation. That is the work we are doing in the House. The Conservatives are playing politics.

* * *

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Ms. Lori Idlout (Nunavut, NDP): *Uqaqtittiji*, discovering burial sites outside former residential schools is difficult for indigenous peoples, and it should be for all Canadians. The government promised to provide support to indigenous communities looking for their children. Yesterday, the minister admitted that many of the promises the government made have no timeline for completion.

First nations and Inuit are still asking for resources to recover bodies and for help to heal from the trauma of these discoveries. Why is the government not delivering faster on its promises to support indigenous communities?

Hon. Marc Miller (Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would highlight the fact that since the discoveries in Kamloops, the first anniversary of which is upcoming, this government has deployed over half a billion dollars to assist communities with this very painful step of deciding whether to go and search for lost ones. Not every community will work at the same pace. There are about 70 applications that are still in and fully funded, and we will continue to be with them. Some have said it could take up to 10 years, and the worst thing to see would be for any government to step away from that commitment. We will keep doing it, but at their pace.

* * *

HEALTH

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, every day 20 Canadians die because of drug poisoning while the current government sits on real solutions. Policies that stigmatize do not prevent people from using drugs; they prevent people from taking steps to reduce risk or seek help. The government ignored its own Expert Task Force on Substance Use, which found that criminalizing simple possession feeds stigma and increases risk for people who use drugs.

Will the government finally listen to its own expert task force and support my bill, which will save the lives of Canadians?

Hon. Carolyn Bennett (Minister of Mental Health and Addictions and Associate Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for the question and his ongoing advocacy. I did speak with the expert panel yesterday. As we know, the opioid and toxic drug supply crisis is heartbreaking and has taken a tragic toll on families, loved ones and communities. Our government recognizes that problematic substance use is a public health issue and we are working with partners to develop comprehensive health strategies to address it, including diversion away from the criminal justice system to other supportive health and social services, as well as

safer supply. Our approach builds on previous actions, including investments of over \$800 million in community-led harm-reduction, treatment and prevention projects.

* * *

● (1450)

SENIORS

Mrs. Rechie Valdez (Mississauga—Streetsville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the many impacts the pandemic has had on Canadians, especially seniors. The Minister of Seniors recently announced funding to support community organizations serving seniors as we continue to face the pandemic.

Can the minister please inform this house how this funding will help seniors in Mississauga—Streetsville and across Canada?

Hon. Kamal Khera (Minister of Seniors, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend, the member for Mississauga—Streetsville, for her question and ongoing advocacy for seniors. I was pleased to announce yesterday that, through the new horizons for seniors program, we are investing more than \$61.3 million and funding over 3,000 community-based projects to support seniors. These projects will help seniors across the country to keep active, stay informed and remain socially engaged during these challenging times.

I would also like to take the opportunity to thank all the organizations, such as those in my colleague's riding, who have stepped up to serve seniors, especially those who are most vulnerable.

* * *

SERVICE CANADA

Mrs. Laila Goodridge (Fort McMurray—Cold Lake, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we have all heard the Liberal talking points about hiring additional employees, but clearly, this has not come anywhere close to resolving the never-ending wait times at Service Canada. Time is ticking and Canadians' stress and frustration continues to grow. This is a process that the government is fully responsible for and a problem only a minister can fix.

The process is clearly broken, and Canadians deserve better. When will the minister do her job?

Hon. Karina Gould (Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as we have said several times in the House, we certainly understand the feelings of Canadians right now who, for the past two years, have done their part and followed public health advice and now are looking to travel again. Of course, over the past two years there have been many passports that have expired. While Service Canada is fully operational, every kiosk is open, and employees are working around the clock, evenings and weekends to service this demand, the demand is exceptionally high. We have not seen volumes like this since 2006 when the United States required passports, but all employees at Service Canada, including this government, are going to work extra hard to make sure we can serve Canadians as best as possible.

* * *

PASSPORT CANADA

Mr. Dan Mazier (Dauphin—Swan River—Neepawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians across the country are anxiously waiting for their passports. The government's passport website states, "processing requires 20 business days", but that is not true as Canadians have been waiting for months for their passports. Now, thousands are being forced to cancel their travel plans because of the Liberal government's failed policy and preparation.

Instead of blaming Canadians for travelling, when will the government fix the passport crisis that it has created?

Hon. Karina Gould (Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I just said to the previous member through you, we are experiencing an unprecedented demand. We recognize that Canadians want to travel. That is why, back in December, we started hiring 500 additional employees to meet this rise in demand. It is why Service Canada employees are working on evenings and weekends. In fact, for the past three weekends, almost a dozen Service Canada passport locations have been open in the busiest areas across the country to meet this demand. It is why there are employees here in the national capital region that are assisting with opening and processing applications. We are throwing—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Hastings—Lennox and Addington.

Mrs. Shelby Kramp-Neuman (Hastings—Lennox and Addington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, early yesterday morning, I went to a passport office here in Ottawa to renew my family's passports. While I was waiting, I personally heard Passport Canada officials tell people in line to contact their members of Parliament for assistance in expediting their applications. My office has been told we do not have that capacity any more. We cannot submit applications like we used to. All we can do is check them over and ensure they are filled out properly.

Why is the Liberal government passing the buck to members of Parliament's offices when it knows full well it should be taking ownership and fixing its own mistakes?

• (1455)

Hon. Karina Gould (Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again, as I have mentioned several times in the House, and as I will repeat for the benefit of

Oral Questions

that member and all members, we are experiencing an unprecedented volume, the likes of which we have not seen since 2006, when the United States required a passport for Canadians. We have already taken additional measures, and we will continue to keep these measures in place as we recognize that there is a pent-up demand for travel. Service Canada and passport employees are working around the clock. They are working overtime evenings and weekends to do their very best to meet this increase in demand.

[Translation]

Mr. Joël Godin (Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the minister that her solution is not working. This government lacks vision. It is always reacting.

It was to be expected that there would be an unprecedented demand for the renewal of Canadian passports because of the pandemic. My riding office is seeing many cases, lots of Julies, Carls and Marie-Annes. According to the Passport Canada site, people can expect to wait 20 days to get their passports.

Why is this government causing people pointless stress and making them wait? Why is it not honouring its own deadlines?

Hon. Karina Gould (Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have said this several times, but I will say it again. We know that demand is extremely high right now. As I have already explained to the House several times, we have taken many measures to try to meet that unprecedented growth in demand for Canadians. Our measures will remain in place to meet that demand, to meet Canadians' needs.

* * *

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mr. Rhéal Fortin (Rivière-du-Nord, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we need to give the police the resources they need to deal with the gang war in the greater Montreal area.

Yesterday I asked the minister whether he had created an organized crime register to help police arrest gang members. The minister said that the short answer was yes, but he did not provide any details.

Today we want the long answer. Will the minister create an organized crime register, and if so, when?

Hon. Marco Mendicino (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have given police forces the tools to combat gang violence. We will continue to invest in our police forces.

Oral Questions

I have had several very constructive conversations with my counterparts in Quebec, more specifically, Minister Guilbault, Mayor Plante and Mayor Marchand. We will continue working closely with Quebec. It is very important.

Ms. Kristina Michaud (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the minister opened the door, but today he seems to be shutting it. Does he not see that there is a gang war going on in Montreal?

Police forces want some latitude to do their jobs. They want to be able to interrogate people, which would be possible with an organized crime register. With such a register, police officers could arrest any member of an officially recognized gang. I think this would be a good way to get these criminals to settle down.

After all of the shootings in recent months, why is the minister still hesitant to create an organized crime register?

Hon. Marco Mendicino (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there are laws for the prosecution of criminal organizations. There are tools to support the good work of police forces, for conducting investigations on the ground and for reassuring everyone that we can ensure public safety.

On this side of the House, we will continue with a comprehensive strategy for fighting gun violence. We will be working with the Bloc and all members of the House on that.

* * *

[English]

HEALTH

Mr. Stephen Ellis (Cumberland—Colchester, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I spoke to Todd, who worked for the federal government as an engineer. He is immunized for all his usual vaccines, except COVID-19. Of course, he has lost his job. He was worried about the short- and long-term effects of the new vaccines. Both Todd, the engineer, and his wife, the nurse, are leaving Canada as they cannot work or travel in their own country.

Is the exodus of professionals the goal of the Prime Minister's vindictive mandates?

● (1500)

Hon. Mona Fortier (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, having a fully vaccinated workforce makes our work sites and our communities safer. We asked employees of the federal public service to attest to their vaccination status. They stepped up, and 99% of employees attested to being fully vaccinated. We committed to review this policy every six months, and the policy review is under way. Any decisions will be based on science and the advice of public health officials.

Mrs. Stephanie Kusie (Calgary Midnapore, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister continues to punish Canadians who do not agree with him. A letter in *The Globe and Mail* stated today that continued travel restrictions are an unnecessary and illogical infringement on individual rights of mobility. The Prime Minister states, over and over, that he stands with Canadians. Well, he sure does not want them sitting beside him on a plane, a train or a bus.

Will he put politics aside and allow Canadians to get back to prepandemic normal, or will he continue to punish Canadians for their health choices?

Mr. Adam van Koeverden (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health and to the Minister of Sport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today we know more about COVID-19 than ever before, and certainly more than back in March 2020. We have safe, effective vaccines and a highly vaccinated population. We have testing and surveillance tools that allow us to identify new variants of concern and track the spread of this virus. However, the future remains uncertain, and people are still getting COVID-19 every single day. It is unpredictable.

Our government will continue making decisions based on the best science from health care providers and public health officials, and will adjust our advice and public health measures based on them and the evolution of this virus.

Mr. Mark Strahl (Chilliwack—Hope, CPC): Mr. Speaker, there are currently two groups of people prevented from getting on commercial flights in Canada. The first group are those on the no-fly list, an air security program that prevents individuals who may commit a terrorist act from getting on a plane. The second group banned from flights in Canada are Canadians who have not been vaccinated against COVID-19.

Why are the Liberals treating our fellow citizens who are not vaccinated in the same way they treat those on the no-fly list?

Mr. Adam van Koeverden (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health and to the Minister of Sport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I just said, we know more about this virus than we did a couple of years ago, and we continue to have safe and effective vaccines available—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Deputy Speaker: Order. The member is right there and I cannot hear him right now.

The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health.

Mr. Adam van Koeverden: Mr. Speaker, today we know more about COVID-19 than we did two years ago, and that is a good thing, because we have safe and effective vaccines, which continue to be available for everyone, and we continue to have a highly vaccinated population. That is one of the reasons we have one of the lowest death rates in the world. We also have new treatments that can help patients from getting seriously ill. However, people continue to get COVID-19 and folks are still dying from COVID-19.

It would be great if some of the Conservatives on the other side encouraged their populations and their constituents to get vaccinated.

[Translation]

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mrs. Brenda Shanahan (Châteauguay—Lacolle, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, across the country, Canadians have experienced extreme heat waves—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Mrs. Brenda Shanahan: Mr. Speaker, could you intervene, please?

The Deputy Speaker: Everyone has the right to ask questions and hear the answers.

The hon. member for Châteauguay—Lacolle has the floor again.

Mrs. Brenda Shanahan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Across Canada, people have experienced extreme heat waves, their houses have been destroyed by forest fires or floods, and their crops have been devastated by drought. Building a secure and healthy future for Canadians means building houses, infrastructure and an economy prepared to deal with the realities of climate change.

Yesterday, the Minister of Environment and Climate Change launched public consultations to develop Canada's first-ever national adaptation strategy. Could he—

The Deputy Speaker: The Minister of Environment and Climate Change.

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my hon. colleague from Châteauguay—Lacolle for her question and her work on the environment in her riding.

When the roof over our heads is leaking, we repair it and then we can think about what to have for dinner. We can and we must mitigate the impacts of climate change and, at the same time, prepare for it.

These consultations will lead to the first inclusive national adaptation strategy, which will ensure that we are prepared to face the climate of today and tomorrow, and to implement measures to ensure the safety and well-being of our families, our communities and the environment.

* * *

• (1505)

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Mr. Jacques Gourde (Lévis—Lotbinière, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the temporary foreign worker saga continues. On April 15, 2022, after eight months of waiting, some businesses in my riding received their confirmation letters of a positive labour market impact assessment.

That is far too long and the process is not even complete. The government has a duty to simplify the process for approving temporary foreign workers. When will it do so?

[English]

Hon. Sean Fraser (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, addressing the labour shortages is

Oral Questions

a top priority for our government, and that is why we are putting additional resources toward processing cases, including work permits, to ensure that people have access to the workers they need. I would advise the hon. member that the average processing time for work permits in the province of Quebec today is 33 days, which is among the very best available in Canada.

We are going to continue to do everything we can to get businesses the workers they need. Our economy depends on it, and it is is going to help kick-start our economic recovery from the COVID-19 recession.

* * *

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Cardinal Joseph Zen is a 90-year-old retired Catholic cardinal, much loved throughout China and the world for his deep faith and courageous advocacy for democracy. The Chinese Communist Party now considers this 90-year-old clergyman a threat to national security and has arrested Cardinal Zen. Arrested alongside Zen are a number of other prominent voices for justice and human rights, including Canadian citizen, singer and actress Denise Ho.

Will the government join us in clearly condemning these arrests and also commit to strengthening immigration measures to make it easier for human rights defenders in Hong Kong to come to Canada?

Hon. Robert Oliphant (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the relationship that Canada has with China is complex, it is challenging and it is always important for us to be mindful of it. As we engage in that relationship, there are no more important issues than Canadian values and Canadian rights, including the human rights agenda of this country.

We will continue to stand up for human rights at every opportunity and take every opportunity to speak to our Chinese counterparts about the issues the member has raised.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Scot Davidson (York—Simcoe, CPC): Mr. Speaker, on a recent episode of *The Fifth Estate*, Canadians were horrified and shocked to see tonnes of plastic waste shipped overseas from Canada where it is being burned and dumped in developing countries. While other nations take action, the Liberals are doing nothing. They even blocked my Conservative bill to ban the export of plastic waste.

Enough is enough. We need action. The world's oceans and the environment are suffering.

Will the Liberals finally stop this shameful practice?

Business of Supply

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government is in the process of putting in the first-ever Canadian strategy to reduce plastic pollution, move Canada toward a circular economy, ban single-use plastics and force plastic companies to use more recycled content in the plastic they produce.

[Translation]

Mrs. Sherry Romanado (Longueuil—Charles-LeMoyne, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the environment is a very important issue for my constituents in Longueuil—Charles-LeMoyne.

Yesterday we announced a major investment in the biomethanization facilities in Varennes, which serve the city of Longueuil, among others.

Could the minister tell us more about this project and what it would do for the Quebec economy and for our environment?

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, members will not be surprised to hear me thank my colleague for the outstanding work that she does.

We are proud to be investing more than \$25 million in this expansion project, which will help many municipalities in Montreal divert more organic materials. This will reduce our emissions by more than 13,000 tonnes a year and divert thousands of tonnes of organic waste.

This is all thanks to the hard work of our colleague from Longueuil—Charles-LeMoyne.

* * *

• (1510)

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Ms. Niki Ashton (Churchill—Keewatinook Aski, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the public service has gone back in time to the good old days when the foremen gave orders in English and francophones did their bidding.

The federal government is hardly setting an example for CN or Air Canada; in fact, it is doing the same thing. In all, 19% of deputy ministers and associate deputy ministers speak French as their first official language, compared to 31% of workers and 23% of society as a whole. The Prime Minister decides who is to be appointed. He can correct this situation.

When will he show leadership and correct this representation gap at the top of the civil service?

Hon. Mona Fortier (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, official languages are essential to the effective and efficient delivery of our federal services. Over 40% of public servants in the federal government are bilingual.

Our government is also developing a new framework for language qualification standards, supervision and assessment to support a culture of bilingualism in the public service. All deputy ministers have a duty to support and promote the objectives of the Official Languages Act by encouraging the use of both official languages within their organizations.

We will continue to pursue our efforts.

* * *

[English]

TELECOMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, last week the Competition Bureau filed to block the Rogers-Shaw merger. This merger would eliminate competition, hurt business growth and increase consumer prices. Canadians pay some of the highest cellphone fees in the world. We pay close to double what the U.S. does for data alone. Now another telecom giant, Quebecor, is using this disastrous merger to try to acquire Freedom Mobile. This will only lead to more price gouging for Canadians.

Will the government finally do its job, just as the Competition Bureau has, and stop this outrageous fleecing of Canadians by blocking this merger? Where is the accountability?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, accountability is on this side. I have been very clear to Canadians that affordability is central in my decision. I have even said publicly that under no circumstances will I allow the wholesale transfer of licences from Rogers to Shaw.

This is an experienced member of the House. He knows that in addition to my department, the CRTC needs to make a decision, as does the Competition Bureau. Affordability is key to Canadians. That is what we will defend.

* * *

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Deputy Speaker: We have a few visitors joining us in the gallery. I wish to draw the attention of members to the presence in the gallery of the finalists of the 2022 Shaughnessy Cohen Prize for Political Writing: Mike Blanchfield, Joanna Chiu, Stephen Poloz and Geoffrey Stevens.

Please rise and receive a warm welcome.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—SUBSIDIES FOR THE OIL AND GAS SECTOR

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

The Deputy Speaker: When we left this, the hon. member for South Okanagan—West Kootenay had four minutes in debate.

The hon. member for South Okanagan—West Kootenay.

Business of Supply

Mr. Richard Cannings (South Okanagan—West Kootenay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, when we left off for question period, I was talking about how Canada is uniquely positioned to become a renewable energy superpower. During the natural resources committee's study on critical minerals, we learned that Canada is the only nation in the western hemisphere with all of the minerals and metals needed to produce the advanced batteries, electric motors and wind turbine generators that will be needed in the low-carbon economy. The International Energy Agency's net-zero energy scenario estimates that the global value for select critical minerals will grow substantially over the next two decades, reaching today's level for coal market value of about \$400 billion U.S. by 2040.

The opportunity is there for Canada to both reach net zero and prosper, but we cannot continue down the path that Liberal and Conservative governments have chosen when it comes to spending money on the oil and gas sector. Canada currently spends more per capita on those subsidies than any other developed country. We cannot keep paying companies to clean up their own pollution.

New Democrats know that public funds are best spent supporting the transition to renewable energy and helping Canadians struggling with the high cost of living, rather than on profitable oil and gas companies. Instead of spending billions on new oil pipelines, we should be building hydrogen infrastructure for heavy transportation hubs, stronger provincial interties to distribute clean electricity across Canada, and electric vehicle infrastructure and manufacturing, and we should be training and employing workers now working in the oil and gas sector in these new opportunities. They are opportunities that will last into the future.

This is where the puck is going.

We need to stop providing those subsidies to oil and gas companies, which delay climate action, and instead spend that money on climate action. Increasingly, we need to spend money on climate adaptation, since the effects of global warming are locked in. We have to talk about the cost of climate inaction, and that cost is rising every year.

Right now, Canadian governments, businesses and citizens spend more than \$5 billion annually to fix the destruction caused by increased fires and floods. That is predicted to rise to over \$40 billion by 2050. At the moment, the federal government puts up just over \$300 million of that cost. It is past time that we faced up to the rising costs of climate change.

We must realign the disaster mitigation and adaptation fund to spend more on adaptation, so that we protect communities from disaster rather than rebuild them after the fact. Last year, British Columbia communities such as Lytton, Princeton, Merritt and many more, were badly impacted by fire and floods. Small communities such as these do not have the monetary resources to rebuild under present funding formulas.

We must have a clear strategy for the future that faces the facts of climate change, both limiting the extent of future changes and dealing with the changes that have already taken place. Canada's future is very bright, but first we must invest in that future, not in the past.

• (1515)

Mr. Ken McDonald (Avalon, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have always heard the NDP picking up for unionized workers and picking up for workers in general, but I heard the member come down hard on the oil industry. Most of those workers are union-paying members.

Is he saying to put them out of work and leave them without jobs?

Mr. Richard Cannings: Mr. Speaker, the answer to the member's question is, of course, "no". We do not want to put oil and gas workers out of work. The oil and gas industry has been very good to Canada over the past decades. The member for Calgary Centre recounted in great detail how much benefit it has provided Canadians and Canadian workers.

However, that is not where we are going. What I am saying is we have to make sure that those workers who have good union jobs now will have good union jobs in the future, but those jobs are disappearing, whether they like it or not. A lot of those workers are rightly concerned about what they see. We have to invest in that future for them and their families.

Mr. Greg McLean (Calgary Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, has my hon. colleague, who gave a good speech, actually read the preamble to this motion, which talks about the increasing price of gas?

In his speech, he talked about the move toward renewable energies as replacing fossil fuels. There is a dichotomy there. I wonder if he has thought about it, because the whole concept of renewable energies and making gas more expensive is so that renewable energies do not look as mounting expensive in comparison.

Has he thought at all about what the actual outcome is here for Canadian consumers in the critical minerals chain he is discussing?

