



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

House of Commons Debates

Official Report
(Hansard)

Volume 151 No. 083

Tuesday, June 7, 2022

Speaker: The Honourable Anthony Rota



CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, June 7, 2022

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayer

• (1000)
[English]

The 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 of the June 8 and June 9 sittings be 12 midnight, pursuant to order made on Monday, May 2.

The Speaker: Pursuant to order made on May 2, the minister's request to extend the said sittings is deemed adopted.

Mr. John Brassard: Mr. Speaker, the order did require two House leaders, including an opposition House leader.

Can the hon. member indicate which other House leader gave an indication that they would like to extend hours?

The Speaker: We did consult, and the Standing Orders state that the hon. government House leader has the right to stand up and it is assumed that he has consulted with others, and there is no need to produce another one.

The hon. member for La Prairie on a point of order.

[Translation]

Mr. Alain Therrien: Mr. Speaker, I want to echo the comments of my colleague, the leader of the official opposition, who was not consulted. I was not consulted either. I would like to know who agreed to it. There is no indication, so we have no idea.

I simply want to say that I was not consulted and that the government leader did not even broach the subject with me.

• (1005)
[English]

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, in this corner of the House, we believe in working hard on behalf of the constituents of Canada. We have absolutely no hesitation in supporting that move to midnight sittings.

However, to the “block everything” party, they really need to stop abusing these midnight sessions, as they did last week when

we were supposed to vote on which Conservative would speak next. What a colossal waste of time that was. I hope they do not do that again. I hope Conservatives will actually work this time.

The Speaker: That is getting into argument.

I want to thank the hon. members. We will continue with Routine Proceedings.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

CHIEF ELECTORAL OFFICER OF CANADA

The Speaker: It is my duty to lay upon the table, pursuant to section 536 of the Canada Elections Act, a report from the Chief Electoral Officer, accompanied by a report of the Commissioner of Canada Elections, on proposed amendments to the Canada Elections Act.

[Translation]

Pursuant to Standing Order 32(5), this report is deemed permanently referred to the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

* * *

[English]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. Maninder Sidhu (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), and consistent with the current policy on the tabling of treaties in Parliament, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the treaty entitled “Modification to Canada's Schedule of Specific Commitments”, pursuant to the World Trade Organization's General Agreement on Trade in Services, as set out in the World Trade Organization's “Reference Paper on Services Domestic Regulation”.

* * *

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 five petitions. These returns will be tabled in an electronic format.

Routine Proceedings

[*Translation*]

HISTORIC PLACES OF CANADA ACT

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-23, An Act respecting places, persons and events of national historic significance or national interest, archaeological resources and cultural and natural heritage.

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

* * *

[*English*]

INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS

Hon. David McGuinty (Ottawa South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 34(1), I have the honour to present to the House, in both official languages, a report of the delegation of the Canadian Group of the Inter-Parliamentary Union respecting its participation in the 142nd assembly of the Inter-Parliamentary Union and related meetings, held by video conference from April 13 to May 27, 2021.

* * *

PETITIONS

ELECTORAL REFORM

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise this morning in our virtual setting.

I am presenting a petition on behalf of many constituents who are very concerned about the nature of our voting system in this country. The petitioners point out that the first-past-the-post system results in a Parliament that does not reflect the popular vote. They ask very specifically that this Parliament establish a national citizens assembly on electoral reform. They point out that many other countries have used the vehicle of a national citizens assembly in order to develop voting systems that promote democracy and provide results that reflect the way citizens have actually voted.

• (1010)

CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS

Mrs. Kelly Block (Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of presenting two petitions this morning.

The first petition is calling on members of Parliament to do all they can to prevent the current government from revoking the charitable status of pro-life organizations in Canada. The petitioners are concerned that this policy, outlined in the Liberal Party's election platform, will eventually be extended to other entities that do not align with the Liberals' ideology.

MEDICAL ASSISTANCE IN DYING

Mrs. Kelly Block (Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek, CPC): Mr. Speaker, freedom of conscience is a fundamental right, clearly articulated in section 2 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. I have the honour to present a petition signed by hundreds of citizens from across Canada calling on Parliament to protect the conscience rights of medical professionals from coercion or intimidation to provide or refer patients for assisted suicide or euthanasia.