Mr. Richard Cannings: Mr. Speaker, obviously, the price of gas is at the top of a lot of Canadians' minds right now. It has gone up a tremendous amount. It has probably gone up \$1 a litre since the war in Ukraine has changed the world markets.

What I am looking for is a future that we are moving toward and planning for, which will create an energy market that is not so sensitive to world events. I am looking for an energy future where Canada is creating its own energy and not subject to world prices for oil.

Business of Supply

The Conservatives are always talking about using Canadian oil to fuel Canada, but I can bet that if we had that system right now, Canadian oil companies would not want the Conservatives to say that we will cut the price of oil in half because we control oil in Canada. We need a system that is good for the planet and for consumers, and we have to plan for that.

• (1520)

Mr. Taylor Bachrach (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the thing that stands out to me the most is this \$2.6-billion subsidy for carbon capture and storage that is in the most recent budget. It stands out as egregious, not only because this technology has yet to prove feasible at scale, but also because these billions of dollars are going to some of the largest companies in the world, which are making record profits.

Could my colleague comment a bit on where he would rather see that \$2.6 billion go in the budget, especially in terms of helping Canadians transition to lower-carbon, more affordable lifestyles?

Mr. Richard Cannings: Mr. Speaker, I outlined some of that in my speech. I would like to thank the member for Skeena—Bulkley Valley for allowing me to go on.

We need to spend those monies on reaching this future with a clean economy. I mentioned interprovincial interties in electrical redistribution. That would help us get clean electricity across the country and reduce our emissions tremendously, but it costs a couple of billion dollars for each intertie. Those are the kinds of things we have to be looking at, instead of funding the oil and gas industry, which is very profitable.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for London West.

I have had the opportunity to emphasize a few points already today. They are important points that we need to understand and have an appreciation for. I have talked about the differences between political entities inside the chamber. We have some in the chamber, in some political parties, who will say we are not doing enough to support the energy industry, and then we have others who say we are doing too much to support the energy industry.

As a political party and, more importantly, as a government, we have recognized the true value for all of Canada. We say that, in fact, we can be responsible for environmental stewardship while, at the same time, respecting the energy industry. We have seen a number of different policies, both through legislation and budgetary measures, that demonstrate that it is doable.

I made reference to one of the questions. We talk a lot about the environment, as well we should. I am going to repeat a quote from earlier today. It was from the former leader of the Green Party in British Columbia, Andrew Weaver. This was based on election platforms. I thought it was important to provide this quote and a little balance to it.

Andrew Weaver supported the NDP when it was in a minority situation in the province of Manitoba. He said, “I’m a climate scientist and a parent, and I’ve spent my life working on climate science, policy and solutions. The science is clear. Urgent action is required

to mitigate the worst aspects of the climate crisis and to get to net-zero emissions by 2050. The Liberal Party of Canada’s climate plan is both bold and thoughtful. It is the only credible, science-aligned climate plan put forward by any political party at the federal level to date.”

He continued, “It includes a world-leading price on carbon pollution, permanent public transit funding, rapid zero emissions vehicle deployment, which is even stronger policy than the one we developed here in B.C. as part of Clean B.C., the phasing out of coal by 2030, and much, much more. This is a plan that reflects the urgency and scale of the crisis. I am extremely impressed at how ambitious the Liberal Party of Canada’s climate plan is, and I am confident that this is the right path for Canada.”

This was what the former leader of the Green Party in British Columbia had to say.

I made reference to the fact that over the last six or seven years, we have seen historical amounts of money invested in a green transition. We are talking not only about hundreds of millions of dollars, but we are going into multiple billions of dollars. It is estimated to be as high as just under \$100 billion.

No government in the history of Canada has ever provided as much money towards a green transition. We have seen it done, both directly and indirectly. Money speaks volumes. At the end of the day, ours is a government that understands the importance of having a balance.

When we talk about zero emissions and achieving that goal by 2050, we have implemented legislation that has been put in place to ensure that we stay on target, even if 20 years from now we are not in government. The government in 20 years from now will have that obligation.

• (1525)

At the end of the day, it is not only legislation. There are budgetary measures too. There are things that have been put in place that consumers in Canada can really relate to, such as the greener homes grant. It is a great deal of money that is enabling literally thousands of people across Canada to access a grant that will enable them to improve their home, to build and to renovate.

Not only is that better for our environment, but it will also reduce the energy bills of our constituents who take advantage of that grant, while improving the communities where those homes are located. It improves the quality of Canada’s overall housing stock. That is one program I have talked about, encouraged and promoted.

Business of Supply

We can talk about the two billion trees over 10 years. That is an incredible commitment. Averaged out, that is about half million trees every day for 10 years. I know the opposition will say that they are not seeing half a million trees every day today, and that is true. That is because we cannot just take a seed and convert it into a two-year-old seedling or six-month-old seedling and plant it. It takes time.

We will see a much larger percentage of those two billion trees in the latter of those 10 years, rather than at the beginning. The point is, averaged out, how do we conceptualize two billion trees in a 10-year period of time. I would suggest to look at as half million trees a day. We have seen how well that policy has been received.

We talk about the banning of plastics, which is another regulation moved by the government to ban single-use plastics. Once again, that is something that is very popular. It is being put into place, and it will make a difference.

Going back to consumers, we have a budget that says we want to encourage members and the public to purchase and acquire electric vehicles to the point where we have provided financial incentives to do so. Some other provinces, and the first that comes to my mind is the province of Quebec, have a financial incentive to purchase an electric vehicle. I would love to see the province of Manitoba also participate in that kind of program. It did a number of years ago. These types of programs make a difference.

Earlier today I asked a question of one of my Conservative friends because many of them within the Conservative Party still have that climate denial. They do not understand and appreciate climate change. I pointed something out during a question to a member opposite because he had mentioned getting into a truck and taking trips in rural Alberta.

I said that speaking of trucks, I had talking to workers at a Ford dealership, and they were saying that for the electric version of the Ford F-150—

An hon. member: It takes two years.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, it takes more than two years. Some are looking at four years, likely five years, and that was a couple months ago. It might have even been extended by now. The reason I used that example was to share with my Conservative friends that many people within their constituencies have recognized the true value of electronic vehicles.

• (1530)

Mr. Blake Desjarlais (Edmonton Griesbach, NDP): Madam Speaker, I want to thank my hon. colleague for the important work that our energy sector truly does, but one critical question, which is important for the House to know about, is the reality facing indigenous communities in the resource areas. What I have heard, speaking with indigenous leadership, is the fact that these companies are often predatory in their work with indigenous communities.

Can the member explain how we can ensure that indigenous communities will truly see a diversified economy where they do not have to rely on selling their resources back for the penny just to go backwards?

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, before question period, I was having a conversation with the Minister of the Environment, and we were talking about the green transition. We were speaking about how, in the province of Alberta, through renewable energy and job creation, somewhere in the neighbourhood of several thousands of jobs, just in that one province, have been created.

I think we underestimate, as the Minister of the Environment would no doubt tell us, those nations, countries, provinces and provincial governments that get engaged on the whole concept of green technology and what we can do as provincial or federal entities to encourage and promote it. Those are good jobs for the future, and thousands of jobs are being generated because of some of the budgetary measures we have put in this last budget, specifically, but others also.

Mr. Greg McLean (Calgary Centre, CPC): Madam Speaker, I always enjoy hearing the parliamentary secretary to the government House leader on the other side of the House, but I want to ask him about this, because he drifted away from the substance of this motion when he started talking about trees.

Three years ago, his government committed to planting two billion trees in 10 years. That is about 200 million a year. Three years later, it is planning to plant the first 30 million, because it actually did not figure out the execution. Much like everything in its policies, it likes announcing things, but it does not actually know how to deliver. This kind of thing spins around in their heads for three years, and then they think, “Oh, yeah, we should probably start moving on that.”

Has he thought about the execution of the policies he is talking about concerning an actual energy transition?

• (1535)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, yes, we have actually given a great deal of thought to it.

On the issue of the trees, I look forward to eight years from now, when the member on that side of the bench will be able to ask questions, and we will be able to provide the answers to those questions and the success of planting those two billion trees. In time, we will see that we will achieve the two billion, but we have to emphasize that we have to gather the seeds and the different types of seeds. It takes a while for those seeds to become seedlings and to put them into the ground.

We cannot just click our heels and wish them into existence. There is a process, and we in government will achieve that process.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order. There are a lot of reactions happening, and I would just ask members, if they want to react loudly, to maybe leave the chamber and then come back in when they have composed themselves.

The hon. member for Mirabel.

*Business of Supply**[Translation]*

Mr. Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ): Madam Speaker, it is rare to see the member for Winnipeg North so out of sorts. He was so out of sorts that he had to read notes, because his government has forced him to say that the oil subsidies are investments in the environment.

In committee, the oil companies told us that they needed public funding because they do not have the means to pay for their own investments.

Does the member for Winnipeg North agree with the oil companies' assertion that they are too poor to make their own investments and they need money? In my opinion, that money should be invested in health and in seniors.

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, there are many different industries in which the Government of Canada invests. We want to see the advancement of technologies that are going to create the good, solid middle-class jobs going into the future.

Whether it is jobs through green transition or jobs—

[Translation]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order. Is there a problem with the interpretation?

Mr. Jean-Denis Garon: Madam Speaker, I would like to raise the fact that my colleague is not answering the question. He spouted nonsense.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Since that is not a point of order I would ask the members to listen to the response.

[English]

The hon. parliamentary secretary has time for a brief response.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, the point is that we have a government that is prepared to invest in technology, to work with both private and public sectors, and to ensure that we can create the types of jobs Canadians want to see for the future.

Green transition is of critical importance. We say that, and we believe in it, and that is why we have invested literally hundreds of millions, going into the billions, of dollars. It is because that is where the future jobs, in good part, are going to be.

Ms. Arielle Kayabaga (London West, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to take part in today's debate—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): There is an individual whom I have recognized and who has the floor, yet we still have other individuals who wish to have conversations. I would ask them to take those conversations out of the chamber, or if they are just reacting, maybe they would like to leave and come back when they have composed themselves.

The hon. member for London West.

[Translation]

Ms. Arielle Kayabaga: Madam Speaker, I am pleased that my colleagues are so excited to see me rising in the House.

[English]

I will start again.

I appreciate the opportunity to take part in today's debate.

Our government fully understands the importance of phasing out or rationalizing inefficient fossil fuel subsidies. We take Canada's G20 commitment to do so very seriously. More importantly, we have already made important progress toward achieving this goal. This includes action we have taken to phase out or rationalize tax measures providing preferential tax treatment to the fossil fuel sector.

Taking into account the phasing out of flow-through shares for oil, gas and coal activities in 2023, which was just announced in budget 2022, nine inefficient fossil fuel subsidies will have been phased out or rationalized by this government. This includes the phase-out of the accelerated capital cost allowance for oil sands, announced in budget 2007 and completed in 2015; the reduction in the deduction rates for intangible capital expenses in oil sands projects to align with rates in the conventional oil and gas sector, announced in 2011 and completed in 2016; the phase-out of the Atlantic investment tax credit for investment in the oil and gas and mining sectors, announced in 2012 and completed in 2017; the reduction in the deduction rate for pre-production intangible mine development expenses to align with the rate for the oil and gas sector, announced in budget 2013 and completed in 2018; the phase-out of the accelerated capital cost allowance for mining, announced in budget 2013 and completed in 2021; allowing the accelerated capital cost allowance for liquefied natural gas facilities to expire as scheduled in 2025, announced in 2016; the rationalization of the tax treatment of expenses for successful oil and gas exploratory drilling, announced in 2017 and completed in 2021; and the phase-out of the tax preference that allows small oil and gas companies to reclassify certain development expenses as more favourably treated exploration expenses, announced in 2017 and completed in 2020.

To support its efforts to phase out or rationalize inefficient fossil fuel subsidies, Canada committed to undergo a peer review of inefficient fossil fuel subsidies under the G20 process. Once the process is completed, the results will be communicated in a very transparent and timely manner. Canada will continue to review its measures that could be considered inefficient fossil fuel subsidies, with a view to reforming them as necessary.

Business of Supply

We have been taking effective action to help Canadians with the high cost of living, and we continue to support Canadians struggling with the high cost of living, as called for in today's motion. Our government understands that Canadians are being hit by rising prices. We are also taking effective action to meaningfully support them so they can deal with this challenge. For example, we are investing in cutting taxes for the middle class while raising them on the wealthiest 1%. We continue to increase support for families and low-income workers through programs such as the Canada child benefit and the Canada workers benefit. Thanks to the CCB, nine out of 10 Canadian families have more money to help them with the cost of caring for their children than they did with previous benefits. Our expanded Canada workers benefit will support an estimated one million additional Canadians, which could mean \$1,000 more per year for a full-time minimum-wage worker.

Our financial support for Canadians does not stop there. In budget 2021, our government laid out an ambitious plan to provide Canadian parents with an average of \$10-a-day regulated child care spaces for children under six years old. In less than one year, we have reached agreements with all provinces and territories. This means that, by the end of this year, families across Canada will have seen their child care fees reduced by an average of 50%, which is an average of \$6,000 in savings per child for families in British Columbia and Ontario. These are not savings that will appear in five or 10 years; these are savings that will occur by the end of December. By 2025-26, our plan will mean an average child care fee of \$10 a day for all regulated child care spaces across Canada, meaning thousands of dollars in savings for families across Canada.

• (1540)

To support vulnerable Canadians at the other end of the demographic spectrum, we have also increased the guaranteed income supplement to top up the benefit for low-income single seniors and enhanced the GIS earnings exemption. We are also increasing old age security for Canadians aged 75 and older in July of this year. This 10% increase would provide about \$800 in additional benefits to full pensioners over the first year. About 3.3 million seniors would benefit from this and no action will be required on their part. They would automatically receive the payment if they are eligible. This is the first permanent increase of old age security pensions since 1973, other than just adjustments due to inflation.

To protect Canadians from the impact of inflation, the government indexes the Canada child benefit to inflation, as well as the Canada pension plan, old age security, the guaranteed income supplement, the goods and services tax credit and other benefits for the most vulnerable people. To further help make life more affordable for Canadians, we have also increased the basic personal amount, BPA, that Canadians can earn before paying any federal income tax. To ensure this support is targeted to the middle class, the benefits of the increased BPA are phased out for high-income taxpayers. When this measure is fully implemented next year, single individuals will pay \$300 less in tax each year and families will pay \$600 less.

Our government is also returning the direct proceeds from the federal carbon pollution pricing system to their province or territory of origin, with most of these proceeds going to families in those jurisdictions. In fact, in jurisdictions that do not have their own pricing

system consistent with the federal benchmark criteria, which is to say Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, approximately 90% of direct proceeds from the fuel charge are being returned to the residents of these provinces through climate action incentive payments. Between 2022 and 2023, a family of four would receive \$745 in Ontario, \$832 in Manitoba, \$1,101 in Saskatchewan and \$1,079 in Alberta. In addition, families in rural and small communities are eligible to receive an extra 10%. The reality is that, as a result of these CAI payments, most households are getting back more than they paid in increased costs they faced from the federal carbon pollution pricing system. What is more, the remaining fuel charge proceeds are being used to support small businesses, farmers, indigenous communities and other organizations. Going forward, the federal carbon price will continue to be revenue-neutral for the Government of Canada.

At the same time, we are also ensuring that taxes are appropriate and fair. Our government knows that those who can afford to buy expensive cars, planes and boats can also afford to pay a bit more, and Canadians agree. Our government campaigned on this promise in 2019 and 2021 and was elected to enact this. To that end, we are also following through on our commitment to introduce a tax on the sale of new luxury cars and aircraft with a retail sale price of over \$100,000 and on new boats over \$250,000. The revenues raised by this tax can be used to offset costs for Canadians and invest in a strong economic recovery that supports their highest priorities.

Another example of our government's commitment to tax fairness is our proposed tax for non-resident-owned, non-Canadian-owned residential real estate that is considered to be vacant or underused, which would become effective as of January 1, 2022. While this tax would not be paid by individual Canadian homeowners, it would definitely benefit Canadian families. That is because the recent and rapid rise in housing prices has made finding an affordable place to call home increasingly difficult. The underused housing tax would help support investments in housing affordability so that all Canadians can have a safe and affordable place to call home.

Our recent federal budget introduced what may be the most ambitious plan to build new housing that Canada has ever seen, putting Canada on the path to double the number of new homes we build over the next 10 years. These—

Business of Supply

• (1545)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I am sorry. The hon. member's time is up. I have been trying to give her some signals, but she was quite into her speech and I can understand that this is a very important issue.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Cowichan—Malahat—Langford.

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Madam Speaker, families in Cowichan—Malahat—Langford right now, when they are filling up their vehicles, are looking at those eye-watering prices, and then they read the news and hear about the billions of dollars of profits that oil companies are making. Then, to add insult to injury, they learn that their hard-earned taxpayer dollars are directly subsidizing those companies, especially in unproven technology.

I have a very clear question for my hon. colleague: Does she not agree that this is precisely the wrong time to continue subsidizing oil companies, not only because of the climate danger, but because of the pressure that working families are feeling? Is it not time to directly invest those dollars, instead, into the pockets of working families to help them out and give them a break?

I want to hear a clear answer from my Liberal colleague on putting that money directly into working families' pockets through an increase in the GST credit.

• (1550)

Ms. Arielle Kayabaga: Madam Speaker, I appreciate the question from my colleague across the aisle. I believe that our government has been working to invest in making life more affordable for Canadians. There are a number of measures that we put in budget 2022 to make sure that families are able to afford life. There are things that we are working through right now, after the pandemic, but we are taking strong measures to have a green recovery, to invest in child care, to invest in families, to invest in young Canadians being able to afford homes.

I understand that gas prices have been frustrating, as the member on the other side mentioned, but the important part is that we are committed to making sure that life is more affordable for Canadians and we have taken measures to do so.

Mr. Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC): Madam Speaker, the member from London West made the comment that most Canadian families are getting a bigger carbon tax credit than the carbon tax they would incur throughout the year. I would suggest that a lot of the carbon tax that families are going to be incurring throughout the year is now hidden in the cost of goods and services and we can see that, whether it is on the grocery shelves, in the lumber stores or in retail shops.

Can the member explain to us exactly why she thinks that the average Canadian family will actually receive more back than it is costing them? The costs will certainly be hidden.

Ms. Arielle Kayabaga: Madam Speaker, I find that question very interesting, because I did mention the numbers and the amount of money that we are going to be putting in the pockets of single people and families to make sure that Canadians are getting the money from this tax back.

Once again, I just want to reiterate that budget 2022's main goal and primary driver is to make life more affordable for Canadians, and we are doing that.

[Translation]

Ms. Monique Pauzé (Repentigny, BQ): Madam Speaker, I would like to point out that Canada subsidizes the oil and gas sector more heavily than any other G20 country.

The member talked a lot about subsidies for families, but I would like to talk about subsidies for oil companies. She spoke about the carbon tax. On one hand, the government is taxing carbon, taxing pollution, but then on the other hand, it is subsidizing the polluters.

Does she not find that somewhat illogical?

[English]

Ms. Arielle Kayabaga: Madam Speaker, once again, I want to reiterate that our government is committed to reducing fossil fuel subsidies. At COP26, we reiterated our commitment to phase out Canada's fossil fuel subsidies by 2023, two years earlier than originally planned. We continue to do that and we continue to do all that we can to have a green recovery for all Canadians.

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Madam Speaker, I will be sharing my time with my hon. colleague, the member for Vancouver East.

We put forward this motion for a number of reasons. I want to lay out, first of all, the context. In our country right now, Canadians are paying over \$2 a litre for gas. That means that families are being hurt. Families have been isolated because of this pandemic and have not been able to visit their close ones, and now, when they finally have the opportunity, they are considering cancelling road trips to visit dear family members because they simply cannot afford it.

What makes it even more offensive is that oil and gas companies are posting massive profits, in some cases record profits. Imperial Oil is experiencing the highest profits it has enjoyed in 30 years. In light of that, what adds insult to injury is that the Liberal government continues to hand out billions of dollars in subsidies to these very profitable oil and gas companies. That is wrong.

• (1555)

[Translation]

Gasoline costs more than \$2 a litre in much of the country. People are struggling, and it is getting harder and harder to make ends meet. At the same time, these oil companies are making huge profits, record profits in some cases.

It gets worse. The Liberal government continues to throw billions of dollars in subsidies at these companies. People are struggling, while big oil is making record profits. That is unacceptable, and we are saying that we can do things differently and fix this problem.

[English]

Any time the cost of everything goes up, it hurts families, but there are also winners. While families are hurt as the cost of living goes up, inflation rises and gas rises, oil and gas companies are benefiting from this moment. The sad thing is that the only solutions ever proposed in times when there is inflation are measures that make things even worse for families, increasing interest rates, which only further squeezes families that are already so hurt. Why is it that the only response in difficult times is to put more pressure and burden on the families and workers who are already struggling?

The New Democrats contend that to deal with the rising cost of living, to deal with the cost of goods going up and to deal with inflation, we have to find a solution that does not follow the traditional path of putting more burden on families. We have to find a solution that helps families, does not put the burden on them, lifts them up and provides them with support.

[Translation]

Whenever the cost of living rises, there are winners and there are losers. Families lose because the cost of living goes up and it gets harder and harder to make ends meet. Oil companies win because they rake in huge, record profits.

The only solutions proposed, traditionally, actually make things worse for workers and families. New Democrats believe profoundly that we need solutions that help workers and families, and that is exactly what we are going to put forward.

[English]

I want to be very clear. Whenever the cost of living rises and inflation rises, there are winners and there are losers. Families are hurt, workers are hurt and people who are precariously employed are hurt, but the oil and gas companies are benefiting. They are winning. They are making more and more profit, and the only solutions proposed, traditionally, are solutions that put further and further weight and burden on the shoulders of families. That has to end. The New Democrats believe profoundly that we need solutions to deal with the cost of living and inflation that actually support families, help workers and lift people up.

People across this country are paying hundreds of dollars more in their costs, and oil and gas companies are enjoying record profits. On top of that, they are receiving billions of dollars of public money, which is our money. Our solution is to stop subsidizing already profitable companies, end those subsidies and invest that money back into people by doubling the GST tax credit, increasing the child benefit and supporting families that need help the most.

While oil and gas companies make massive profits as the cost of oil rises and enjoy profits they have never seen in 30 years, the New Democrats are calling on the government to end fossil fuel subsidies and use that public money to invest in people, to support families and to invest in renewable energy. That is the way forward.

• (1600)

[Translation]

Right now, families are struggling. They are spending hundreds of dollars more because the cost of living and the cost of gas have

Business of Supply

gone up. New Democrats want to end fossil fuel subsidies and invest that money to help families.

We want to double the GST tax credit, increase the Canada child benefit and invest in renewable energy in our country. That is what we see as the way forward, a way that will do more to help people.

[English]

Families are struggling at the pumps with the cost of gas going up. At the same time, families are struggling with worry about the climate crisis. We have seen the impact in our lives in B.C., with intense flooding and intense record-setting temperatures, the cost of which was a loss of lives. We see flooding and forest fires across the country. We know that the impact of the climate crisis is real and it is now, and instead of giving public money to these profitable oil and gas companies, we must end those subsidies and use that public money to fight the climate crisis, invest in renewable energy, support workers who are hurt by the climate crisis and help families that are struggling with the cost of living.

While the Liberals talk about ending fossil fuel subsidies, their actions are very different. Instead of ending fossil fuel subsidies in this budget, they have increased them by \$2.6 billion for a carbon capture tax credit, which we are not very certain is actually going to help in tackling the climate crisis. Either way, we should force profitable companies to do the right thing, be environmentally conscious and make the right decisions to protect our planet and our environment. We should also be spending public money on sectors that need more support, such as the renewable energy sector, so that we can have renewable energy in our country and good jobs that are long-lasting.

At the end of the day, politics is about choices. The choices we make reflect the priorities we have. It is clear that the Liberal government's priority is protecting the profits of billion-dollar oil and gas companies. It continues to give them billions of dollars more in public money instead of standing up for workers, families and people struggling with the cost of living.

The New Democrats would make different choices. Our choice would be to end the billions of dollars in public money flowing to profitable companies and use those financial resources to help families and people and invest in renewable energy. There are better choices we can make, and the New Democrats are outlining those better decisions.

Business of Supply

Mr. Patrick Weiler (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country, Lib.): Madam Speaker, Canada has made the ambitious target of reducing emissions from the oil and gas sector by 40%, relative to current levels, by 2030, and is in the process right now of developing regulations to cap emissions and have them steadily reduced to net zero by 2050. I think we would all agree on the need to reduce emissions, but as we develop more stringent regulations, there is a risk that jobs and investment could move to countries that have less stringent regulations but have deposits of energy.

Would the member for Burnaby South want Canada to work with industry to reduce emissions and keep jobs in Canada, or would he rather that emissions be eliminated in Canada simply by eliminating production and we move them to another country?

Mr. Jagmeet Singh: Madam Speaker, I want to remind the member that today's motion is about ending fossil fuel subsidies. How does it make any sense that as a G7 nation we give billions of dollars to a sector that is already profitable and is right now making massive if not record profits? I would contend that makes absolutely no sense. Instead, we should be spending our public money, those precious public dollars, on helping workers who are impacted by the climate crisis and whose jobs go through bust and boom cycles. We should invest it in families that are struggling with the cost of living and invest it in building more renewable energy, which we know we need today and for the future.

This is really the fundamental question here: Why would we be giving profitable companies more public dollars?

• (1605)

Mr. Stephen Ellis (Cumberland—Colchester, CPC): Madam Speaker, what I find interesting is this trumped-up indignation that the member has with respect to the coalition party, which his party continues to support. I also find this really fascinating: When this side of the House proposed a cut of eight cents per litre to the price of gasoline, where was the member's party? That is the question I have.

We talk about choice. That is a choice. When are we going to make this change, vote against the government and end the spenDP-Liberal coalition? Will the member commit to that?

Mr. Jagmeet Singh: Madam Speaker, I find it fascinating that the member would use the word "trumped" when there are a lot of concerns about his party being affiliated with that type of rhetoric and ideology. It is very troubling.

We are talking about billions of dollars in subsidies. The member is talking about eight cents. We are talking about doubling the child benefit and increasing the GST tax credit in a direct way so they go directly to families in need. The member is talking about an idea to get help to people that may or may not work. We are talking about getting help directly to people in need. I think the member would rather protect the profits of the oil and gas sector than help families that are struggling right now.

[Translation]

Ms. Monique Pauzé (Repentigny, BQ): Madam Speaker, 30,000 Canadians and 400 academics have said that we must not invest in carbon capture and storage.

When the member for Burnaby South says that the federal government must stop giving subsidies and invest in renewable energy, I would like to know in what year he thinks that should start. It is surely not 2022, because he is supporting the budget, which includes \$2.4 billion for carbon capture and storage.

When should the government stop the subsidies?

Mr. Jagmeet Singh: Madam Speaker, we completely agree that the Liberal government's approach is the wrong one and that it will not solve the current crisis. The crisis requires urgent action.

We want the government to stop, cancel and eliminate oil subsidies immediately, this year. We want it to reinvest in the priorities of Canadians, families and workers and in renewable energy.

[English]

Ms. Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of the motion put forward by my colleague, the member for Victoria.

The NDP motion calls for the government to stop using Canadian taxpayers' money to subsidize oil and gas companies, and to instead reinvest that money into renewable energy and measures to help Canadians with the rising cost of living.

The motion could not have come at a more desperately needed time. This week, constituents in my riding are paying over \$2 a litre for gas at the pump. Many of the people scraping together the necessary funds to pay for fuel are essential workers, small business owners, families with young children and people with mobility challenges who need to drive for their livelihoods or to access essential goods and services.

Canadian families are already struggling with sky-high housing costs and income precarity exacerbated by the ongoing pandemic. Even before the rise in gas prices, people were living paycheck to paycheck and struggling to make ends meet. Retirees and people on fixed incomes have not seen a rise in income to account for the rise in living costs.

By glaring contrast, the oil and gas companies are making record profits, while being heavily subsidized by taxpayers' money. This grossly unjust situation is a direct result of the government's heavily misaligned priorities. The NDP motion calls on the government to fix this dire situation and place people and the planet before oil and gas company profits.

As Canadians are struggling more than ever, we are also faced with the most urgent crisis of our time: the climate change crisis. The most recent IPCC report states:

It is unequivocal that climate change has already disrupted human and natural systems.

It goes on to say:

Societal choices and actions implemented in the next decade determine the extent to which medium- and long-term pathways will deliver higher or lower climate resilient development.... Importantly climate resilient development prospects are increasingly limited if current greenhouse gas emissions do not rapidly decline, especially if 1.5°C global warming is exceeded in the near term.

A new climate update issued by the World Meteorological Organization pointed out that there is a fifty-fifty chance that the annual average global temperature will temporarily reach 1.5°C above the pre-industrial level for at least one of the next five years, and this likelihood is increasing with time.

Let us just think about that for one minute. They are saying that we are not going to meet our target. I should not need to remind anyone in this house of the importance of the 1.5° mark. Climate scientists have long established that holding global warming to 1.5° could limit the most dangerous and irreversible effects of climate change.

Our global temperatures have already risen by 1.1° since pre-industrial levels. We are already feeling the devastating effects of climate change. B.C., my province, has just experienced one of the most challenging years of extreme weather in recent memory, with a heat dome that shattered temperature records and killed hundreds of people, followed by weather bombs that destroyed critical infrastructure, livestock and agricultural lands with record precipitation and floods. For days, B.C. was cut off from the rest of Canada by rail and road because of the damages from the unprecedented floods.

Left unchecked, extreme weather connected to climate change will continue to wreak havoc on Canadian lives and livelihoods.

• (1610)

Around the globe, we are witnessing how climate change has caused substantial damage to terrestrial, freshwater and coastal and ocean marine ecosystems. We are seeing glaciers melt, mountains change and permafrost thaw in the Arctic ecosystem. Let us be clear: This is the result of human-induced climate change. That is why we must fight the climate crisis like we mean to win.

Despite the urgency of the climate crisis on our doorstep, Canada has failed to meet any of its climate targets to reduce carbon emissions over the past 40 years. In fact, not only has Canada repeatedly failed to meet its climate targets, Canada is also one of the few wealthy countries where carbon emissions continue to rise. Industrialized and wealthy nations are responsible for most of the greenhouse gas emissions in the world, but the effects of climate change impact developing nations and indigenous peoples the hardest.

Climate justice is justice, period. Continuing to subsidize oil and gas companies while delaying the economic and infrastructure overhaul and transition to green energy is the very opposite of climate leadership that Canadians and the world so desperately need. The new carbon capture tax credit is, in effect, a \$2.6-billion subsidy to oil and gas disguised as a so-called climate solution by the Liberal government. It is the wrong path to take.

Earlier this year, more than 400 Canadian climate scientists and academics pleaded with the finance minister to scrap the plan to create the carbon capture tax credit. Professor Christina Hoicka, from the University of Victoria, stated that carbon capture is expen-

Business of Supply

sive and unproven in its effectiveness in reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Julia Levin, senior climate and energy program manager, stated that by relying on unproven “techno-fixes”, the government is “gambling with our lives.”

Carbon capture projects exist at the demonstration level only, and have not successfully been deployed at the scale needed to make them part of a viable pathway to reach net-zero by 2050. More than 80% of the carbon capture projects attempted in the United States have ended in failure. Shell's Quest carbon capture facility near Edmonton is emitting more greenhouse gas than it captures.

Across the board, scientists are calling for the government to invest in proven climate solutions, including renewable energy, efficient affordable housing and the electrification of transportation as the way to go. The choices we make today will have a lasting impact on future generations.

It has long been my belief, and the NDP's belief, that a just transition must not only create a healthier environment, but also create better opportunities and improve affordability for Canadian workers and families. A just transition creates good jobs in the renewable energy sector and supports workers and communities in transitioning to jobs in this sector.

Canada could become a world leader in renewable energy development. Investing in energy-efficient home retrofits and affordable energy-efficient new homes, as well as investing in a robust electric public transit system, would make life more affordable for Canadians and reduce emissions. In other words, a just transition would help to build a stronger, resilient economy. It is an opportunity that any government that values people and the planet would jump on. Instead, Canada is spending 14 times more on financial support to the fossil-fuel sector than it does on renewable energy.

The Liberals promised a just transition act in 2019, but have failed to deliver and were recently rebuked by the Environment Commissioner for their lack of a plan to support workers and communities through the transition to a low-carbon economy. At the same time, oil and gas companies are making record profits, and Canadians are being decimated at the pump with record-high prices while the world is on the brink of a climate disaster.

Business of Supply

• (1615)

The majority of Canadians are concerned about climate change and affordability as the cost of living continues to rise. If the Liberals eliminated the tax credits for oil and gas exploration and development right now, it would bring in almost \$10 billion over the next four years. Instead—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. member's time is up. I have been trying to signal that to her.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Kings—Hants.

Mr. Kody Blois (Kings—Hants, Lib.): Madam Speaker, my hon. colleague made it very clear that she is against any type of public financing for the oil and gas sector. The way I view it is that this particular tax credit is meant to incentivize a reduction in emissions, but I respect her point and her view on this.

My question is a bit broader. Does she feel the Government of Canada has a role in working with private-sector entities to reduce emissions? She has made it very clear that she does not support that in the oil and gas sector. Where would she delineate, if at all, whether or not the Government of Canada should be providing these types of incentives to other private-sector industries?

Ms. Jenny Kwan: Madam Speaker, instead of subsidizing very profitable big oil companies, the government can provide immediate relief to struggling Canadians by suspending the GST on residential energy bills, doubling the GST tax credit and increasing the Canada child benefit to all recipients by \$500. That would be an immediate help for Canadians.

By the way, the oil and gas industry should be paying for the work that needs to be done to make the planet better. It is making record profits and can afford to do it. There is no good reason why the Canadian Liberal government continues to subsidize it. That money should be invested in people and renewable energy.

• (1620)

Mr. Greg McLean (Calgary Centre, CPC): Madam Speaker, I heard the member refer in her speech to the same misinformation we identified earlier, which is a lie propagated by a subsidiary of Tides International. It is the only place where this “14 times” number comes up. I hope she is happy, in this House of Commons, as she and her colleagues continue to repeat that misinformation, but they should recognize what it is.

I am going to challenge the member on the whole thing: on carbon capture, utilization and storage, because she talked about it being at a demonstration level only in Canada. She also referred to the Shell Quest facility. Shell Quest is using the technology it has at Edmonton in the Northern Lights project that is offshore of Norway, which has a better tax regime than Canada with respect to carbon capture, utilization and storage. Can she comment on why we have developed technology in Canada that is now leaving to be exploited around the world in other environmental countries that are approaching the same problem?

Ms. Jenny Kwan: Madam Speaker, I did not realize the member was a scientist. I did not realize we should trust someone who is frankly right in the pockets of big oil instead of the scientists who have brought forward the evidence. The last time I checked, I would rather trust the scientists than the Conservatives.

Let me say this on the issue of carbon capture. If that is the technology to be used, as the member suggests, why does the oil and gas industry not pay for it itself? Why does it need a subsidy from the Canadian government? I hope the member realizes that money should be invested in communities and Canadians who need that support and are being gouged right now at the pumps.

[Translation]

Ms. Louise Chabot (Thérèse-De Blainville, BQ): Madam Speaker, I completely agree with the speech denouncing the use of carbon capture technologies, which will benefit the oil companies. However, there is something I do not understand. I would like the member to explain to me how she can condemn this practice and at the same time praise it in the last budget.

[English]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Before I get the hon. member to respond, I just want to indicate that if anybody has any questions or answers or comments, they should wait until I recognize them. Otherwise, I would ask them to be quiet until such time as I acknowledge their presence in the House.

The hon. member for Vancouver East.

Ms. Jenny Kwan: Madam Speaker, on the issue of the NDP negotiating with the government on the supply and confidence agreement, we have advanced the notion to call on the government to end the oil and gas subsidies. We got a bit, only \$9 million, in terms of a return, but of course the government went and gave a giant gift to the oil and gas sector. That does not mean to say we will not continue to strongly advocate for this and to call the government out whenever it steps in the wrong direction. That is why we have this motion on the floor today. I hope all members of the House will support it.

[Translation]

Mr. Kody Blois (Kings—Hants, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I will be sharing my time with my hon. colleague from Vaughan—Woodbridge. As usual, it is a privilege to rise this afternoon to speak to the NDP opposition motion moved by my hon. colleague from Victoria.

In principle, the motion has three elements. It recognizes that the price of gas is high, at more than \$2 a litre in some regions in the country, and that that is affecting affordability across the country. The motion points out that energy companies are making profits, especially with the high price of basic energy products. The motion calls for the elimination of the tax credit for carbon capture, utilization and storage that was presented in the budget by the Minister of Finance and for the savings from that measure to be reinvested into helping Canadians.

I will talk about the motion, but I will also use my time to talk about the broader issue of affordability and the energy transition in Canada and in the world.

I represent a rural riding where a good number of my constituents do not have access to public transit. This conversation on affordability and the ability to use public transit for work and pleasure is an important public policy concern.

As far as affordability is concerned, I would like to share with my colleagues that my father was a truck driver and my mother is an administrative assistant. We were a low-income family. One of the reasons I decided to join the Liberal Party and run as an MP is because of the work this government has done to support low- and middle-income families. I want to give some examples of how our government has done that since taking office in 2015: We created the Canada child care benefit, enhanced old age security, reversed the Conservative plan to change the eligibility age from 67 to 65, and strengthened the guaranteed income supplement.

• (1625)

[English]

We also introduced national child care, and we had the opportunity to see that rolled out across the country. That is something that this government has focused on because it helps support affordability for families paying for child care costs. It is also an important economic driver. It had been talked about for a long time, but it was this government that stepped up, showed leadership and made it happen across the country.

I was not part of it, but from 2015-19, in the 42nd Parliament, the first thing this government did was to lower taxes for lower and middle-income Canadians and increase them for the wealthiest one percent in the country. Indeed, this government has invested significantly in the Canadian housing benefit, trying to support individuals with rental costs and their ability to put a roof over their heads.

I could go on with the programs I am proud of from this side. That is not to say that all issues are solved or that affordability writ large is taken care of, but I am proud of the record on this side of the House, and of the plans and programs we have introduced because they are making a difference in the lives of Canadians across the country.

Let us talk about the inflation issue because it is an important piece to raise. I would suggest that from where I sit in the House, there is no one silver bullet solution to inflation. In fact, history has shown that to be the case, but let us first examine the reasons why we are seeing inflation across the economy and recognize that this is not just a Canadian problem. This is being recognized across the world, in Europe and in the United States. Indeed, the inflation we are experiencing is challenging and impacting us in Canada, but it is actually lower than in other jurisdictions around the world.

It is happening, in part, because of the war in Ukraine. We heard, in question period, the Associate Minister of Finance talk about the importance of supporting Ukraine and being able to support them in their fight against Russia. The war and the conflict is having cascading impacts that are creating inflationary pressure around the world. We have to remind Canadians that this is being perpetuated by the Russian Federation, namely, Vladimir Putin.

Business of Supply

There has also been a supply chain disruption, and it has been talked about at great length. The pandemic has created those challenges. They are not easily reversed. I would also submit that the changing geopolitical situation will also have reverberations on how our supply chains have traditionally operated prior to the pandemic and, indeed, prior to the war in Ukraine.

On government spending, governments around the world, including this one, were compelled to step up to support their citizens and make sure that they were taken care of. We were asking individuals to do their part to stop the spread of COVID-19 until we had access to a vaccine and until we had the work that had to be done by the scientific community. This government makes no qualms about the fact that we stepped up for Canadians. Eight dollars out of every 10 were provided by this government. That was to help provinces and territories, municipal governments, businesses, and individuals.

Undoubtedly, the global community stepping up to help support citizens put additional liquidity into the market. I think that has led, in part, to some of the inflationary pressures we have seen.

On the aging workforce, I think this is something we have not discussed to the extent that it should be discussed in the House. We have labour challenges. We have heard that in large detail, in the 44th Parliament, about some of the challenges.

That is not just Canada. That is the western world, as we have a large baby boomer demographic that is making its way to retirement. That is creating challenges in employment, which has, as well, an inflationary pressure on wages. In some cases, that can be really important for lower wages, in terms of lower hourly wages, but it is undoubtedly putting on some of that inflationary pressure. That is part of what we have seen.

As we can see, it is nuanced. There is not one single thing we can point to. It is a variety of circumstances that have presented themselves for a long time and, indeed, in the last couple of years to where we find ourselves.

The question becomes how best to address it. History suggests that it is not easy. Do we spend more money to give individual households some of the affordability measures that they might need? Of course, I think most of us would agree that, in principle, this sounds great. History has shown that when the economy is hot, providing additional support to households, notwithstanding that we want to do that, in some cases, can actually reverberate some of the inflationary pressure that we have seen, particularly when there is a lot of liquidity in the market, with money supply.

On interest rates, the Bank of Canada has raised interest rates and, indeed, that is seen as one way, from an economic theory. If we raise interest rates, it can have a cooling effect on the economy to bring inflation down, but that has an impact on the affordability element for individuals who might hold debt, in terms of their monthly mortgage payments and some of their bills on that side.

Business of Supply

I guess, at the end of the day, what I would say is that the question of inflation and affordability is an important one. There is no easy solution, but when I look at the text of this motion, which is talking about taking away a program that the government has introduced for our energy sector to reduce emissions, for us to be able to meet our emissions reduction plan, which was introduced a couple months ago by our Minister of Environment, I do not think that this is the best public policy approach.