I thank these Canadians for their engagement on this important issue.

ELECTORAL REFORM

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, first and foremost, it is great to see you back in the chair.

I am really honoured to present this petition on behalf of constituents of mine. They are citing that Canada's electoral system, from its very inception, has been a first-past-the-post system, unfairly resulting in either a Liberal or a Conservative government, and that proportional representation is a principle that says that the percentage of seats a party has in a legislature should reflect the percentage of people who voted for that party.

The petitioners highlight the 2021 election results, where the Liberals, with 32%, won 160 seats; the Conservatives, with 33%, won 119 seats; the Bloc, with 7%, won 32 seats; and the NDP, with 17%, won 25 seats.

As well, they cite that many other countries, such as Germany, Italy, Ireland, New Zealand and the Netherlands, have progressed from a first-past-the-post system to a PR system.

The petitioners are calling on the government to move to a proportional representation system to bring credible representation to Canadians.

PHARMACARE

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is good to see you back in the chair and looking so hale and hearty. Welcome back.

I am pleased to present, on behalf of several dozen Canadians, a petition that speaks to the lack of universal pharmacare in this country. They point out that there are nearly 10 million Canadians who do not have access to drug plans, that two million Canadians have to skimp on their medicine because they do not have the money to pay for it, and that hundreds of people die every year in Canada because they simply do not have the money to pay for their medication.

Therefore, these petitioners from across Canada are calling upon the Government of Canada to pass a Canada pharmacare act legislation that would create universal, comprehensive and public pharmacare for all Canadians. Members will recall that this is part of the confidence and supply agreement that the NDP pushed and agreed to with the Liberal government.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Hon. David McGuinty (Ottawa South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(6), I rise to present a petition on behalf of constituents in my riding of Ottawa South.

The petitioners are calling on the government to enact just transition legislation to address the climate emergency. As an environmental lawyer, I am very pleased to present this petition. I would like to thank my constituent Dr. Sarah Charron for organizing this important local effort.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

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

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1015)
[English]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—MEASURES FOR IMMEDIATE FINANCIAL RELIEF

Hon. Candice Bergen (Leader of the Opposition, CPC) moved:

That, given that,

- (i) high inflation rates are driving the cost of living up for all Canadians,
- (ii) the price of gasoline and diesel is hitting record-highs across Canada, making it more expensive for Canadians to get to work, transport goods, and to live their everyday lives,
- (iii) the price of food is up more than 9.7% since last year, making it more difficult for Canadians to put food on the table,
- (iv) contrary to the government's previous statements, heightened inflation is not transitory and is projected to persist,
- (v) the decision to continue to impose ideologically-driven COVID-19 restrictions places a barrier on growth and recovery of the Canadian economy, the transportation of goods, and by consequence, the cost of those goods,
- (vi) Canada has experienced the steepest decline in housing affordability in a generation,

the House call on the government to provide immediate relief to Canadians by:

- (a) temporarily suspending the Goods and Services Tax (GST) collected on gasoline and diesel;
- (b) suspending the carbon tax;
- (c) eliminating tariffs on fertilizer;
- (d) enabling the free flow of goods across the Canadian border, supporting the recovery of the tourism sector and protecting the jobs of federally-regulated employees by immediately removing all federal COVID-19 restrictions; and
- (e) curbing speculation in the housing market by immediately launching a national public inquiry into money laundering.

The Speaker: Since today is the final allotted day for the supply period ending June 23, 2022, the House will go through the usual procedures to consider and dispose of supply bills. In view of recent practices, do hon. members agree that the bills be distributed now?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Hon. Candice Bergen: Mr. Speaker, I will be splitting my time this morning with the member for Mégantic—L'Érable.

Business of Supply

The Prime Minister's political vindictiveness is hurting Canadians. Since February, Conservatives have been presenting pragmatic and reasonable solutions to help Canadians who are suffering because of the affordability crisis. Instead of agreeing with us, the Prime Minister is being vindictive, and he thinks he is hurting Conservatives politically by saying no to our proposals, when in fact he is punishing Canadians with his petty political vengeance.