I agree that we need to have important conversations about what the government can do to support affordability and to support Canadians who are having challenging times, but taking away a program that is designed to incentivize the energy sector to reduce emissions and ensure that we are competitive heading into 2050 is the wrong approach.

• (1630)

Mr. Richard Cannings (South Okanagan—West Kootenay, NDP): Madam Speaker, the hon. member's riding includes Windsor, which is where my grandmother was born and raised. As he said, it is not a wealthy riding. I just checked, and the median income there is \$31,000, which means more than half of his constituents were too low-income to benefit from the Liberals' much-vaunted tax cut for the middle class.

All this is to say, I am just wondering if he could comment on the fact that we have multinational oil companies making billions of dollars in profits while we are spending tax money to support them. We are doing this, in various ways, to the tune of billions of dollars a year.

How can he justify that, with where we are in the world today, when we have to move away from the oil and gas sector? Why are we supporting these very profitable companies with tax dollars?

Mr. Kody Blois: Madam Speaker, indeed, we are very blessed to have deep connections to Windsor. It is a beautiful township, which I have the privilege of representing.

I will try to address the question twofold. The member opposite talked about some of the tax credits and incentives this government is putting in. I have said in this House before that I believe there will be an oil and gas industry in 2050. The oil and gas market will be much reduced globally, but Canada has a role to work with energy companies to help reduce emissions to be able to also position them on competitive footing heading into 2050. Canada still has a role to play in that market.

The question I would then ask back, and I have posed it to the NDP before, is this: Where do we stop? If not oil and gas, do we have other roles in working with the private sector? It has made it very clear it is against oil and gas on public financing and support for reducing emissions. Should that extend to other sectors? It is not clear to me based on the responses so far.

• (1635)

Mr. Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies, CPC): Madam Speaker, the member talked about Canada's role not ending anytime soon when it comes to fossil fuels and what we provide the world. I want him to perhaps speak to the geopolitical role Canada plays with energy production and supplying energy to our allies.

It was at a meeting in Prince George where I heard the Japanese ambassador imploring Canada to supply natural gas to Japan. Certainly we hear about carbon a lot, and that is an important conversation to have, but we rarely hear the geopolitical conversation about Canada's role in providing that energy to our allies.

I would like the member to speak to that, please.

Mr. Kody Blois: Madam Speaker, in a world where we are going to see a smaller role for oil and gas, and I think the International Energy Agency has said that, my thoughts are we actually need to work with the Canadian energy sector to make sure its emission intensity per barrel is some of the lowest in the world. That comes back to the CCUS and how important that is.

We also, undoubtedly, need to make a transition. I am just trying to be realistic in that I believe this product will still be important. Canada is the fourth-largest oil producer in the world and the fifth-largest for gas. How can we work to reduce emissions so Canada still has a role in the energy that will still be needed?

To the geopolitical piece, our role right now in the world has to be engaging with our allies to find opportunities to provide energy security, which would include natural gas in the short term. Longer term, it will be hydrogen and working on critical minerals to support energy transition. It is a really important question, and I hope we can continue with it here in the House.

[Translation]

Mr. Luc Desilets (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, BQ): Madam Speaker, I would not want to be in any Liberal members' shoes right now, because they are stuck having to defend the indefensible. Trans Mountain was supposed to cost \$4 billion, but now it is up to \$20 billion. Then we have the Bay du Nord deal, along with everything else.

Canada is the fourth largest oil producer in the world, with 5.23 million barrels per day. Canada gives 14 times more financial resources to the fossil fuel sector than to the renewable energy sector. How can my colleague explain that?

[English]

Mr. Kody Blois: Madam Speaker, I would normally respond in French, but I will speak in English so as to be very clear. It is very easy for that member to suggest that Canada being the fourth-largest oil producer is a bad thing. That is the way he framed it.

This is a resource that has been extremely beneficial from Victoria to Newfoundland and Labrador, and everywhere in between, including in his home province. We have an obligation to work with the Canadian energy sector to make sure it is on competitive footing and reducing emissions, while also transitioning to technologies to transition to lower-emission fuels as part of our commitment to net neutrality in 2050.

[Translation]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): 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 Saanich—Gulf Islands, Climate Change; the hon. member for Spadina—Fort York, Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship.

[English]

Mr. Francesco Sorbara (Vaughan—Woodbridge, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is wonderful to be here and it is wonderful to be speaking to this opposition day motion brought forth by the member for Victoria. I would like to start off by framing this opposition motion the way I view it.

When I think of a trifecta and of the energy industry where we are, both domestically and globally, and how it relates to affordability and where gas prices are today, I think of three things. I think of energy security, which means security of supply and also security of work. I think of energy affordability, which means being able to afford the energy we buy. We have seen the prices of commodities rise globally due to supply chain bottlenecks and the barbaric invasion of Ukraine by Putin's regime, which imperils energy affordability. Then, we talk about decarbonization. I think of energy security, energy affordability and then a longer-term transition where we have decarbonization. That is important because, when we think about it, Canada is an energy leader.

This morning, I spent some time researching what I wanted to say this afternoon. I went to the Natural Resources Canada website and looked at the "Energy Fact Book 2021-2022". There is some great information out there for policy wonks and people who want to understand just how important both the renewable and non-renewable energy industries are to Canada and Canadians from coast to coast to coast. According to the "Energy Fact Book 2021-2022", produced on the Natural Resources website, direct to indirect jobs total 845,000 folks. These are hard-working middle-class Canadians who earn their livelihoods from this industry. That is very important to understand.

The investments that are taking place, just on the renewable side or clean energy, have totalled roughly \$80 billion to \$100 billion every year for the past several years. I was looking at the numbers: the total was \$92.1 billion in 2021. That is wind, geothermal, nuclear, hydro, solar and tidal. There is this industry in Canada that we need to be extremely proud of, and that I am very proud to support and to speak about on this opposition day motion, from which Canadians are earning their livelihoods. People are putting their kids in school. They are paying for their hockey lessons and swimming lessons, and we are here to support them.

The opposition day motion talks about ending any sort of financial support to the fossil fuel sector. Our budget that we produced states, I believe, that by 2023 there will be no more direct financial support provided to the energy sector, when we talk about the non-renewable side. When we think about energy security, we must think about Canada and areas such as the western Canada sedimentary basin. I know some of my colleagues on the opposite side come from these areas, and I am from British Columbia originally. There are literally tens of thousands of kilometres of pipeline in

Business of Supply

that area that are moving gas everywhere in North America. In fact, it is being exported via LNG sites in the United States to Europe at this time and helping our European allies. We need to consider that. It is easy to criticize an industry when one thinks it is fun to do so, and I use that word carefully. I do not. There are 845,000 Canadians tied to this industry.

In reference to the carbon capture tax credit, the third pillar I spoke about was decarbonization. With respect to decarbonization, to me the story is to lower greenhouse gas emissions both domestically and globally. We do not want leakage. We will do that in a manner where we work with stakeholders, including industry. Industry has these roughly 845,000 Canadians who earn their livelihoods from the energy industry. That, to me, is what is called "responsible leadership". That, to me, is doing the right thing and moving this needle and yardstick in the right direction.

In fact, in our budget, and I look forward to seeing the full details in the fall economic statement, we will introduce a new tax credit for investment in clean technology of 30% for zero-emission technologies and battery storage; in clean hydrogen, which is very exciting; and in blue hydrogen, which I have been learning a lot about in the past few weeks. It is very important.

● (1640)

What I think of as the three pillars are energy security, energy affordability and decarbonization. We are on a track that I am proud of, the emissions reduction plan, which is under the umbrella of Bill C-12: the net-zero accountability act. It is accountable, it is tangible and it lays out a framework so that we can decarbonize our economy and, yes, lower greenhouse gas emissions.

To my hon. colleagues in the NDP and the member for Victoria, when I think about affordability, yes, gas prices are absolutely high. Yes, they are absolutely pinching Canadians. We must demonstrate empathy. I know that. I live in the suburbs outside of Toronto, and everyone in my neighbourhood drives two or three vehicles. They have to get their kids to school and sports and they have to drive them home. We understand that and I understand that, but inflationary forces, be they supply chain bottlenecks or how refineries operate, which would take another hour to explain on the refinery margins part, fracking and NAC and all that stuff, and what has happened with Russia's barbaric invasion of Ukraine have driven up prices across the board. Even the Europeans have reached out by saying they need more gas. That is the energy security component.

Business of Supply

On the affordability component for my hon. colleague for Victoria, I think about the Canada child benefit that we introduced in 2015, which all parties voted against, including the New Democratic Party. It benefits the residents of my riding in the amount of over \$60 million a month. Almost \$7,000 can help a family with one child earning below a certain amount. We returned the old age security and GIS eligibility to age 65. In June and July, over three million Canadians will be receiving a 10% increase in their old age security payments, bringing it up to \$766. That is how to help on the affordability side, particularly at a time when inflationary forces are elevated, and we must be cognizant of that.

For seniors who are concerned about how they are going to pay their dental bills, we are going to go down that route, just as we got national child care done after the Conservatives scrapped it many years ago. It is going to benefit Canadians from coast to coast to coast and allow for greater and higher labour force participation rates by parents. It will be a boost to our labour supply and good for our productive capacity. We will do the same thing on dental care. We will ensure seniors and individuals who do not have insurance or a copay will benefit from that. Our government has been there for Canadians, and we need to continue to be there.

On the recovery from COVID, as I said, we were there for Canadians and we had their backs. We must work with all industries as we come out of COVID, which we have been, and we must keep our eye on the ball that climate change continues to be the transition in front of us, independent of what is happening in other parts, because that is where the world is going.

The auto sector right now is investing roughly \$515 billion in transforming itself into what I call auto to electric vehicles. That is something we are participating in, and we are at the table. It is important that we remain focused on that front.

When I read the opposition motion that talks about carbon capture, utilization and storage and other forces at play, I ask myself what we are doing in the economy that allows us to decarbonize, which is an element of working with stakeholders and listening, and at the same time making life more affordable for Canadians.

There are things we are doing on the housing front, such as providing 100,000 new homes and doubling housing construction, allowing Canadians to save for a home with the first-time homebuyers' investment vehicle, getting the froth out of the housing market by ending blind bidding and speculation, and banning foreign purchases.

On the affordability front, we are doing what is right for Canadians not only for today, but for the long term. I am so proud of the \$10-a-day day care national child care plan modelled after la belle province that is going help residents in my riding because, frankly, it costs \$1,500 to \$2,000 for a family to put a child in day care in the city of Vaughan and York Region. Those are after-tax dollars, and we are going to help them.

• (1645)

Mr. Blake Desjarlais (Edmonton Griesbach, NDP): Madam Speaker, I have some important questions related to what the member said. We have heard from the Conservatives, for example, that the government is spending too much money, raising the cost of in-

flation. Simultaneously, the Conservatives talk about how the government spends too much. The member is talking about how the government is going to continue these subsidies. Which is it? Are Liberals going to spend too much raising the cost for Canadians there, or are they going to truly put that money back into the pockets of families that really need it?

The people in my community do not have two or three cars to be spending that money on, like the member opposite. Will they give Canadians their money back?

• (1650)

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Madam Speaker, as I stated in my speech, and I want to be very clear, in our budget we have made very clear that all subsidies will be ending in 2023. It is there and it is very clear, so I would refer the hon. member to that part of the budget that I put forth. We will continue to support all workers across Canada. We will continue to support all families across Canada and make sure we have their backs after we exit COVID-19, and we are going to very strongly, and also as we undertake this energy transition that is going to be taking place in Canada for many years to come.

Mrs. Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Madam Speaker, I appreciate the words of the member for Vaughan—Woodbridge in regard to carbon capture.

I am sure he is aware that the 14 of us from Saskatchewan have been, for years, encouraging the government to look at that and realize that in Saskatchewan we have been developing this whole program in Estevan, Saskatchewan, for a long time. There have been 4,402,000,073 tonnes of carbon capture, since this establishment was developed, going into the ground.

Can the member please explain to me, if he is concerned about sequestering and doing what is best for the environment, why his government is not taking advantage of getting that last bit of oil, which is significant, out of the ground from pumps that already exist, rather than creating more greenhouse gases by having to develop more pumps?

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Madam Speaker, I am completely and utterly for innovation within the oil and gas industry that will reduce greenhouse gas emissions. As we continue to earn revenues from this sector and as we continue to export this product to markets that need it, we are talking about energy security and the North American energy markets. They are very integrated, and we work together with our partners, but I continue to see innovation as being crucial, in terms of reducing greenhouse gas emissions across this beautiful country we call home.

[Translation]

Mr. Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to the Liberals talk about the fight against global warming since 2015, but they bought a pipeline and are still subsidizing the fossil fuel industry.

Oil companies are currently raking in billions of dollars in profit while consumers pay over \$2 a litre at the pump.

Is he not ashamed?

[English]

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Madam Speaker, 845,000 hard-working Canadians go to work every day in the energy sector in Canada. They are hard-working folks. They do what is right for their families, and they try to put some money away for the future of their kids. We need to continue to support them. The energy industry is going to be with us for many years to come, and we need to make sure, as the energy transition moves along, that we have its back.

Mr. Mike Morrice (Kitchener Centre, GP): Madam Speaker, as has been put forward by over 400 leading academics across the country, carbon capture is a false climate solution. It is a distraction from decarbonization. A recent study in the Netherlands made clear that 32 out of 40 times it is used, emissions went up. Given the member for Vaughan—Woodbridge's interest in affordability, I am wondering if he could reflect on what the \$7.1 billion in the recent budget could have done, if it was put toward low-interest loans, for example, for households to action on climate.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Madam Speaker, as I said to the member for Kitchener, very clearly, carbon capture and storage is one tool we will utilize in working with industry and stakeholders. I would like to remind the hon. member that we put \$4.4 billion in home energy retrofits and loan and grant programs that Canadians are utilizing today.

[Translation]

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Madam Speaker, I just want to say that I will be sharing my time with my hon. colleague from Cowichan—Malahat—Langford. I am very much looking forward to his speech. I think we will have a lot to learn from him on this vital topic.

I am very proud to rise in the House to talk about the environment, the climate emergency and the crisis that is affecting us all and will, unfortunately, continue to affect us throughout the coming years. I will also talk about the concrete solutions the NDP is putting forward in this motion.

We could talk about a lot of things. A lot of people are talking about the price of gas right now. It is hurting a lot of people in many provinces and many regions. People are finding it hard to travel or get to work because it is costing them more and more money. I would like to share some data from a graph I found recently by Gérald Fillion, a Radio-Canada economics reporter. He makes it very clear that claims about the price of gas being connected to the invasion, the war, high government taxes or the carbon market are not true.

Between June 2008 and May 2022, the price of oil went from 84.5¢ per litre to 91¢ per litre. This is not that much. The increase is slightly more dramatic in the carbon market, where the price went from 1¢ per litre to 8.8¢ per litre. The refining margin jumped from 9¢ per litre to 48¢ per litre. The biggest increase in the real cost to consumers at the pump is the refining margin, which is the oil companies' profit.

We could tax these large companies, which are making huge profits. We could put forward very simple solutions, such as those proposed by the leader of the NDP, which include temporarily sus-

Business of Supply

pending the GST on heating bills; increasing the GST tax credit, which would help those most in need and a good part of the middle class; and increasing the Canada child benefit, a progressive measure that would once again benefit those most in need, workers and the middle class.

Clearly, the money is there, and the economics reporter's table shows us why oil companies are seeing a dramatic increase in their ability to make profits.

During the first quarter of 2022, in three months, Suncor Energy, Imperial Oil and TC Energy posted \$2.95 billion, \$1.17 billion and \$1.1 billion in profits, respectively.

The Liberals are giving them money. They think that these companies do not have enough. They are taking consumers' and taxpayers' money, even though the government has been promising them since 2009 that it would reduce oil and fossil fuel subsidies. They have still not even begun to do so, other than a few crumbs in the last budget. The government is also behind, in terms of its pairing with Argentina to review progress in phasing out subsidies to oil companies.

What is more, the government found another present in the latest budget in the form of \$2.6 billion tax credit for these companies to invest in a technology that most people doubt is even feasible. It is a pointless pursuit, a technological fantasy that distracts us from real solutions for a carbon-free society and economy. Most of the countries that have tried carbon capture have not been successful.

My colleague from Vancouver East asked a good question earlier. With the record profits that these companies are making, can someone explain why they need public money to invest in new technologies? It seems to me that they are on quite solid financial ground. If they believe that it is the right thing to do and want to help reduce greenhouse gases in Canada, it seems to me that they have deep enough pockets to make those investments.

There are two problems. First, the technology is not really reliable nor is it guaranteed. I will come back to that. Second, these companies do not need this money. Unfortunately, it would seem that the Liberals and the Conservatives are addicted to fossil fuels and unable to rid themselves of this dependency and to begin the shift and the transition that is required.

The following saying is erroneously attributed to Einstein: Insanity is doing the same thing over and over and expecting different results. Everyone believes that Albert Einstein said that, but it is not true. Someone else did. It really does not matter, because it is a good saying.

Business of Supply

● (1655)

Why do we continue to double down on this economy?

Yes, it provided for communities, families and provinces for decades. No, it will not go away overnight, but it is not the economy of the future. We need to make this transition. We need to invest in training our workforce. We need to invest in green and renewable technologies that will also help create jobs, but we are not doing that. We are doing the same thing we have always done, thinking it will produce different results. That is not going to work. It has not worked for 10 years. It has not worked for 15 years, but the government still insists on giving gifts to these corporations.

Recently the Liberal government was quite proud to boast that Canada's greenhouse gas emissions had declined for the first time in 2020. What happened in 2020? It was the pandemic.

The economy was shut down. Manufacturing, transportation and foreign travel came to a halt. People were holed up in their homes, no longer using their cars or trucks. It took a global pandemic and an economic shutdown for the Liberals to be able to say that GHGs went down over the course of a year. This is nothing to be proud of. I heard the Minister of Environment and Climate Change recently, and I could not believe it. I think we need to be a little more discerning and take a much safer path, one that listens to science and is serious about our collective future, our jobs, our ecosystems and our future generations, but that is not the case here.

Despite all the rhetoric, all the promises made, and the fact that various environment ministers have attended COP24, COP25 and COP26, aid to oil companies from successive Liberal governments has been, on average, higher than the Harper government's financial aid to oil companies. They all told us, with tears in their eyes, that this is important and that they would be able to do things differently.

Unfortunately, we are going to have to continue pushing the Liberals—both in the House and outside—to finally do the right thing, because the measures currently in place will not get us where we need to go. As a reminder, Canada provides more public funding to the fossil fuel sector than any other G20 country. Between 2018 and 2020, there was 14 times more funding for oil and gas than for renewable energies. I hope my colleagues think that is unacceptable. We are not moving in the right direction, and it is important to say it.

The Liberals promised in 2009, before the G20 and the entire world, to end inefficient fossil fuel subsidies. What is sad and incredibly politically cynical is that several years later, the Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development has to remind us that there is no definition for an inefficient subsidy. Moreover, it is not the Department of the Environment that determines what is efficient or inefficient, it is the Department of Finance.

For the finance department, it is not rocket science. If it makes money, it is efficient. If we want to reduce greenhouse gases, which is more of an environment and climate goal, we need a clear definition of the goal, which is to be a net-zero society by 2050. We need to take specific steps between now and then so we can see our progress and figure out which measures work and which do not.

People often talk about the cost of investing in renewable energy or training, but they never talk about the cost of doing nothing. If we do nothing, we will see more droughts, more floods, more forest fires. The climate refugee crisis will get even worse. Not long ago, it was 53°C in India and Sri Lanka. Massive parts of the planet may become uninhabitable. Those people will migrate. Naturally, they will want to survive. That could cause wars to break out. The cost will be exorbitant. The Liberal status quo will not save us.

● (1700)

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, carbon capture and storage is necessary. I would think that even my friends in the New Democratic Party and Green Party would acknowledge that to be a fact. Going forward, investment in technology could assist the world in being a healthier place, if technology continues to advance in that direction.

Does the NDP have a position on carbon capture and storage? Is it in favour of that kind of technology?

● (1705)

[Translation]

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice: Madam Speaker, we would support it if it worked and if we had scientific evidence that it could be used and would help us make progress. Some 80% of greenhouse gas emissions come from the burning of oil, not the life cycle fraction of the barrel of oil when it is extracted.

In the United States, 80% of carbon capture projects have failed. There is even a Shell carbon capture operation near Edmonton that produces more greenhouse gas emissions than it captures.

Mr. Greg McLean (Calgary Centre, CPC): Madam Speaker, I do not think my colleague has the correct figures on the Canadian economy.

There is no doubt that carbon capture is the most advanced decarbonization option currently available in the world. The International Energy Agency has indicated that carbon capture is the most readily available technology for energy decarbonization.

Will my colleague follow the advice of scientists or of the people who gave his party bad advice?

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for the question.

I would remind him that the evidence I provided him shows that this is not reliable technology, and that carbon capture has not proven successful. What is more, if he insists on listening to the International Energy Agency, does he not agree with the agency that all fossil fuel products should from now on stay in the ground?

Ms. Sylvie Bérubé (Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou, BQ): Madam Speaker, earlier my colleague was talking about dependency. I must say that it is a bit contradictory, since the NDP members are dependent on the Liberals.

Also, the motion moved by his party denounces the tax credit created in the budget, when the NDP voted in favour of that budget. That is a bit contradictory. Can my colleague explain that to me?

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice: Madam Speaker, it is very easy to explain. This is a Liberal budget, not an NDP one.

When we no longer are the fourth party but the first, we will not present this kind of budget. In the meantime, we are negotiating and attempting to get what we can.

I remind my Bloc Québécois colleagues that they too have supported Conservative or Liberal budgets that contained subsidies for the oil companies or the Trans Mountain purchase. We need to be careful, because both sides have done it.

However, the NDP sought gains for Quebeckers, such as dental care, lower prescription drugs, a definition of affordability and better access to housing.

We can vote in favour of a budget even if we do not agree with everything, as my Bloc Québécois colleagues have often done in the past.

[English]

Mr. Taylor Bachrach (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Madam Speaker, one of the key principles when it comes to tackling the climate crisis and other environmental problems is the principle of polluter pays. I wonder if my colleague could comment on things like the orphan well program, in which billions of public dollars are going toward cleaning up problems created by fossil fuel companies, or, in this budget, the \$2.6 billion going toward carbon capture. Do they support the principle of polluter pays?

[Translation]

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his excellent question. We do agree with the polluter pays principle with respect to fossil fuels and other sectors, as well, such as mining or forestry.

I think it is an important principle that significantly helps change behaviours and make companies and businesses more environmentally responsible in general.

[English]

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Madam Speaker, it is indeed a great honour to stand in this place and once again speak on behalf of the amazing residents of Cowichan—Malahat—Langford. I am pleased to rise to support the motion that is before us today on the NDP opposition day, which has been put forward by my hon. colleague and almost neighbour, the member for Victoria from beautiful Vancouver Island.

Business of Supply

Today's motion is really trying to bring together several themes: the theme of massive corporate profits, the theme of rampant climate change and also the theme of inflationary pressures, both as they relate to climate change and as they are affecting residents like mine in Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, but also right across this great country of ours.

Before I delve into the specifics of the motion, I think it is important that we put today's conversation in the context of what is going on with climate change. I want to start by saying that if we look at the history of oil as an energy source, there is no argument that it has absolutely been one of our most volatile energy sources. It has experienced massive booms and busts, and with those decreases and increases in price so have risen and fallen the fortunes of many. It has never been reliable as something that is stable for people. We can see that in the current context. It has always been subject to geopolitical tensions and profiteering by various companies, which have driven the price up for ordinary consumers, and sometimes it has brought about change much faster than ordinary working Canadians can adapt to. I would argue that today's circumstances are one such example.

I also think it is very important because we are talking in the House of Commons a lot these days about inflation, but what we are not talking a lot about is the inflationary pressures of climate change. That needs to be part of this conversation.

We can look at what climate change is starting to cause around the world. Not just the world, but we can look at what happened to my home province of British Columbia last year. In one single calendar year, we had one of the highest heat waves ever recorded, which caused hundreds of deaths in the Lower Mainland and led to raging forest fires across my beautiful province, and a few short months later that was followed by one of the most disastrous flood events ever to happen in the Lower Mainland, a flood event that effectively cut off the port of Vancouver from the rest of the country.

We are talking about inflationary pressures here. We can look at how much the Government of British Columbia, the people of British Columbia and, indeed, the federal government have had to pay to adapt to that climate-related event. We have to ask ourselves this in the House, because we are talking a lot about the money that is to be made and oil as an energy source, but we never quite contemplate the question of how many future tax dollars we as a society are prepared to spend to both adapt to and mitigate climate problems as an event.

Business of Supply

Make no mistake, this question is settled and the science is clear. Extreme weather events like the ones we saw last year are going to come more frequently. They are going to come more powerfully. We as a country are going to deal with worsening flood events, extended droughts, forest fires and massive heat waves that will bake our urban centres and kill people. This is going to cost money. It is going to be a real problem. Unless we, as the House of Commons, treat this issue with the seriousness that it deserves, we are failing the Canadian people and we are failing future generations. There has been a decided lack of ambition, action and commitment to effectively address this problem and put in place policies that are going to deal with it.

Going to my riding, Cowichan—Malahat—Langford on Vancouver Island, and looking at the current inflation pressures on working families, we have experienced some of the highest gas prices across the country, over \$2 a litre in many cases. I have a farm truck. I remember that a couple of weeks ago I went to fill it up, and it was the first time ever that it cost more than \$200 for a fill-up. That is a regular problem for working families in my riding.

• (1710)

We know low-income families are hit the hardest by rising prices because those increases in fuel prices not only affect the vehicles that they have to fill up on a weekly basis, in some cases for their work, but they affect everything that is transported using fossil fuels. If people are in the middle of a renovation or if they are going shopping, we know the price of food has gone up, as well as the price of materials and the cost of labour. These are all very real pressures.

On gas prices particularly, this is where we add insult to injury, because the average family in Cowichan—Malahat—Langford are standing at the pump watching the dollar figure go up as they are filling up their vehicle, and then they look at the newspaper and see the record profits oil and gas companies are making in Canada today. Billions of dollars are being paid out in dividends. Billions of dollars are being paid out in corporate executive compensation. Then to add further to that, they learn that the tax dollars they are paying off every paycheque are in fact being used by the Liberal government to subsidize those very same companies, inefficient subsidies to help them with exploration, but even in the most recent budget, that subsidy to help companies with carbon capture and storage.

Let us make this very clear. Oil companies, with today's prices, are profiteering off the backs of working families, and I do not see either of Canada's biggest political parties standing up, stating that this is an unequivocal fact and putting in place policies that are actually going to help working families. Both of these parties are far too deferential to corporations in this country, and it shows by the way they argue in the House of Commons.

If we look at the federal subsidies to oil and gas, we absolutely have to change course. Canada provides more public financing to the oil and gas sector than any other G20 country. Between 2018 and 2020, Canada provided 14 times more support for the oil and gas sector than for renewable energy, and this is in the face of all the evidence we see with climate change around us. Last year alone, the Liberals handed out \$8.6 billion in subsidies and public

financing to the fossil fuel sector, but the cherry on the cake is the fact that they have now added a \$2.6-billion carbon capture tax credit, which is actually their largest “climate” item in the budget. This is unproven technology. It is money that should be spent in completely different areas if we are going to tackle this problem with the urgency that it so very rightly deserves.

In the final two minutes, in my conclusion, I want to say this. We know Canadian workers want to be a part of the climate solution. Our workers, and let us not call them oil and gas workers but energy workers, have the transferable skills to work in any industry that we put our minds to. They want to be a part of the solution. They have the skills to make Canada a renewable energy leader in this world to help put us at the forefront of the 21st century economy.

However, we need to make sure that the federal government is putting the fossil fuel industry on notice, putting Canada on notice, that we are going to change our direction, that we are going to be where the puck is going, as is the famous quote that comes often from Wayne Gretzky. We need to make those investments in renewable energy. We need to electrify our grid. We need to make those energy retrofits a part of helping low-income families, and we need to make sure that through this process we are creating those good, long-term jobs for Canadians and communities right across the country, which will make life more affordable.

I think that through this motion today we need to redirect the subsidies that we are pumping into profitable corporations and reinvest that money directly into the pockets of low-income families, just like the working families that live in my riding of Cowichan—Malahat—Langford. We need to make sure that we are converting that money instead into doubling the GST credit and making sure that the Canada child benefit for recipients goes up. By putting that money directly into the pocketbooks of Canadians, we can help them with the inflationary pressures they are dealing with right now. It will make a real difference, and it will send a signal to the world that we are serious about changing course.

• (1715)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I think the NDP is underestimating the potential technology advancements with regard to carbon capture and storage. Carbon capture and storage is, in fact, a possible reality that is not that distant in the future, and it can be of great benefit not only to Canada but to the world in being able to achieve ultimate climate targets into the future. To underestimate that technology, and to say that it is not worth the Government of Canada investing in it, I think would be strategically a wrong message to send.

I am wondering if the member could be very clear whether the NDP is saying no to carbon capture technology.

• (1720)

Mr. Alistair MacGregor: Madam Speaker, on the contrary, as the NDP's agriculture critic, I am very proud to say that the technology already exists. Canada's farmers are leading the way. If the federal government wants to make a real difference, it will help farmers in rural communities make that transition to things like regenerative agriculture, paying attention to soil science and making sure that soil carbon sequestration is a centrepiece. I believe that our farmers have an important role to play in this whole conversation. They want to be placed on that pedestal as climate leaders. They are already doing this, but they need a partner in Ottawa to do it, not investments in an unproven technology.

Mr. Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies, CPC): Madam Speaker, I respect the member, but it is always interesting to me when I see members of the NDP get on plane rides with me back to Vancouver regularly and then talk about how we need to phase out fossil fuels in their entirety.

My question tonight is around Arctic sovereignty and energy security for us in Canada and the world. Canada has a huge role to play geopolitically in supplying energy to our allies, and yet we have not heard that from this member. We have not heard from the NDP at all on what our other role is in Canada, and it is a pretty significant role: to provide energy to our allies.

I would ask the member to speak on that exact matter. How does he see Canada playing a role in our geopolitical reality, supplying energy to our allies?

Mr. Alistair MacGregor: Madam Speaker, this very question has come up before the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security, of which I am a member, looking at what Canada's Arctic sovereignty is like vis-à-vis our security stance with Russia.

I would argue that we need a renewed commitment with the Inuit people who live up in the north and who know the ways there. They need to know that they have a firm and strong partner in Ottawa who is going to respect their traditional way of life, learn from them and find ways to partner to make sure that we do have that Arctic sovereignty firmly in mind, because I do not think that our policies to date have really respected the change in the geopolitical alignment that has happened, especially this year with Russia's invasion of Ukraine.

[Translation]

Mr. Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ): Madam Speaker, Alberta has one of the most inefficient tax systems in the country because it has a fuel tax but no value-added tax. On March 31, Alberta decided to pause collection of the fuel tax. We see that this idea is gaining momentum here among our Conservative friends.

I would like to know what my colleague thinks of the Conservatives' idea to stop imposing the GST on fuel, even if temporarily. If he is against the idea, I would like him to tell us what could be done to fight climate change with the GST tax revenue collected by the federal government.

[English]

Mr. Alistair MacGregor: Madam Speaker, it is funny to me, because I do not really think that the oil and gas lobby actually needs

Business of Supply

to spend all that money coming to Ottawa; it already has a political party here doing that work for free. The Conservatives are great friends in that regard.

I believe that the motion we have constructed today, about tackling excess profits, is in fact the way to go, rather than the reduction in fuel taxes. What has been left out of this conversation is the extreme profits of corporations. I think we need to tackle that and reinvest that money directly into the pocketbooks of Canadians.

I am lucky to live in a province that is not subject to the federal Greenhouse Gas Pollution Pricing Act, because unlike other provinces, British Columbia decided that it did not want an "Ottawa knows best" approach, and we have asserted our provincial authority in this realm.

• (1725)

Mr. Kyle Seeback (Dufferin—Caledon, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am really happy to participate in this debate. It is hard to know where to start with this motion because, to be kind, it makes very little sense.

The first thing we talk about is record profits or profits. The New Democrats talk about this as if it is something terrible or dirty. How dare a company make a profit? The thing they always have difficulty with, as I do not think there are very many business people in that caucus, is that companies sometimes make profits, yes, and in other years they do not. Profit is what enables companies to invest in things like technology and CCUS. The problem is that right now we have a global search for investment, so we have to compete here in Canada with the investment opportunities being offered all around the world, in particular with CCUS.

What is the alternative? This is where the New Democrats and the Liberals are together on everything. They want to shut down all kinds of development in this country so that they can say they balanced and lowered our carbon emissions. However, guess what? The demand for oil is not going anywhere. The demand for other products in the energy industry is not going anywhere either. Guess what happens. These companies go to other parts of the world to supply that demand. How do they do that? They do it in countries where the environmental standards are lower and where they do not have to worry about their carbon emissions, so we end up with greenhouse gases increasing. Why has so much industry moved to China? It is because it uses coal-fired energy, which is terrible for greenhouse gas emissions.

Private Members' Business

Rather than trying to stop all of these projects here in this country, why do we not look at making Canada an energy superpower with low-carbon emissions? That is what investments in things like CCUS are going to do. Otherwise, oil and gas production, mineral exploration and anything else will go into higher-intensity production per barrel and per kilogram around the world. The last time I checked, we do not have a carbon dome over Canada. We are not protected by exporting carbon emissions to China or other countries around the world.

This ideological approach actually harms the country. We lose investments in businesses and industry, investments that create good-paying jobs and that allow companies to make profits. Here is what the NDP often forgets: Profits lead to taxes and taxes fund the social services we have in this country. Taxes fund everything. Corporations have to be profitable in order for us as a country to have tax revenue to provide the services we have in this country.

Why the New Democrats are so unhappy that there are profits in the oil and gas sector I do not know. The profits and taxes from the oil and gas sector have funded so much across this country, and somehow they pretend they do not. It is terrible. The New Democrats talk about the record oil profits of those terrible companies, but they are paying loads of taxes that provide the social safety net in this country.

It is completely irresponsible to say there should be no CCUS in this country for oil and gas. What would that do? As I have said before, it would dramatically reduce oil and gas in this country. The New Democrats would say that is great; that is what we want to do, except the demand does not go anywhere. Rather, it just shifts to other countries that will not worry about their carbon emissions and may not worry about other environmental standards.

Canada cannot go to the dark ages of investment that this NDP motion is trying to take us to. The motion has to be opposed. The cognitive dissonance the NDP has that somehow stopping all oil and gas production in Canada will solve the problem does not make any sense and does not work. Let us vote against this motion.

• (1730)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): It being 5:30 p.m., pursuant to order made Monday, May 2, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the business of supply.

The question is on the motion.

[Translation]

If a member of a recognized party present in the House wishes to request a recorded division or that the motion be adopted on division, I invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

The member for Edmonton Griesbach.

[English]

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: Madam Speaker, I request a recorded division.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Pursuant to order made on Thursday, November 25, 2021, the divi-

sion stands deferred until Wednesday, May 18, at the expiry of the time provided for Oral Questions.

It being 5:31 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business, as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[Translation]

ARAB HERITAGE MONTH ACT

The House resumed from March 3 consideration of the motion that Bill C-232, An Act respecting Arab Heritage Month, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Ms. Sylvie Bérubé (Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am proud to rise today to speak to this bill introduced by the member for Ottawa South. As everyone knows, this bill would designate the month of April as Arab heritage month. The Bloc Québécois supports the principle of this bill. We are pleased to acknowledge the extraordinary contributions that the Arab community has made to Quebec society.

The majority of Canadians who report Arab origin live in Quebec. They are primarily of North African and Lebanese descent. This has to do with the colonial past of many Arab countries, which were French colonies. Many people in these countries speak French as a first or second language, in addition to Arabic.

Quebec's shared history with the Arab community started with the arrival of Ibrahim Abou Nader, the first immigrant from Mashreq to settle in Canada. Ibrahim Abou Nader was originally from Zahleh, in what is now Lebanon. After a short stay in New York, he decided to travel to Montreal after hearing that they spoke French there, because he was more familiar with French than with English. He married a French woman in 1890, and their daughter, born in 1892, was the first baby of Syrian descent born in Quebec and therefore in Canada.

I would point out that, where the text of the bill refers to Arab Canadians and Arab Canadian communities, it paints a picture of populations of Arab origin in Quebec and Canada that does not reflect reality because it suggests that the Arab diaspora makes up a uniform community all across Canada.

Indeed, many people, Westerners in particular, tend to think that all Arabs are Muslim, that all Muslims are Arab and that all Arabs speak that language. However Arabs practice different religions. Consider the Lebanese community, which is really big in Quebec and whose members are more likely to be Catholic. Consider the fact that most of the world's Muslims are not from Arab countries but from countries such as Indonesia, India and Pakistan. Consider that many people of diverse Arab backgrounds speak French, which helps explain why they choose to settle in Quebec and why this bill needs to take Quebec's uniqueness into account.

Of course, Quebec and Canada's respective national realities have had an impact on how successive waves of immigrants have been welcomed over the years. While Canadian immigration laws and policies have been applied throughout Canada and have influenced the pace of Arab immigration in what could be called the golden age of immigration, Quebec's explicit desire to strengthen its ties with Maghreb countries and to promote francophone immigration, expressed since the Quiet Revolution, has necessarily had an effect on the trajectory of Arab immigration to Quebec that sets it apart from the rest of Canada.

More importantly, the linguistic and cultural factor is enough to preclude equating the journey of Quebecers of Arab origin with that of Canadians of Arab origin. In fact, they do not integrate into the same society. Immigrant populations that settle in Canada outside Quebec are integrating into Canadian society, in other words, into the English Canadian majority. Immigrant populations that settle in Quebec integrate into Quebec society, in other words, into the francophone majority. Accordingly, the back-and-forth movement and the important relationships between Arab migrants on both sides of the North American border explain why a certain number of pioneers pass through an American city before settling in Canada, especially in Quebec.

Given the historical factors that explain why many Arabic populations already share francophone culture, it is only natural that the integration pathway differs depending on whether it is experienced in Quebec or in Canada.

It is perfectly possible and desirable to recognize the cultural heritage of people of Arabic origin in Quebec and Canada. That is why the Bloc Québécois intends to support the principle of this bill. It is not necessary to lump in Quebecers with Canadians as though they were part of one and the same community, the Arab Canadians, as the bill seems to wrongly suggest.

Abitibi—Témiscamingue, more specifically Val-d'Or, is another region affected by the most recent wave of immigration. It reflects the Quebec situation on immigration on a smaller scale. There are a lot of francophone nationals from different continents. As we see, newcomers of Arabic origin are more likely to settle in major centres and less so in the regions. Despite the omnipresence of francophones, Val-D'Or has had a multitude of cultural communities from its earliest days.

• (1735)

The arrival and the number of cultural communities changed with the times. We can even list different waves of immigration in Val-d'Or, which contributed to its cultural richness, so unique to Quebec. However, there are very few people of Arab origin in Abitibi-Témiscamingue. According to 2016 statistics, there were 330 people in Abitibi-Témiscamingue whose main mother tongue was Arabic.

Since 2010, Muslims who settled in this riding have been able to rely on the Val-d'Or Muslim cultural association. It has created an environment conducive to the practice of their faith by providing a mosque, an imam, courses on the Koran and the Fiqh, seminars and more. Another one of the association's missions is to pass on to and preserve the culture in the minds of new generations by providing an environment suitable for teaching the Muslim faith and the Ara-

bic language. This fosters the development of youth with a Muslim identity while facilitating the process of integration into current society. The association also offers families the opportunity to meet and bond with other community members, which helps them integrate and feel a little less distant from their family and country of origin.

Finally, this association enables Muslims who have settled here to celebrate holidays and special occasions collectively in a suitable place. This strengthens their community's ties with those around them and makes it easier for them to integrate into society, through cultural sharing activities organized by the association. Thanks to this association, there is a project under way to build an Islamic centre in Val-d'Or. I would like to underscore the important work being done by this association and to thank its members.

As we saw earlier, the history of Arab populations in Quebec is more than 130 years old, but it is important to note that the majority of these people have immigrated more recently. For example, North African immigration to Montreal began in the late 1950s and intensified in the 1990s. In the wake of decolonization and the rise of Arab nationalism in North Africa, and then the Quiet Revolution in Quebec, the pace of North African immigration to Quebec intensified. The Quebec government wanted to give priority to francophone immigrants as early as the 1960s. In this sense, people from North Africa were an attractive target for immigration. Language, which is key to integration, can be an excellent advantage.

I know that my colleague from Rivière-des-Mille-Îles mentioned this in his speech during the first hour of debate on this bill, but it is important to remember that Quebec reaches its own agreements on student mobility at the university level with various countries. For instance, the co-operation agreement between the Quebec government and the Algerian government in the field of education and training promotes financial support for students, exchanges between higher education institutions, the circulation of scientific and technological information, and so on.

According to the 2016 Canadian census, 368,730 people in Quebec reported being of Arab origin. In other words, a huge proportion of the people of Arab origin living in Canada, nearly half, are Quebecers. Whether they speak Arabic or not, Arab Canadians can and do maintain ties to their cultural heritage through traditional cuisine, music, dance, news media, travel to their country of origin and correspondence with friends and family members who are still back home.

In general, first-generation immigrants are more likely to stay connected to their cultural heritage than their Canadian-born compatriots. However, even though many Canadians of Arab origin have essentially lost contact with their past, the majority of them are aware of their ethnic origin and proud of it. April will become Arab heritage month to focus on recognizing the contributions that Quebecers and Canadians of Arab origin make to our society every day.