This is his last chance before the summer adjournment to listen to what Conservatives have been saying and to take action for Canadians who are suffering with the high cost of food, fuel and housing. The Liberals need a reality check, so here are some facts they might want to consider—

The Speaker: I am just going to interrupt the hon. member. I believe we have a translation issue.

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Perron: Mr. Speaker, the interpreter is saying something about the Larsen effect, but I do not know what that is. However, it is affecting the interpretation.

An hon. member: It has to do with the earpieces.

[English]

The Speaker: We have a problem with the pickup. The earpiece is maybe too close to the microphone and we are getting feedback. How about if we start right from the beginning so that everyone can hear what the hon. member has to say?

Hon. Candice Bergen: Mr. Speaker, I would let the House know I will be splitting my time, so I will continue from the beginning.

The Prime Minister's political vindictiveness is hurting Canadians. Since February, Conservatives have been presenting pragmatic and reasonable solutions to help Canadians who are suffering because of the affordability crisis. Instead, the Prime Minister is being vindictive, and he thinks he is hurting Conservatives politically by saying no to our proposals. In fact, he is punishing Canadians with petty political vengeance.

This is the last chance before the summer adjournment to listen to what Conservatives have been saying and to take action for Canadians who are suffering with the high cost of food, fuel and housing. The Liberals need a reality check, so here are some facts they might want to consider. Canadians are paying record high gas prices. Housing costs have had their biggest increase in a generation. The dream of owning a home is withering away for young Canadians. Food prices are up 9.7% this year alone. These are the realities that Canadians are facing, but instead of working to help, the government has the gall to hike taxes and drive the cost of living even higher.

Business of Supply

The solutions that Conservatives have been offering for months to deal with this crisis are not radical ideas; they are common-sense ideas. When gas prices started to increase, we asked that the government suspend the GST on fuel to give Canadians a break. Provinces were doing it, and we believed the federal government could offer help too. The Prime Minister said “no”. We asked for relief for Canadians by suspending the carbon tax on April 1. Again, the Prime Minister said “no”. He thinks he can score political points with his friends at the UN, maybe, by making Canadians pay record-high gas prices. He thinks he can hurt Conservatives by acting like we are being careless, but that is just not true. It is clear the Prime Minister is saying no because of politics: It is because it is Conservatives who are asking. It is our idea. The fact is that in both cases his vindictiveness did not hurt us, but it did hurt Canadians.

This attitude is incredibly disheartening and it is failing the people who need help the most. It ignores the facts that single parents are not able to fill up their cars and that seniors are struggling to pay for groceries and rent. We must keep in mind that the cost of living crisis does not affect the Prime Minister at all. He does not pay for his own gas. He does not pay for his own food. He does not have to worry about standing in line anywhere.

Conservatives have also been asking that the tariff on fertilizer be removed so that our farmers and producers are not punished for using the tools they need to work effectively. Again, the Prime Minister said no to this, at the expense of farmers who have been working tirelessly through the pandemic to keep food on our tables.

Conservatives have also consistently been asking the Prime Minister to listen to science and to experts who say that vaccine mandates are no longer required. We have asked that he return to pre-COVID normal in order to allow Canadians to travel unobstructed, to help our hurting tourism sector and to let Canadians get back to their pre-COVID normal. Again, he said no to Conservatives, thinking he was hurting us, but saying no to Canadians is causing irreparable damage to Canadians.

To him, it does not matter that we are not the only ones asking that these restrictions be lifted. The Canadian Chamber of Commerce agrees with us. The Toronto Airport Authority has called for an end to the restrictions. There are the Hotel Association of Canada and the Canadian Tourism and Travel Roundtable. The CEO of WestJet has asked for it as well as the Canadian Airports Council, just to name a few. It does not matter to the Prime Minister. It does not matter what experts say: what doctors, scientists or public health officials say. All that matters to the Prime Minister is that he seize on these issues so that he can wedge, stigmatize and divide Canadians and try to hurt Conservatives. This is probably the most egregious example of his pettiness, his vindictiveness and his hypocrisy.