Private Members' Business

• (1740)

[English]

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): Madam Speaker, it is a privilege to speak today on Bill C-232. I thank the critic from Edmonton Griesbach for his thoughts and his previous intervention on this. I also thank the member for Ottawa South for bringing this critical legislation forward. I served with him on the Canada-US parliamentary association for a number of years.

I am speaking from Windsor, Ontario, which is approximately a 15-minute drive to the United States, and Dearborn, Michigan, has the largest Arab community outside of the Middle East. It has been part of our heritage here for hundreds of years, and it is something I am really proud about.

It is also important to note this bill would harmonize April as Arab heritage month, similar to what was done in the United States in 2021. This bill will not be in place this year, but hopefully it will be next year. I have learned over time that sometimes the simplest and most straightforward things can see complications in Ottawa, but this one enjoys large public and parliamentary support.

It is a worthy cause because there is no doubt that the Arab population, not only in Windsor but across Canada and the world, has contributed quite significantly and continues to do so despite some recent challenges with Islamophobia and other types of sensitive issues over the years. The community deserves this type of positive recognition, especially when we consider its economic, social and cultural contributions, which continue in our neighbourhoods.

When I think about the regeneration of the auto industry taking place with electric vehicles, there have been some good announcements in Windsor West recently. We are finally at a point where we are fighting back for an industry that, at one point, we were number two in the world in assembly. That has dropped down significantly, but we are starting to get battery plants and modernization.

Right now, there are many Arab Canadians who are participating in that industry, which is really interesting. I say that because, in the early 1900s, they helped build the auto industry in this community and for this country. We have seen influxes over a number of different years, and I am very proud we have a lot of young and also established people who are contributing quite significantly.

When I travel to the mosques, or other places such as churches, I hear stories from the Arab population. I hear the stories of people working in engineering, design and development, mould making and tool and die, OEMs and a whole series of exciting opportunities for young people to be involved in.

Often they have been travelling along the border between Canada and the United States, and there have been challenges of racial profiling at times, under different presidents. We have needed to deal with those issues on a regular basis in my office, but at the same time, they have helped rebuild even Detroit's industry, which is exciting.

In my community, Wyandotte Street East is being redeveloped. It has been phenomenal to see the Arab population come together. There are food shops, barber shops, fashion boutiques and other

types of industries that have come in to rejuvenate and create a brand that is exciting. It shows a lot of pride.

Until recently, I shared an office with a person named Alan, who came from Iraq and rebuilt his operations here. Sadly, we had to move out of that constituency office to a new one. Alan has also moved, but we became like family in many ways.

We look at issues of representation. I have been on doorsteps, and I have heard negative things. At the same time, I reminded constituents that when they need to go to the hospital to see a doctor, or they need the police or the fire department to come, they do not ask where somebody came from, but rather how they are going to help.

The contributions by the Arab community has been highly diverse when it comes to its participation in the workforce. It has been led by pioneers who have made international contributions.

• (1745)

The Jamil family founded the Holiday Juice Company in Windsor, which was eventually taken over by a multinational. We are right on the border here, which as we have seen is the busiest border crossing in North America. We have had owners of a small hotel, the Blue Bell Motel, opened by Alex Abraham, who helped lead many of the developments and contributions in this area. We also have Dr. George, a pioneer in the 1930s and a family doctor who was involved as well. There was, as I mentioned earlier, my friend Alan. We also had Mr. Brissony, a local barber, who was very well known in the community and became a city councillor and warden in the early days of development here.

In our community, we have people from Morocco, Tunisia, Algeria, Libya, Egypt, Sudan and Lebanon. I will send a special shout-out to the NDP lobby and Anthony Salloum of our team, who is of Lebanese heritage. In our community, we also have people from Palestine, Jordan, Syria, Iraq, Kuwait, Yemen, Saudi Arabia, Oman, Bahrain, Qatar and U.A.E. We get to know them and celebrate them.

There are not only their groups and organizations, but the people have also founded and been part of groups that represent the Catholic Orthodox, the Protestants and many Shia and Sunni mosques in my community. The groups are all connected together and interfaith. We have seen that come to light many times when there have been tragedies with individuals and families, or a number of different discrimination issues or things we have had to face that are very serious. We have also had this community come together and rally to help others.

Most recently, just before COVID, and now it is opening up a bit with a commitment from the community, I was working together with them to look at the situation with the Uighurs in China and the genocide and discrimination. It was led, again, by our local associations. There have been other times when there have been world tragedies when it is not uncommon to have the mosque or other organizations and interfaith groups come together to raise funds for earthquake victims or victims of other types of natural disasters that have taken place. This has been kind of the DNA of Windsor and Essex County, but it plays itself out to the world.

This is what is really important about this bill. It brings us together in a way that we have seen with some really good measures in the past, especially with some of the other months that have been designated, such as Black History Month and others. That is one of the things that we can build upon because there is the educational element and the necessary celebrations that bind communities together and show how much we can actually learn and understand where we came from. Some people do not understand that even though we have some great moments, there have been some challenges in the past. Therefore, we need recognize that, reconcile those and work toward celebrating what we can further accomplish.

That is why I tied in the strengths of what is taking place from the microcommunity aspect, such as Wyandotte Street, which I mentioned earlier, and the rehabilitation and great work that is happening there. Also, we have seen some exciting announcements in the auto sector. The renewal that is taking place is very diversified.

I will conclude with this: One of the things we are struggling with now is our Canada–U.S. relations for lots of different complications. Aside from the politics and the politicians, the binding of our citizens on both sides of the border, to be effective in our business, social and cultural relationships, really shines through with our Arab populations. It is families who are united. It is families who are growing together. It is about strengthening our regions together, and that is going to make us stronger economically, socially and culturally. This is very special and unique.

As I conclude here I will say again that I am so close to the largest population outside of the Middle East. We like to say in Windsor that Detroit is actually a suburb of Windsor. The reality is that there are so many people in the area, but our ties are so strong and clear. They are fiercely proud as Canadians, but also fiercely proud that their families are so close together.

• (1750)

Mrs. Salma Zahid (Scarborough Centre, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am grateful for the opportunity to rise today to speak in strong support of the Private Member's Bill moved by my colleague, the member for Ottawa South. It is Bill C-232, an act respecting Arab Heritage Month.

I want to thank the member for bringing this bill forward to the House. In the 41st Parliament, I had the opportunity to introduce my own piece of private member's business. Motion No. 155 designated June as Filipino Heritage Month across Canada, from coast to coast. It was passed unanimously by the House, and I am sure Bill C-232 will receive similar widespread support.

Private Members' Business

I know how much the official creation of June as Filipino Heritage Month has meant to that community. They have taken this recognition and run with it, organizing local events, festivals and celebrations right across the country. I know that designating April as Arab Heritage Month in Canada will be equally meaningful and significant for Canada's large and proud Arab community.

As the member for Scarborough Centre, I have the privilege of representing a large and proud Arab community. They contribute to all aspects of life in our community, from the professions and the trades to small businesses and restaurants. In my community, they are a big part of the Scarborough food scene. From the shawarma at Sumac Iraqi Grill and Ibrahim Shawarma, to the burgers at Saltyz, from the ice cream and shakes at Crème et Miel to the meat at Al Ghadir Meats and Alwalaa Halal Meat, Arab-owned restaurants and grocers are a big part of my community.

I would also like to recognize the work of the Arab Community Centre of Toronto. It is an important foundation of the community in Scarborough, providing a meeting place and a focal point, and has done such important work to help newcomers feel welcome and to settle in our community.

I would also take this opportunity to recognize Al-Huda Muslim Society, which was established in 1993 to harbour the community and help preserve its cultural and Islamic atmosphere.

Today, Al-Huda strives to create one facility that offers the services of a mosque, school, youth centre, social hub, a cultural and educational centre and funeral services. The Al-Huda Scouts, school and youth programs are operating successfully at this centre. I can say that the Al-Huda Muslim Society is an important pillar of Scarborough Centre.

Many members of Canada's Arab community are former Syrian refugees who came to Canada in 2015 and beyond to flee the civil war raging in their country. Canada gave them a safe haven and a new start, and they, in turn, have given so much more to Canada.

We all know the story of Tareq Hadhad: the Syrian refugee who settled in Nova Scotia and started a chocolate business. *Peace by Chocolate* is one of Canada's sweetest immigrant success stories. The story is now a major motion picture I cannot wait to see on the big screen.

In Scarborough Centre, we have our very own Syrian refugee success story not with chocolate, but with kebab. Zakaria Al Mokdad was a restaurant owner in Syria before fleeing the civil war with his family and coming to Canada. He spent a year improving his English before working at Paramount Fine Foods, which is a restaurant chain founded by another successful immigrant entrepreneur named Mohamad Fakih.

Private Members' Business

In 2019, Zakaria opened Aleppo Kebab, which offers delicious Syrian food to the people of Scarborough. He is paying it forward by offering jobs to other newcomers to Canada. The customer favourite is the Aleppo kebab, with its unique blend of Syrian spices. It is one of my favourites. Last year, Zakaria obtained his Canadian citizenship, and we could not meet a prouder Canadian.

Another local Syrian refugee success story is Crown Pastries. It has quickly gained a reputation for having the best sweets in Scarborough, and I can assure members that is no easy title to earn. They have become so popular that when I went in to order some sweets the day before Eid, there was a line out the door. They told me I would have had to place my Eid order at least a week in advance.

• (1755)

Outside of Scarborough Centre, there are also Arab Canadians making a difference in all aspects of life in Canada. There is my friend, the Minister of Transport, who brings his lived experience to this important portfolio and his job representing the people of Mississauga Centre. Many members of the Arab community have been elected to serve in this chamber from all parties.

If someone has enjoyed classic pop hits like *Put Your Head on My Shoulder*, *Diana* or *Puppy Love*, they have been singing along to the classics of a proud Arab Canadian and one of Ottawa's favourite sons: Paul Anka. There are academics such as Hoda El-Maraghy, the first woman to serve as the dean of engineering at a Canadian university, and Mamdouh Shoukri, the former president of York University.

In the world of sports, many Maple Leafs fans may be disappointed that they do not still have the services of Nazem Kadri after their game seven exit from the playoffs this weekend.

There are so many Arab Canadians making a difference in the medical profession in Toronto and across Canada. Dr. Basem Naser at Toronto's SickKids hospital and Dr. Tarek Khalefih are doing great work with children, and Dr. Salah Ali and Dr. Nihad Abu Seteh are family doctors who are greatly respected by their patients.

I want to especially highlight a Canadian of Arab heritage who is not only a successful businessman and entrepreneur, but also a philanthropist and outspoken educator and worker for building a better Canada. I speak, of course, of Mohamad Fakih, president and CEO of Paramount Fine Foods. He has built the chain into a success with locations not only across Canada, but also in Pakistan, Lebanon and the U.K. He has helped to introduce Middle Eastern and Arab cuisine to too many people across Canada who never had the chance to try it before.

No matter which Paramount I visit, the food is consistently delicious, even if I do wish the chicken could be a little more spicy, but calling Mohamad Fakih a restaurant owner would only be scratching the surface. His commitment and generosity to this country are unparalleled. After the Quebec City mosque shootings, he paid funeral expenses for the victims and helped fund repairs to the mosque. He travelled to the front lines in Syria to better understand the refugee crisis and hired 150 refugees in his restaurants. His Canada Strong campaign raised nearly \$3.3 million for the victims of the Ukraine International Airlines flight shot down by the Iranian

military, and during the pandemic he has donated and delivered tens of thousands of meals to frontline workers, the homeless, food banks and others.

He is a man of conviction who uses his platform to stand up to hatred and bigotry, as we saw when he refused to back down in the face of public harassment and online videos attacking his religion and his character. In his work ethic, his generosity and his principles, Mohamad Fakih would probably tell us he is like any other Arab Canadian, and indeed like any other Canadian, and this is true. The Arab Canadians I know are warm, generous, hard-working and committed to their families and their communities. They are an important part of our Canadian family and help to contribute to the diversity that makes Canada strong.

I am proud to support this bill and this important recognition for Arab Canadians. I urge all my colleagues to support it, and next April let us celebrate Arab Heritage Month together.

• (1800)

Mr. Brad Redekopp (Saskatoon West, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am very proud to be here today to speak on Bill C-232 this evening, which would proclaim April as Arab heritage month in Canada. I appreciated listening to the speech of my colleague for Scarborough Centre and to hear all of the people she named, all of the distinguished people of Arab descent. It is quite significant in our country. As many Canadians know, we have a long tradition in the House of Commons of recognizing certain months or days to honour individuals or groups or, indeed, entire peoples that make up this Canadian fabric. We do this much more than just the 12 months or the 365 days that make up the calendar.

April, for example, is already officially recognized as African American Women's Fitness Month, Alcohol Awareness Month, Black Women's History Month, Celebrate Diversity Month, Distracted Driving Awareness Month, Financial Literacy Month, Foot Health Awareness Month, International Guitar Month, Mathematics Awareness Month, Month of the Military Child, Pets are Wonderful Month, Scottish-American Heritage Month, Sexual Assault Awareness Month, Sexually Transmitted Infections Awareness Month and Sikh Heritage Month. This is just the tip of the April iceberg.

Why do we need an Arab heritage month? The answer is that, like the worthy causes I just listed, we need to formally recognize the contributions that Arabs make to Canadian society.

Let me tell everyone about my riding of Saskatoon West and the contributions that Arabs make to my community. As many people know, I knocked on many doors over the past three years and on many occasions I got the usual politician-at-your-door treatment, which was, “Why are you here? Get off my lawn. I am voting for the other guy,” and that type of thing. When I would go into apartment buildings that had primarily Arab tenants or even people from other Islamic backgrounds, I received a different treatment. People said, “Yes, yes, please come in. Have some tea and biscuits. Sit down. Please discuss what you are here for.” I would spend 10 or 20 minutes there, then knock on the next door and it would be the same thing all over again.

As a westerner in a country like Canada, I am not used to Middle Eastern hospitality. Arab people are earnest and honest about treating outsiders with kindness, respect and dignity. This is a value that is ingrained in their culture. The result of those visits was that those polls that I visited, where I sat down and took tea and biscuits, ended up voting for me. If we look at the electoral map, this is the first time ever that some of those polls voted Conservative. It is because I took the time to make a one-on-one connection with the people there, which is the way they are. More importantly, they got to know me and to know more than just the politician. That is the amazing thing about the Arab and Muslim people. They love their children and care deeply about their families. They care for their neighbours, they love this country of Canada and want to make it a better place. They work hard, often working at multiple jobs or working at a job while running a family business at the same time.

As old-stock Canadians, we just need sometimes to move beyond our preconceived ideas that have formed in our minds from popular culture and past events and get to know our Muslim brothers and sisters. Just two blocks away from my constituency office live Ahlan, her husband Osoma and their six children. They are Arab Muslims from Jordan and want to visit Osoma’s ailing father, who is in a hospital in Jordan. The family has personal objections to the COVID vaccine and now that the world is reopening, they would like to go to Jordan to visit the children’s grandparent, whom they have not seen in eight years. The only thing stopping them from this trip is the NDP-Liberals’ unscientific vaccine mandates, which prohibit them from boarding the airplane. I want this family to know that I am doing everything I can to fight these useless mandates put forward by the current government.

I want to tackle head-on some of the perceptions that Canadians have of Muslims and Arabs, in particular, due to past events and popular culture, and I am not going to sugar-coat this. When I was growing up, I and many people of my generation saw constant conflict in the Middle East between various nation-states, and the growth of terrorism scared many people. We saw the despots in control of Arab countries such as Syria, Iraq and Egypt and the puppet regimes in other countries such as Lebanon. The Persian neighbour of Iran saw the Ayatollah come to power, seize the U.S. embassy and declare us in North America to be the great Satan. Who could forget 9/11 and then war and even more war?

Canada went to war in Afghanistan for nearly 20 years with our American and European allies, only to let Kabul end up in the hands of the Taliban. Hollywood, the mainstream news media and now social media have added an extra layer to these actual histori-

cal world events. Hollywood takes everything and embellishes it. In the early and mid-2000s, we could not turn on the TV without hitting another American TV show with Arabs as the bad guys against the American good guys.

● (1805)

NCIS is still the number one show on TV, and for 19 years, in almost every episode, Gibbs is chasing down some fictional Arab terrorist.

Social media has taken all of that anti-Arab, anti-Muslim mixed bag of historical fact and popular culture and created the new global crisis of out-of-control conspiracy theories. Conspiracy theories have always been a part of a free society, but now every hateful, spiteful thing that is said is twisted and amplified by the Internet.

Why am I bringing this up? It is because, as parliamentarians, we need to shine a light on the dark spaces and on the garbage dumps of our society in order to clean them up.

Unfortunately, but truly, Islamophobia and anti-Arab sentiment are real in Canada. If this bill, Bill C-232, which would create Arab heritage month, and the few hours of debate that we will have on it allow us to address this issue, then so much the better, because as members of Parliament, we owe it to all of the Arab folks to get this right.

Let me tell you, Hollywood has it wrong. Yes, bad historical events happened, but they happened because of bad individuals, not because of the religion or the area of the world. Putin is nominally a Christian, and he is engaging in a war of aggression. Mussolini was the first to call himself a fascist, and he was a Roman Catholic from Italy. Hitler was Austrian. These were individual men causing great harm, and they did not reflect European Christians at the time. Just like Saddam Hussein was one man and Gaddafi was one man, they did not reflect all Arab Muslims.

What we need to do is move beyond these individual men and these bad events and celebrate Arab people as a group. We need to better understand the Muslim religion in its entirety. That is what Bill C-232 strives to do.

The Tigris River is the birthplace of modern civilization. The Bronze Age, where man moved from stone tools to metalwork, took place in the delta of the Persian Gulf. From that moment on, civilization has been marked by the advances in the Arab world. Did you know that the concept of the number zero was invented by Arabs?

Private Members' Business

It actually goes back to the Quran, which calls upon Muslim people to count the phases of the moon in order to track days. As we know, there are 28 days in a month, with the new moon at the beginning of each cycle, so they needed a way to numerically write that and came up with a number to represent nothingness, the number zero.

It seems a simple concept to us but it was not the Greeks, nor the Romans, nor the Indians, nor the Chinese who could grasp this concept until the Arab world taught it to them.

What about language and learning? The Great Library at Alexandria, in Egypt, was the first place of learning. Long before Oxford and Cambridge were established in England as the first modern universities, the first university had already been established in Damascus in the eighth century. To the chagrin of many school-aged children, who invented algebra? It was an Arab, in the territory of Spain.

The first hospital was also established in the Arab world and, prior to that, there was no central place for physicians and patients to gather in one place. The first modern surgical procedure was also undertaken by Arabs.

How about inventions in the Arab world? Graph paper, the first planetary globe and the first mechanical clock. Yes, it was the Arabs, not the Swiss, who invented the clock.

In Canada, the first mosque built was the Al Rashid Mosque, in Edmonton, in the 1800s. My colleague from Edmonton West would argue that the Rahma Mosque in Edmonton West was the first, but I do not think he is right.

Mr. Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC): No, it is the best.

Mr. Brad Redekopp (Saskatoon West, CPC): Oh, it is the best, Madam Speaker. I will not pass judgment on that, but I do know it is the first.

I must emphasize how proud I am to support this legislation. Canadians need to understand the positive accomplishments that the Arab people have brought to our planet and our country. It is not just the bad stuff they see on the TV and the Internet. There is much more to it. In Canada, the contributions of Arab Canadians are immeasurably positive.

There are, of course, many friends and neighbours who have come from countries throughout the Arab region. Some of us have family members who are Arab or Muslim. We know them as shopkeepers, business people, restaurateurs, school teachers, oil rig workers, bus drivers, pilots, doctors, nurses, members of Parliament and every vocation possible. They are Canadians and, according to our census, 2,300 people of Arab descent live in my riding. They may be from the Middle East and have a different religion, but they are the same as everyone else.

If there is one message that I want my constituents to hear, and I want all Canadians to hear, it is that we must move past historical events and what Hollywood has shown us and focus on the positive.

Let us work together and vote to support this legislation.

• (1810)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I appreciated the comments. In fact, I appreciated the comments from all members this evening in regard to a very important piece of legislation.

I thank the member for Ottawa South for taking the time to work with the different communities in order to develop what is, for a wide variety of reasons, an important piece of legislation. I would like to pick up on a couple of those points.

From a personal perspective, I really did not have a full understanding of the Arab community for the vast majority of my life. In fact, it was not until I had the opportunity to travel to Israel, when I also had the opportunity to visit Jordan, that I started to get a perspective of the time span in terms of the place and the Arab people, and it really goes back many hundreds of years before Christ.

As I tried to get a better understanding of the Arab people here in our community, I quickly found out that, at the end of the day, Canada is a very diverse nation. We talk about our communities and what we might do to contribute to the debate. Looking at the world today, there are countries all over the world that have descendants from the Middle East, from countries like Syria, Jordan and so forth. That is whether we are talking about Canada, the U.S.A., Brazil, Australia, the U.K., Germany, etc. Here in Canada, it is estimated that there are somewhere in the neighbourhood of 750,000 Arab people.

When I think in terms of my home city of Winnipeg and the area that I represent, the Arab community is not that large, but it tends to go into the south end of Winnipeg, and I am sure my colleague for Winnipeg South would be able to tell us far more about that particular community than I would. However, I do know that it is a community that is made up of so many individuals who have contributed to every sector of our society, whether it is in the health care field to entrepreneurs to individuals who have built our community.

The mosque in South Winnipeg contributes immensely to the spiritual well-being of the city of Winnipeg, because it goes far beyond people of Muslim faith in terms of reaching out. It is important to recognize that, at the end of the day, we can travel virtually to any part of the city of Winnipeg and we will find someone from the Arab community who is an owner or businessperson behind a particular restaurant or other store. Whether it is professionals, entrepreneurs or workers in general, we will see that the community is in fact very much a part of our Canadian heritage.

We have had other pieces of legislation and motions that have been debated inside the chamber, and I have always felt that one of the ways in which we can continue to grow as a society in terms of our diversity is to recognize things such as heritage months, days or weeks, or whatever it might be, because it provides communities the opportunity to get engaged and to educate people. For example, we have seen, in recent years, a heritage month being designated for the Filipino community, and we have seen it in regard to Sikh Heritage Month. I get involved in both of those months.

• (1815)

Bill C-232 would designate the month of April as Arab heritage month, and I feel very confident that what will happen as a direct result of the passage of this legislation is that we will see organizations that will organize educational opportunities throughout the country regarding our Arab community, hopefully with a focus on faith.

My understanding is that over 90% of people of Arab ancestry are of Muslim faith. I have gotten to know that faith personally over the last number of years. In fact, I was always impressed with my campaign manager, who has the entire Quran memorized, which is no easy feat. He is not alone. It shows the sense of commitment that many members of the community have when it comes to the Muslim faith.

At the end of the day, when I look at these resolutions and bills that we pass, I truly believe that through that, we see more educational opportunities. I can only cite personal examples, in terms of Winnipeg North, where we have a heritage week in recognition of Filipino heritage. There are a number of different organizations that come together and highlight the Filipino heritage community in Winnipeg. In fact, I will start with something on June 1.

As we do with the Filipino heritage community, which I love and care deeply about, as I do all communities that make up our country of great diversity, I suspect we will see things of that nature occurring in our Arab communities. We will have dozens of organizations that have been there to serve the community that will put on special events.

Through those special events, they will invite members of the community and members outside of the community to partake in that. By doing that, I believe that we will have more people engaged and becoming better acquainted with the many different customs and the different heritage of our community. By doing that, I think we will have a better society.

During the 1990s, I always talked about the issue of racism. We had the Manitoba Intercultural Council, which came out saying that the best way to combat racism and intolerance was through education. I believe we are affording public schools and other organizations the opportunity to put some emphasis on the Muslim faith or any other issue they can identify by having the month of April recognized, through the House of Commons, as Arab heritage month. They can use that as a focal point in order to be able to have a special event in a public school, where we can get young children engaged. It affords them that opportunity.

I have seen first-hand that things that have taken place on the floor of the House of Commons have been adopted in our communities and taken advantage of to the degree that because of them, events take place. That is where we see the real benefit of legislation of this nature.

On that note, I would encourage members, as they have done in the past in recognizing heritage resolutions and legislation, to support Bill C-232. I applaud the member for Ottawa South for taking this initiative. I know is very important to him personally that we recognize just how important it is that this particular community, like other communities, be acknowledged by having a heritage

Private Members' Business

month designation, which will no doubt allow for a lot more activities across Canada that will highlight just how important this community is to our Canadian makeup. With those few words, I look forward to the bill's passage.

• (1820)

Mr. Frank Caputo (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, CPC): Madam Speaker, as always, it is a pleasure to rise in the House of Commons for the people of Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, especially on an issue such as this.

Make no mistake. Heritage is very important to me. When people ask me where I am from, I may say that I grew up in north Kamloops, British Columbia, but my heritage comes from so much farther than that.

Both of my parents came from southern Italy. I recently did an ancestry DNA test that found I was 89% Calabrian, so I am from very far south in Italy. As some in the House may know with regard to the Speaker who ordinarily occupies the chair during question period, my mother's family came from the same small town as his family, so our grandfathers may well have known each other. My grandfather may well have known his father too. They may have become acquainted in that small town of about 1,800 people.

I am proud to participate in my heritage, and two things in which my pride most abounds are my connection to my Italian culture and how I channel that through my Italian cultural centre in Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo. We should all be proud of our heritage. One thing that I really loved about growing up in north Kamloops was the confluence of all the different heritages. I came to realize that this is what really defined Canada.

Part of being proud of our heritage is also being proud of other people's heritage. That is why it is with a source of pride that I stand in this chamber, the people's chamber, in support of this bill. I thank the member for Ottawa South for bringing it forward.

In preparing this speech, I came to learn that our neighbours to the south designated April of last year, 2021, as Arab heritage month. One of the things that I have come to realize in volunteering at my cultural centre is that often people of different heritages come through. I have learned about and seen the pride. As I return back to this point, one thing I really love to emphasize about Canada is the different heritages we have here.

I was at an event not long ago that was put on in my riding by people of African heritage. I was asked to give a few words when I was there. What I reflected on when I was thinking about it was this. What I saw in that room, what I see here in the House of Commons and what I see in Canada is diversity, and it made me very proud, when I was at that African heritage night, to be part of that diversity. I absolutely love it. It is what makes Canada Canada. I was very proud that the neighbourhood I grew up in was very multi-faceted. There were people who spoke different languages, but it did not matter: We all came to appreciate and love one another.

It is within that vein that I recognize the need to support Arab heritage month in the House of Commons. Just as Canada was welcoming to the people of my heritage, I want to be proud of all heritages in this country. Some 42% of Canadians of Arab heritage are under 24 years of age. What a bright future they have.

Private Members' Business

I was thinking back to my own history, and I can say to those in the House, many of whom do not know me, that I was not political whatsoever. This is essentially my first elected position, and I know there is a very bright future for people of Arab heritage. I am sure they will make all the people in their communities proud. I thank the member for bringing this bill forward.

● (1825)

Hon. David McGuinty (Ottawa South, Lib.): Madam Speaker, good evening to you, colleagues and the viewers who are tuning in to this important debate.

After almost 18 years in the House, I know that sometimes there are moments when the House truly comes together. Sometimes there are moments when Parliament can showcase its ability to come together, overcome partisanship and pursue something that I believe all of us here find to be good, fine, worthy of pursuing and timely.

I am very proud of the fact that I was lucky enough to obtain an early opportunity in a random draw to help bring us together in this Parliament through this bill. At a time when there are powerful forces in the House and in Canadian society seeking to pull us apart, and we all know there are many, I hope this bill can serve as a force that pulls us together, because as sure as day follows night, we need that in Canada today.

[Translation]

I would like to thank my Bloc Québécois colleague who gave an excellent overview—in the context of both Quebec and Canada—of the history of North African immigration, student mobility and other elements in Quebec society.

[English]

I would like to thank my colleague from the NDP, the member for Windsor West, who talked about how we were hopefully harmonizing our April Arab heritage month here in Canada with the one that was decreed by President Biden in the United States. He went on to explain the involvement of the Arab Canadian population in the auto sector on both sides of the border. He recounted the geographical diaspora and the religious diversity of Arab Canadians, all of which, of course, is true.

I would like to thank the member for Scarborough Centre, who represents a large and proud Arab community. She spoke about trades, professions, restaurants, butchers and grocers, and highlighted the contributions of Syrian refugees, who are so incredibly proud to have reached our shores and become Canadians.

I would like to thank my colleague, the MP for Saskatoon West, who spoke honestly and earnestly about the personalities and warmth of Arab Canadians in his own constituency and his province. Most importantly, he debunked misperceptions about Arab Canadians, saying the bill can “shine a light on the dark spaces”. That is an important quote because the Arab Canadian community is dealing with racism and anti-Arab sentiments and we will have to wrestle this to the ground together. He spoke about the historical truths, the learning, the hospitals and the inventions, like the clock, all of which were devised by Arab human beings.

I would like to thank my colleague, the deputy House leader, for highlighting the breadth of contributions in every sector in Winnipeg and Manitoba. He talked about more educational opportunities to break down barriers and foster understanding at a time when we really need it in this country. We need to come together because, as my mother used to say to her 10 children, this country is wealthy beyond belief. My mother, who grew up in abject poverty, was never talking about money. She was talking about culture, dance types, food, language, music, literature, dress, traditions, depth and richness. All of this is reflected in the bill.

We are trying to recognize this wealth in the Arab Canadian community, celebrate all of it in the Arab Canadian community, nurture the talent and passion of Arab Canadians and, finally, deploy Arab Canadians on behalf of this country and the rest of the world as we help to continue to build the finest, most inclusive, most accepting and most celebrating culture and country in the world. It is high time to move beyond the notion of tolerating anyone. It is now entirely a question of celebrating each other, and that is what the bill is trying to do.

I am very proud to have the support of 35 Canadian community groups and organizations. I am very hopeful that with the support of all members of the House, we will be able to achieve this on behalf of our Arab Canadian neighbours.

● (1830)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): It being 6:31 p.m., the time provided for debate has expired.

[Translation]

The question is on the motion.

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

The hon. member for Barrie—Innisfil.

[English]

Mr. John Brassard: Madam Speaker, I request a recorded division.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Pursuant to order made on Thursday, November 25, 2021, the division stands deferred until Wednesday, May 18, at the expiry of the time provided for Oral Questions.

* * *

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed the following bill, to which the concurrence of the House is desired: Bill S-245, an act to amend the Citizenship Act (granting citizenship to certain Canadians).

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

PRESERVING PROVINCIAL REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS ACT

BILL C-14—TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

Hon. Mark Holland (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.) moved:

That, in relation to Bill C-14, An Act to amend the Constitution Act, 1867 (electoral representation), not more than one further sitting day shall be allotted to the consideration at second reading stage of the Bill; and

That, 15 minutes before the expiry of the time provided for Government Orders on the day allotted to the consideration at second reading stage of the said Bill, any proceedings before the House shall be interrupted, if required for the purpose of this Order, and, in turn, every question necessary for the disposal of the said stage of the Bill shall be put forthwith and successively, without further debate or amendment.

[Translation]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Pursuant to Standing Order 67.1, there will now be a 30-minute question period. I invite hon. members who wish to ask questions to rise in their places or use the “raise hand” function so the Chair has some idea of the number of members who wish to participate in this question period.

• (1835)

[English]

The hon. member for Barrie—Innisfil.

Mr. John Brassard (Barrie—Innisfil, CPC): Madam Speaker, obviously I rise disappointed in the government's action. It is only a small thing like amending the Constitution, so why would we have fulsome debate on that and allow members to speak? I think at this point we have only had 10 speakers speak to the bill, but I have no doubt that we will hear indignation from the government House leader and, of course, his partner in the NDP, and about obstruction. We will hear that the Conservatives are obstructing the House. We are actually fulfilling our constitutional obligation of holding the government to account, and for that we are not going to apologize.

Motion No. 11 allowed for the government to extend hours not just to have fulsome debate, but to make sure issues that are important to Her Majesty's loyal opposition, and indeed other opposition parties, are debated in the House. Spare me if I cry crocodile tears for what the government is about to talk about and certainly what its partners in the NDP will be talking about. This is all about democracy in decline. I was very pleased to hear the Minister of Infrastructure agree with that fact.

The other thing I want to point out is that as these extended hours are happening, committees get cancelled, which we saw tonight with regard to the Emergencies Act committee. The whitewashing and the undermining of getting to the bottom of this continue to happen with the cancellation of these committees, and certainly the NDP is a party to it.

We are not going to be lapdogs like the NDP is to the government. We are going to continue to push. We are going to continue to make sure that we hold the government to account and make sure that we are not just an audience, as the Prime Minister and certainly

Government Orders

the government House leader would like us to be. We are going to be an effective and loyal opposition to Her Majesty.

That is all I have to say. Here comes the indignation. It is going to be good. Hang on to your seat, Madam Speaker. Go ahead.

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I think members will find it ironic that we are getting lectures on indignation in that Oscar-winning performance on the other side of the aisle. We should never underestimate our Conservative friends' ability to manufacture outrage and indignation, and talk about loyal opposition and democracy.

We think that Bill C-14, which is the subject of the discussion for the next 25 minutes and not the fabricated outrage of my friend on the other side of the aisle, is about ensuring that every province, including the Speaker's province of Quebec, maintains the electoral representation and the number of seats it had in the House of Commons in 2021. In other words, no province should see a reduction in its representation in the House of Commons.

I was very encouraged, when this bill was first debated, that the Conservative Party showed support for this legislation. Members spoke in favour of the bill as an important gesture recognizing the unique position that the province of Quebec occupies in the Canadian federation, and recognizing that every province should be able to benefit from a grandfather clause, similar to what former prime minister Brian Mulroney did in 1985. We are suggesting in this legislation that the House of Commons and the Senate approve a similar amendment that would allow us to have a 2021 grandfather clause.

That is the subject of this conversation. The Conservatives say they want to support the bill, but they do everything they can to vandalize the legislative process and make sure that Parliament cannot actually proceed to a vote. What we are saying tonight is that it is time for members to stand in their places and vote on this legislation, and we are very confident that the Conservatives, who manufactured this outrage, will in the end stand up and vote for this process. We are making this possible for them tonight.

[Translation]

Ms. Louise Chabot (Thérèse-De Blainville, BQ): Madam Speaker, I think that the substance of Bill C-14 is worthy of further debate. It is not simply a matter of the number of seats; however, I am not going to debate Bill C-14 here. I think the debate deserves to continue in a truly democratic fashion.

I have a question about the gag orders that are being used week after week. Normally a gag order would be something out of the ordinary in this form of government, but we are seeing them come up repeatedly. Is this by any chance related to Motion No. 11, which we had shoved down our throats?

Government Orders

• (1840)

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc: Madam Speaker, I agree with my colleague from Thérèse-De Blainville that this bill deserves to be debated. That is precisely what we tried to do last night. However, we saw the official opposition, the Conservatives, move bogus motions to force 30-minute bells and votes to ensure that there would be no debate, even though they said they wanted to have one.

The best way to continue to debate is to ensure that there are no endless procedural games that prevent Parliament from discussing and debating this important issue, as my colleague from Thérèse-De Blainville indicated.

We look forward to seeing the debate continue, for example at the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs or even when Bill C-14 comes back, I hope, to the House of Commons at report stage and third reading. We will then have many opportunities to hear our colleagues debate this bill.

I think that our colleague from Thérèse-De Blainville understands full well that this has absolutely nothing to do with Motion No. 11; rather, it is a way to ensure that the provinces in our federation, including her province of Quebec, keep their number of seats. I know that the Bloc Québécois is in favour of maintaining the 78 seats for the Province of Quebec. That is what we are trying to do, in due course.

[English]

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Madam Speaker, I think never has the House leader of the official opposition spoken truer words than when, in referring to the Conservative Party, he talked about the decline of the democracy.

We have now seen over the past six months, ever since we passed unanimously the ban on conversion therapy and there was a revolt in the Conservative backbench, that Conservatives have blocked every single piece of legislation. In Bill C-9, teachers and farmers were looking for supports and Conservatives refused to let it through. They are now blocking Bill C-14.

The reality is as we saw it last night. The House leader of the official opposition referred to vigorous debate. What Conservatives wanted us to debate, at a cost of tens of thousands of dollars last night, for hour after hour, was which Conservative MP would speak. We had vote—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I apologize for interrupting, but can we stop with the imitation of animals in the House please?

The hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, this is the overall decline of Conservative morals and scruples. The Conservatives were willing to have the entire Parliament of Canada subject to a debate within the Conservative Party on which Conservative MP should speak. This was a complete, colossal waste of the time of the House of Commons. Every single Conservative MP participated in what was a travesty. Instead of debating legislation, we were debating which member, which faction, in the Conservative Party would actually speak, and they held us up for hours on that absolutely irresponsible evening.

My question to my colleague is simply this: What has happened to the Conservative Party? Why do the members show such complete disrespect for the legislative process? Why do they waste taxpayers' money hour after hour with these procedural, childish games of having all members of Parliament decide which Conservative MP should speak?

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc: Madam Speaker, I want to thank our colleague for New Westminster—Burnaby for his comments and his question.

As colleagues know, the member for New Westminster—Burnaby is a senior member of the House. He has served the Province of British Columbia and the citizens of New Westminster—Burnaby well for a long time. I had the privilege to work with him when I was an opposition House leader, and when we sat on the Board of Internal Economy and other bodies of the House. We have worked well together.

I think that our colleague for New Westminster—Burnaby identifies a fundamental challenge. When members of the Conservative Party say that they oppose, for example, this necessary measure to bring this legislation to a vote, of course they will oppose it, but at the same time they are not interested in participating constructively in debating the legislation. Our colleague for New Westminster—Burnaby identified what I think was a shambolic and appalling performance last night when, with 30-minute bells and vote after vote, the House of Commons was pronouncing on which Conservative member would make a speech. It was all designed to ensure that legislation, which the Conservatives will ultimately support, does not actually come to a vote.

If we are looking for a reason to point to dysfunction in the House of Commons, we can think about this: The official opposition supports a particular piece of legislation, but is desperately trying to make sure that it actually does not come to a vote so that it might be adopted. The legislation would preserve, for example, the seat allocation in the province of Quebec and other provinces. However, at the same time, the Conservatives insist on having vote after vote to decide which Conservative will make a speech, which is designed to delay the legislation coming to a vote. It is unfortunate that it has come to this.

I think that the government House leader has taken his responsibility seriously, and we hope that parliamentarians in the Senate and in the House of Commons can discuss this legislation, consider it in committee, and debate it at report stage and third reading. We think it is important as well to allow the electoral boundaries commissions, which have been set up under law and are operating right now, to have clarity in terms of what will be the number of seats for provinces, which is why it is somewhat urgent that Parliament have a chance to pronounce itself on this legislation.

• (1845)

Mr. Mel Arnold (North Okanagan—Shuswap, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am flabbergasted by the indignation of the Liberal side on this debate. The member speaks about dysfunction in the House. It is their House, as government, to manage, and it is obvious that they are so dysfunctional in managing the House that they cannot get legislation through.

Last night, the Liberals adjourned the House two and a half hours early, after cancelling committees so that we could have interpretation services available and other House services that were required. They sent those people home early and sent the whole House home two and a half hours early after they had scheduled it to sit until midnight last night.

We have to really question what is behind this determination to serve time allocation notice on the bill before us. What is coming behind it? We have seen previous legislation, such as Bill C-10 now Bill C-11, which will be coming through for debate. Is this an effort to get things out of the way so that they can push that forward through time allocation as well?

I hear NDP members rail against the procedural tools that we have to hold this government accountable. For years, in Parliament after Parliament, they railed against time allocation votes. Here they are, after this marriage of the NDP-Liberal government, now joining in with the Liberals in supporting time allocation votes. I question what really is behind all of this rush to get legislation through and to silence the opposition that we are here to provide, having been elected by the people that we represent.

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc: Madam Speaker, far from wanting to silence the official opposition, we are actually trying to help the members have an opportunity to vote on this legislation. We are trying to help them out of the dead end they found themselves in last evening, as our friend for New Westminster—Burnaby pointed out, where they were using a series of absolutely ridiculous measures to ensure that the House was voting on which Conservative member would repeat a speech that was generated the previous time this legislation was brought before the House.

Our Conservative colleague asked what is behind this. I will be very clear on what is behind this. This is about allowing the House of Commons to pronounce itself on Bill C-14, which we think will enjoy broad support in the House, and then allowing the bill to proceed to committee, where our colleagues in committee can hear from witnesses, can debate the legislation and can make amendments if they decide it is necessary. The bill can come back to the House of Commons in the normal legislative process with which we are extremely familiar. Then, finally, our friends in the other place will have an opportunity to study the legislation as well.

The urgency, as I said, is constitutional and under legislation. Every 10 years, after a census, there is a redistribution process that takes place in every province, allowing an independent commission chaired by a justice or a judge from that province, appointed by the chief justice of the province, to look at the question of electoral boundaries and to adjust electoral boundaries for movements in population and for increases in population in some provinces. In this case, if this bill is adopted, we will provide a floor for the number of seats every province will have in this House of Commons. It

Government Orders

is particularly important to our friends from the province of Quebec who, under the formula, would have stood to be diminished by one seat, losing one seat in the House of Commons. We think it is important for Canadians and for Quebecers to know that the representation in 2021 will be the representation used by these commissions in determining the appropriate electoral boundaries. In your great province of Quebec, Madam Speaker, that would be 78 seats.