He travels around the world, and travels around North America today as we speak. He travels to countries without restrictions, enjoying their freedoms, having a good time, hanging out, eating, drinking and partying a little with people who may not be vaccinated. There are no masks on. We have all seen the pictures of the Prime Minister maskless in every country that he has visited over the past year while at the same time telling his own citizens, telling

Canadians, they must abide by domestic restrictions that are incredibly draconian and completely out of date.

● (1020)

The Prime Minister's forced restrictions at home in Canada, while he flaunts his personal freedoms abroad, are theatrics and astounding hypocrisy.

For months, we have been on working on this side to bring solutions to these problems and these challenges. I invite Canadians, and I invite everyone in the House, to go back and look at our record and at the reasonable things that we have been offering. We could have moved all kinds of partisan motions. Even today, we could have presented motions that would have put the Liberals, and even the NDP and the Bloc, in a difficult position. We have not done that, because we want to offer solutions to Canadians. We want to unite Canadians around things that make life more affordable for them, that allow them to visit their families and allow them to be able to go back to work. These are things that unite. These are the things that Conservatives have been offering. What does the Prime Minister do? He says no, and all for political gain.

While we call for action on gas prices and everyday expenses, unfortunately Canadians are paying higher costs. Parents should not be forced to choose between enrolling their kids in sports and putting food on their tables. They should not be forced to rack up mountains of debt just to pay for basic groceries. Young people should be optimistic and see Canada as a place of opportunity. Instead, a recent RBC report has shown that younger Canadians are actually losing money every single month, especially if they live in a big city.

However, the Prime Minister and his government have made it clear that they are more interested in vindictive and petty politics than in actually helping Canadians. At every turn, the Prime Minister has rejected our proposals because he thinks that it helps him politically by hurting Conservatives. While he is focused on scoring points, he is leaving Canadians behind. Canadians are the ones who are being forced to make sacrifices while he sits back and enjoys the praise of his Liberal friends, and I guess his Liberal caucus likes all of it, as well.

Today, we are offering our own omnibus motion of sorts. It is a motion that would give Canadians a break and get their lives back to normal. We do not think that is too much to ask for. We are calling on our colleagues on the NDP and Bloc side to help us help Canadians. They have a chance today to put Canadians first. Our message to our friends in the Bloc and the NDP is not to vote for Conservatives, but to vote yes for Canadians. They can do the right thing, and vote yes for Canadians.

The same opportunity exists for the Liberals. The Prime Minister can continue to be petty and stubborn, because boy oh boy, a lot of the things that he is doing are just pure stubbornness, or he can do the right thing and agree with our common-sense ideas for Canadians. Today, he has the chance to show leadership: to stop his childish games and stop blaming Russia, or the pandemic or whatever excuse he brings up, and recognize that Canadians need him to get to work.

Instead of spending all his time and energy on wedging Canadians and trying to figure out ways to try to hurt Conservatives and make Conservatives look bad, for once the Prime Minister could look beyond his own political future. Our motion would immediately provide relief for families, seniors, farmers, small business owners and commuters who are suffering from high prices. It would give hope to Canadians who are hoping to save up for a home or to those who just want to travel and visit their loved ones. It would help millions of Canadians who are struggling to make ends meet in this affordability crisis. It would help millions of Canadians who work in the federal sector to be able to go back to work. So far, the Prime Minister has utterly failed these people. He has abandoned them in order to play political games.

Today, we are offering our final chance. This is our final opposition day motion. Today, we are offering a final chance to put vindictive, petty politics aside and deliver the relief that Canadians need before the summer holidays begin. It is such an important time, and this year more than ever Canadians want hope. Conservatives are offering that hope. We ask today that the Prime Minister take the opportunity to give Canadians hope and opportunity, and know that things can be better for them, for their children and for this country.

• (1025)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I really believe it is quite the opposite that the interim Conservative leader is talking about today.

When we talk about the Conservative Party's approach, what we have actually witnessed is more of a destructive force inside the chamber. It is to stop everything and not allow anything to pass. It is all about personal attacks coming from the Conservative Party. Its members tend to ignore the issue of the pandemic or the war that is taking place in Europe, based on issues like inflation. As the Conservatives are so focused on that, I can assure people who are following the debate today that the government, and this Prime Minister, will continue to focus their attention on the economy, on the pandemic, on the war and on the issues Canadians are interested in most.