We wish the Conservative Party would support us in passing this so the commission could do its important work.

• (1850)

[Translation]

Mr. Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ): Madam Speaker, what is disappointing this evening is the sad spectacle put on by the Liberals and the Conservatives.

The Bloc Québécois will always oppose muzzling opposition parties and taking away their powers. Yesterday, the delay tactics had consequences not just for the House, but for committees as well. A committee on medical assistance in dying was scheduled to discuss two fundamental matters yesterday: the protection of people with disabilities and the issue of mental illness as the sole underlying condition for medical assistance in dying. Witnesses were waiting. We upended all that and had to make people wait, when this committee does not meet very often as it is.

At present, a minister is telling us that what the Conservatives did was appalling. The Liberals themselves, when they were in opposition, used the same tactic and will continue to use it. Neither party is all that credible. At some point, common sense must prevail, and we must act according to our cherished principles of the exercise of parliamentary democracy.

What we are hearing from the minister and from the official opposition will do nothing to convince the people watching that this place is not a circus. Then, they act surprised that people are cynical about the work that we do here in the House. The Bloc Québécois feels that Bill C-14 offers barely half of what we were asking for. That is another story, but we need to stop acting like this is the place for theatrics.

I would like to see more dignified behaviour here. Instead of telling the Conservatives that what they are saying is appalling, it would be better to tell them that it is more important we keep working. There is no problem with working until midnight. However, members' ability to do so should not be taken away.

We must denounce what the Conservatives did because, if we have a repeat of yesterday's nonsense, the people watching us will wonder what the heck is going on. However, this pretext is being used here to muzzle us. I would like to call for more respect for parliamentary democracy. Otherwise, democracy will rise from the streets.

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc: Madam Speaker, I disagree with our colleague from Montcalm when he says that democracy happens in the streets. I do not share his pessimism.

Government Orders

However, I appreciate the fact that he mentioned what happened last night. The repeated calls for votes showed a lack of respect for our colleagues who sit on House of Commons committees. I am thinking in particular of the Special Joint Committee on Physician-Assisted Dying, which is very important. I am thinking in particular of the witnesses, people who often travel quite a distance to discuss a sensitive, difficult and very important subject. The study of this issue has already been postponed for some time.

We believe it is important to allow this committee to do its important work. It is in the interest of all Canadians that the issues raised by my friend from Montcalm be studied, that they be discussed and that we hear from witnesses with different perspectives and often professional experience in the field. We are well aware of what happens when the Conservatives organize a series of ridiculous repeated votes, like they did last night.

I may not agree with my friend from Montcalm on the second point. The Liberal Party has been in opposition too. We too have sat on the other side of the House, where our Bloc friends are now seated. When we were in opposition, we never sought to sabotage the legislative process with a series of procedural motions to deprive MPs of the opportunity to speak.

Frankly, I think it is time for the House of Commons to vote on Bill C-14 and study it in committee. I am eager to work with our colleagues of all stripes to get this important bill passed as soon as possible.

• (1855)

[*English*]

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the member for Montcalm for bringing up that point, because I am also a member of the Special Joint Committee on Medical Assistance in Dying, and what I saw last night was a travesty of the legislative process. We did have very important witnesses and a very delicate subject matter to cover, the protection of persons with disabilities. The antics that I saw in the House, debating which Conservative member needs to be heard while we have witnesses who are trying to report their important life experiences to our committee so that we can table a comprehensive report on a very delicate subject matter, that was a travesty.

It started earlier in the day. Members will recall that yesterday being a Monday, Routine Proceedings started right after question period and the Conservatives decided to move debate on a committee report, something that was unanimously agreed upon at the committee by all parties. When it came to the member for London—Fanshawe, she gave a short, two-minute speech and then asked for unanimous consent for the House to adopt that committee report. The Conservatives refused unanimous consent, showing that they just wanted to continue delaying the business of the House.

I will end here. The great David Christopherson, during my rookie year here in Parliament, said that if people are going to engage in filibustering or delay tactics, they have to know what the goal is, what the endgame is and what they are trying to achieve. Unfortunately, what I see from my Conservative colleagues is a rudderless ship flailing around with no endgame in sight. I just wish they would clearly state what their legislative goals in this session are so

that the rest of us here can get to work and do that work on behalf of the constituents who sent us here.

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc: Madam Speaker, our colleague from Cowichan—Malahat—Langford reinforced the unfortunate circumstance at the joint committee looking at medical assistance in dying. I entirely associate myself with his view on the inability of those witnesses to be heard on an issue as important to Canadians and as sensitive as medical assistance in dying. This is exactly what the House of Commons should not do.

If we set up a committee like that, and if colleagues want to serve effectively and honourably on a committee like that, to represent their constituents and their colleagues in the House and do that important work, which necessarily includes hearing from Canadians, as I said, with different perspectives and in some cases with professional experience, then anything that would ensure that important work is disrupted is disrespectful to those witnesses. It is disrespectful to colleagues in the House, and it is also disrespectful to our colleagues who serve in the other place, who are also working with colleagues from the House of Commons on this committee.

What the Conservatives did last evening with a series of votes is what has made it important for the government to take this necessary step tonight to ensure this goes through. If the Conservatives were really interested in debate, they would have actually debated the bill last night, and not debated, as our friends have said, which Conservative member should be heard in order to delay the bill coming to a vote.

We think the House of Commons should have an opportunity to vote on this bill. I am confident that the members who are seeking to disrupt and vandalize the legislative process will ultimately vote for the bill. If we ever wondered if it was ridiculous, it will be when they end up voting for a bill they did absolutely everything they possibly could to ensure would never be adopted. One could perhaps see, as my friend from Cowichan—Malahat—Langford said, referring to our former colleague David Christopherson, that they do not know what the ultimate legislative objective is other than to try to burn it down. That is their objective. They start the fire and then pretend to show up with a hose to put it out. That is not the way the parliamentary process works. They cannot be the fire chief and the pyromaniac at the same time.

It is important for the House to proceed to a vote.

• (1900)

Mr. Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies, CPC): Madam Speaker, any Canadians I know from my riding who have been watching the debate over the last couple of years have seen the government run roughshod over the democratic process, and then it hears them lecture us about how bad the Conservative Party is, calling us all kinds of names.

We have a Prime Minister and a Liberal Party that think they are a majority government. Then we hear from the NDP down the way, and it thinks it is the Liberal Party. Once again, instead of standing in opposition to the government, which is running roughshod over democracy, the New Democrats are carrying their water again. I hate to overuse that term “carrying their water”, but my goodness, we hear them again supporting what the government is doing, and then we hear the same from the Bloc.

The Conservative Party is the only party, the only group in Parliament, that is doing its job. We are doing our job of being in opposition to this out-of-control Liberal government.

They represent the Liberal Party. I have a simple question for the minister: When will you represent Canadians once again?

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc: Madam Speaker, I hope our colleague was not asking you when you will represent Canadians, because I think not only that you represent very well the people of your great Quebec constituency, but also that you represent all Canadians when you sit in that chair. I cannot imagine my colleague would be casting that aspersion on you because that would be inappropriate.

There is a level of manufactured indignation and fake outrage from the Conservatives about parliamentary procedures that actually allow the House of Commons to pronounce itself on legislation. As the Speaker will remember, I also sat in opposition on the other side of the House. We watched the government House leader at the time, Peter Van Loan, so many times—

An hon. member: He did it over 100 times.

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc: Madam Speaker, yes, it was over 100 times. Can members imagine it? A Conservative House leader, these great professors of democratic principles, did it over 100 times. Peter Van Loan introduced time allocation or closure measures that many times in the House of Commons.

In fact, the chief government whip at the time wrote a manual of how to ensure that a parliamentary standing committee could be driven completely into the ditch. It was sort of a how-to manual of what to do if something went wrong in the committee, and how to ensure the whole thing could be ground directly into the ditch.

These are the authors of those kinds of documents. I think Peter Van Loan moved time allocation and closure so many times that the words are actually carved into the desk to the right of where I sit. If we lift the desk, we might see that he has engraved in that desk all of the words necessary to bring time allocation and closure. That is what the Conservatives did in government.

Now they are in opposition, and they do everything they can to ensure that the government agenda, which is important to Canadians, cannot advance to a legislative vote. They will not allow the House of Commons to pronounce itself on legislation.

When my colleagues ask when we are going to start working for Canadians, the answer is that we have never stopped working for Canadians.

Mr. Peter Julian: Madam Speaker, my colleague asked who among the Conservatives is a firefighter. The reality is that they are all pyromaniacs. We have seen over the course of the last few months how they have blocked systematically every single piece of

legislation. We are talking about teachers and farmers asking members of Parliament to pass legislation like Bill C-8. The Conservatives never offered an explanation. They never said they were blocking it because there was a reason for it. They just blocked it for the sake of blocking.

What we see now, after last night's travesty, is a group that seems to have as its only goal anarchy and chaos in the House of Commons. My question for my colleague is this: Why?

• (1905)

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc: Madam Speaker, I obviously agree with my colleague from New Westminster—Burnaby when he characterized what is really a very unfortunate series of procedural shenanigans the Conservatives have participated in. Why?

[Translation]

In French, they want to be able to tell their colleagues from Quebec who support Bill C-14 that they are in favour of maintaining the number of seats in Quebec. However, in the House of Commons, and especially in their English remarks, they are doing everything in their power to prevent a vote on this bill. I think that was the reason in this case.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): It is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith the question on the motion now before the House.

The question is on the motion. Shall I dispense?

Some hon. members: No.

[Chair read text of motion to House.]

[English]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): If a member of a recognized party present in the House wishes to request a recorded division or that the motion be adopted on division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

The hon. member for Barrie—Innisfil.

Mr. John Brassard: Madam Speaker, we request a recorded division.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Call in the members.

• (1950)

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

(Division No. 95)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Anand
Angus
Arya
Atwin
Badawey
Baker
Battiste
Bendayan
Bibeau

Ali
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ashton
Bachrach
Bains
Barron
Beech
Bennett
Bittle

Government Orders

Blaikie	Blair	Valdez	Van Bynen
Blaney	Blois	van Koeverden	Vandal
Boissonnault	Boulerice	Vandenbeld	Virani
Bradford	Brière	Weiler	Wilkinson
Cannings	Carr	Yip	Zahid
Casey	Chagger	Zarrillo	Zuberi— 178
Chahal	Champagne		
Chatel	Chen		
Chiang	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)		
Collins (Victoria)	Cormier		
Coteau	Dabrusin	Aboultaif	Aitchison
Damoff	Davies	Allison	Arnold
Desjarlais	Dhaliwal	Baldinelli	Barlow
Dhillon	Diab	Barrett	Beaulieu
Dong	Drouin	Benzen	Bergen
Dubourg	Duguid	Bergeron	Berthold
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Dzerowicz	Bérubé	Bezan
Ehsassi	El-Khoury	Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Erskine-Smith	Fergus	Block	Bragdon
Fillmore	Fisher	Brassard	Brock
Fonseca	Fortier	Brunelle-Duceppe	Calkins
Fragiskatos	Fraser	Caputo	Carrie
Freeland	Gaheer	Chabot	Chambers
Garneau	Garrison	Champoux	Chong
Gazan	Gerretsen	Cooper	Dalton
Gould	Green	Dancho	Davidson
Guilbeault	Hajdu	DeBellefeuille	Deltell
Hanley	Hardie	Desbiens	Desilets
Hepfner	Holland	Doherty	Dowdall
Housefather	Hughes	Dreeshen	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Hussen	Hutchings	Ellis	Epp
Iacono	Idlout	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)
Ien	Jaczek	Fast	Ferreri
Johns	Joly	Findlay	Fortin
Jones	Jowhari	Gallant	Garon
Julian	Kayabaga	Gaudreau	Généreux
Kelloway	Khalid	Genuis	Gill
Khera	Koutrakis	Gladu	Godin
Kusmierczyk	Kwan	Goodridge	Gourde
Lalonde	Lambropoulos	Gray	Hallan
Lametti	Lamoureux	Hoback	Jeneroux
Lapointe	Lattanzio	Kelly	Kitchen
Lauzon	LeBlanc	Kmiec	Kram
Lebouthillier	Lightbound	Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Long	Longfield	Lake	Lantsman
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)	Larouche	Lawrence
MacDonald (Malpeque)	MacGregor	Lehoux	Lemire
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney	Lewis (Essex)	Liepert
Martinez Ferrada	Mathysen	Lloyd	Lobb
May (Cambridge)	McDonald (Avalon)	MacKenzie	Maguire
McGuinty	McKay	Martel	May (Saanic—Gulf Islands)
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod	Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McPherson	Mendès	McLean	Melillo
Mendicino	Miao	Michaud	Moore
Miller	Morrice	Morrison	Motz
Morrissey	Murray	Muys	Nater
Naqvi	Ng	Normandin	Patzer
Noormohamed	O'Connell	Paul-Hus	Pauzé
Oliphant	O'Regan	Perkins	Perron
Petitpas Taylor	Powlowski	Plamondon	Poilievre
Qualtrough	Robillard	Rayes	Redekopp
Rodriguez	Rogers	Rempel Garner	Richards
Romanado	Sahota	Roberts	Rood
Saks	Samson	Ruff	Savard-Tremblay
Sarai	Scarpaleggia	Scheer	Schmale
Schiefke	Serré	Seebach	Shipley
Sgro	Shanahan	Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné
Sheehan	Sidhu (Brampton East)	Small	Soroka
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Singh	Steinley	Ste-Marie
Sorbara	Spengemann	Stewart	Strahl
St-Onge	Sudds	Stubbs	Thériault
Tassi	Taylor Roy	Therrien	Thomas
Thompson	Turnbull	Tochor	Tolmie

NAYS**Members**

Government Orders

Trudel
Van Popta
Vidal
Viersen
Villemure
Vuong
Warkentin
Webber
Williamson

Uppal
Vecchio
Vien
Vignola
Vis
Wagantall
Waugh
Williams
Zimmer — 144

PAIRED

Nil

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

The hon. government House leader is rising on a point of order.

Hon. Mark Holland (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I move:

That this House do now adjourn.

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to order made Monday, May 2, the motion is deemed adopted.

Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 7:53 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 17, 2022

Business of the House

Mr. Holland	5415
Mr. Brassard	5415
Mr. Lamoureux	5415
Mr. Julian	5415
Mr. Therrien	5415
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	5415

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Government Response to Petitions

Mr. Lamoureux	5416
---------------------	------

Committees of the House

Status of Women

Mrs. Vecchio	5416
--------------------	------

Canadian Heritage

Ms. Fry	5416
---------------	------

Public Accounts

Mr. Williamson	5416
----------------------	------

Petitions

Vaccine Mandates

Ms. Lantsman	5416
--------------------	------

Climate Change

Mr. Casey	5417
-----------------	------

Plains of Abraham

Mr. Boulерice	5417
---------------------	------

The Environment

Mr. Boulерice	5417
---------------------	------

Machinists' Union

Mr. Boulерice	5417
---------------------	------

Pollution

Mr. Boulерice	5417
---------------------	------

Climate Change

Mr. Weiler	5417
------------------	------

Charitable Organizations

Mr. McCauley	5417
--------------------	------

Ontario Line

Ms. Dabrusin	5417
--------------------	------

Climate Change

Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	5418
--------------------------------------	------

Charitable Organizations

Mr. Williamson	5418
----------------------	------

Won Alexander Cumyow

Mr. Dong	5418
----------------	------

Human Rights

Mr. Genuis	5418
------------------	------

Ethiopia

Mr. Genuis	5418
------------------	------

Human Organ Trafficking

Mr. Genuis	5418
------------------	------

Charitable Organizations

Mr. Genuis	5419
------------------	------

Questions on the Order Paper

Mr. Lamoureux	5419
---------------------	------

Questions Passed as Orders for Returns

Mr. Lamoureux	5420
---------------------	------

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Business of Supply

Opposition Motion—Subsidies for the Oil and Gas Sector

Ms. Collins (Victoria)	5421
Motion	5421
Mr. Lamoureux	5423
Mr. McLean	5423
Mr. Simard	5423
Mr. Angus	5424
Mr. Lamoureux	5425
Mr. Williamson	5425
Mr. Simard	5426
Ms. Dabrusin	5426
Mr. Angus	5428
Mrs. Wagantall	5428
Ms. Sinclair-Desgagné	5428
Mr. Duguid	5428
Mr. Epp	5430
Ms. Ashton	5430
Mr. Trudel	5430
Mr. Warkentin	5430
Mr. Angus	5432
Mr. Lamoureux	5432
Mr. Perron	5432
Mr. McLean	5433
Mr. Julian	5436
Mr. Lamoureux	5436
Mr. Champoux	5436
Mr. Simard	5436
Mr. Davies	5438
Mr. Lamoureux	5439
Mr. McLean	5439
Mr. Garon	5439
Mr. Julian	5440
Mr. Lamoureux	5441

Ms. Petitpas Taylor	5462
Mr. Trudel	5462
Ms. Petitpas Taylor	5463
The Economy	
Mrs. Vien	5463
Mr. Boissonnault	5463
Mr. Chambers	5463
Mr. Boissonnault	5463
Mr. Van Popta	5463
Mr. Boissonnault	5463
Mr. Perkins	5463
Mr. Boissonnault	5464
Indigenous Affairs	
Ms. Idlout	5464
Mr. Miller	5464
Health	
Mr. Johns	5464
Ms. Bennett	5464
Seniors	
Mrs. Valdez	5464
Ms. Khera	5464
Service Canada	
Mrs. Goodridge	5464
Ms. Gould	5465
Passport Canada	
Mr. Mazier	5465
Ms. Gould	5465
Mrs. Kramp-Neuman	5465
Ms. Gould	5465
Mr. Godin	5465
Ms. Gould	5465
Public Safety	
Mr. Fortin	5465
Mr. Mendicino	5465
Ms. Michaud	5466
Mr. Mendicino	5466
Health	
Mr. Ellis	5466
Mrs. Fortier	5466
Mrs. Kusie	5466
Mr. van Koeverden	5466
Mr. Strahl	5466
Mr. van Koeverden	5466
Climate Change	
Mrs. Shanahan	5467
Mr. Guilbeault	5467
Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship	
Mr. Gourde	5467
Mr. Fraser	5467
Foreign Affairs	
Mr. Genuis	5467
Mr. Oliphant	5467

The Environment	
Mr. Davidson	5467
Mr. Guilbeault	5468
Mrs. Romanado	5468
Mr. LeBlanc	5468
Official Languages	
Ms. Ashton	5468
Mrs. Fortier	5468
Telecommunications	
Mr. Masse	5468
Mr. Champagne	5468
Presence in Gallery	
The Deputy Speaker	5468

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Business of Supply	
Opposition Motion—Subsidies for the Oil and Gas Sector	
Motion	5468
Mr. Cannings	5469
Mr. McDonald	5469
Mr. McLean	5469
Mr. Bachrach	5470
Mr. Lamoureux	5470
Mr. Desjarlais	5471
Mr. McLean	5471
Mr. Garon	5472
Ms. Kayabaga	5472
Mr. MacGregor	5474
Mr. Falk (Provencher)	5474
Ms. Pausé	5474
Mr. Singh	5474
Mr. Weiler	5476
Mr. Ellis	5476
Ms. Pausé	5476
Ms. Kwan	5476
Mr. Blois	5478
Mr. McLean	5478
Ms. Chabot	5478
Mr. Blois	5478
Mr. Cannings	5480
Mr. Zimmer	5480
Mr. Desilets	5480
Mr. Sorbara	5481
Mr. Desjarlais	5482
Mrs. Wagantall	5482
Mr. Thériault	5482
Mr. Morrice	5483
Mr. Boulerville	5483
Mr. Lamoureux	5484
Mr. McLean	5484
Ms. Bérubé	5485
Mr. Bachrach	5485
Mr. MacGregor	5485

Mr. Lamoureux	5486
Mr. Zimmer	5487
Mr. Garon	5487
Mr. Seebach	5487
Division on motion deferred	5488

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Arab Heritage Month Act

Bill C-232. Second reading	5488
Ms. Bérubé	5488
Mr. Masse	5490
Mrs. Zahid	5491
Mr. Redekopp	5492
Mr. Lamoureux	5494
Mr. Caputo	5495
Mr. McGuinty	5496
Division on motion deferred	5496

Message from the Senate

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès)	5496
--	------

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Preserving Provincial Representation in the House of Commons Act

Bill C-14—Time Allocation Motion

Mr. Holland	5497
Motion	5497
Mr. Brassard	5497
Mr. LeBlanc	5497
Ms. Chabot	5497
Mr. Julian	5498
Mr. Arnold	5499
Mr. Thériault	5499
Mr. MacGregor	5500
Mr. Zimmer	5500
Motion agreed to	5503
Mr. Holland	5503
Motion	5503

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>