When will the member opposite start refocusing the Conservative Party, so that we can start to see more attention given to the issues Canadians are concerned about every day, not just the one day in which they propose a motion?

• (1030)

Hon. Candice Bergen: Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by saying that we hear from that member a lot, and I appreciate the hard work he does, but there are four amazing Liberal women in the House. I

Business of Supply

would have loved to hear from one of them, and I would be happy to answer another question.

It shows how absolutely out of touch so many of these Liberals are that this member would stand up and say Canadians do not care about affordability and they do not care about restrictions being lifted. This is all they are talking about. This is all Canadians are talking about, and they are not only angry, they are also scared. They are worried. They are afraid for when the gas prices are going to stop going up. We thought 80¢ a litre was something and 90¢ was a lot, but we have \$1.20 or over two dollars a litre in some provinces.

I would suggest that the member maybe consult with some of the strong women who are sitting around him, because I think they would tell him that moms, dads, teenagers, young people and seniors are incredibly worried about the cost of everything, and they are worried about the Prime Minister, who refuses to lift restrictions that the rest of the world has moved on with. He needs to get with the program. That is what I would suggest.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Simard (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I read in the *Journal de Québec* this morning that Suncor's profits are basically set to triple from \$4 billion to \$11 billion for the coming year. The same is true for Imperial, which will have profits of \$6.2 billion. As we know, Boris Johnson's government has imposed a 25% tax on oil companies' profits.

Earlier, I heard my colleague say not to vote for the Conservatives, but to vote for Canadians. I think she said that wrong. What she should have said was do not vote for the Conservatives, vote for the oil companies.

Does my colleague agree with me?

[*English*]

Hon. Candice Bergen: Mr. Speaker, I would say Conservatives certainly have a very different approach from the Bloc when it comes to oil, gas and natural resources in our country. We believe the natural resources in Canada are amazing things that the world needs, and in this time when we want to fight emissions and be responsible, the world needs more Canadian oil and gas energy, and we are incredibly proud to be champions of Canadian oil and gas.

What we need are the jobs that come from that, and the opportunity. The Liberals have shut down any hope of pipelines being built. They shut down any hope of any kind of infrastructure being built, and then they raised taxes on Canadians. The Liberals actually want gas prices high. The Prime Minister does not pay for his gas, but he wants Canadian moms, dads, single parents, people living in poverty and people in rural areas of this country to pay a heavy price for fuel.

Business of Supply

Conservatives want to see Canadian oil and gas expanded. We want all Canadians to have access to our amazing oil and gas, and not have to pay these ridiculous taxes that do nothing but fill the Prime Minister's coffers.

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we proposed taxing the windfall pandemic profits of big corporations and sending them back to Canadians through the GST rebate and the Canada child benefit as a way for the federal government to provide immediate relief to Canadians and make the wealthy pay their fair share. The official leader of the opposition has put forward an extension of wanting to work with us, but this motion is quick to cut taxes and other sources of revenue for the government, while offering nothing in terms of consumer protection from big corporations raising their prices above and beyond inflation.

Can the member comment on why the Conservatives think cutting taxes at the pump would actually stop big oil and gas from just raising their prices? Can she—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. leader of the official opposition with a brief answer.

Hon. Candice Bergen: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for that question.

Here is the problem: The more we see the Liberals buy NDP policy like that, which is big government, big spend and a few people getting a few cheques here and there, the worse off Canadians are.

Canadians are much worse off now than they were six years ago. The Liberal-NDP plan is to spend, spend, spend on big government, and tax, tax, tax, and maybe throw a cheque here or there to a few people. It is not working. Conservatives believe Canadians need more money in their pockets, less taxes, less spending and less big government to unleash the power of entrepreneurs, of workers, of labour and of our natural resources.

That is how we create economic opportunity, but right now we would like to see taxes decreased at the pump for Canadians.

• (1035)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to highlight the excellent work of the Leader of the Opposition, who today made a passionate plea on behalf of Canadians who are struggling and having a hard time making ends meet. By moving this motion today, the Leader of the Opposition clearly showed her support for Canadians, families, young people, workers, seniors and everyone affected by the skyrocketing cost of living.

Inflation is going through the roof. The cost of everything is rising more than it has in years. Take, for example, the cost of food, which has gone up about 10% over the past year. That means, on average, the cost of some grocery items has gone up by 20%, 25% or even 30%. Unfortunately, those items are often the ones people need the most. We have not seen prices go up like this since 1981.

The motion that the official opposition brought today is eminent-ly sensible. It calls on the government to listen to Canadians for once and to set partisanship and the Prime Minister's vindictiveness aside in order to do what is right: provide a little relief to Canadians who are struggling to make ends meet.

Over the past few days, the Prime Minister and his ministers, including the Minister of Finance, have all demonstrated a total lack of compassion for what Canadians are going through. We have presented quite a few proposals, all of them just and sincere, to make things more manageable for people. Unfortunately, the government chose to say no to the Conservatives' proposals every time. What worries me is that the Prime Minister's attitude suggests he said no to the Conservatives because these good ideas were coming from the official opposition and the Conservatives. He wanted to punish the Conservatives by rejecting their ideas, which included lowering the gas tax and cancelling the carbon tax hike. Those were logical, eminently sensible proposals.

However, by doing that, the Prime Minister punished Canadians instead. He prevented Canadians from enjoying a bit of a break. He did not hurt the Conservatives, he hurt Canadian families, young Canadians, seniors and workers. That is the reality.

Today, we are giving him the chance to make amends. That is something he can do. We have moved a very sensible motion that the government could support to show a bit of compassion to Canadians. It is his last chance to do so, since this is the last opposition day. This is the last chance a member can move a motion in the House calling on the government to act now to provide some relief for Canadians. Based on what we have heard so far, this likely will not come from the Liberal benches.

The Liberals truly need to come down to earth and get in touch with the reality of Canadians. During question period, we call them out on the increased cost of living, because everything is going up. The price of gas is \$2.23 or \$2.32 a litre in some places in the country. It is crazy. When we ask them questions about that, the Liberals say that in their budget they lowered child care costs for families, brought in an expensive dental care program, and so on. These are all sorts of things that are likely connected to the coalition agreement the Liberal government made with the NDP, but none of them will do anything at all to help families that are suffering.

I had the opportunity to speak with some people from ORAPE, a food bank in my riding. Over the last few weeks, demand has gone up 10%. More and more people cannot make ends meet and are urgently going to the food bank so they can get a bit of food and make it until the next cheque, because everything costs more.

Business of Supply

• (1040)

Workers are telling us that they can no longer afford the gas they need to get to work. Other parents are telling us that they can no longer afford to drive their kids to activities and that they are having to make choices: buy a bit more meat for dinner, or take the kids to a few more activities. This is Canada, in 2022, and families are being forced to make these kinds of choices. If someone had asked me last year if I thought this was possible, I would have said no. Today, this is the reality that many Canadians face.

When we hear the answers from the Prime Minister and ministers, including the Minister of Finance, it is as though none of this exists. They think that inflation is global. It is all over the place, and according to them, Canada is doing a little bit better than everywhere else. However, looking at the numbers, we see that this is because inflation in Canada is not calculated the same way as it is in other countries. We are being told that everything is fine, that Canada is doing better than other countries and that this will continue to be the case. That kind of answer offers absolutely no help to families and the people who are struggling to make ends meet and are forced to make tough choices.

I would remind members that 25% of Canadians have been forced to make tough choices like buying less food to make ends meet, and that 40% of families and Canadians earning less than \$50,000 a year are going hungry. When I say “families”, I am not just talking about families with children; I am talking about all kinds of families.

However, when we tell the Prime Minister these things, we are told to look at the latest budget and all the measures that will be introduced several weeks or months from now. We are told to look at the decisions that were made to deliver a budget that clearly proves that this government failed to see the current crisis on the horizon. There is absolutely nothing in the most recent budget to help families now, to help them deal with the crisis of high gas prices, to help people make ends meet. The budget includes a lot of spending for later, but the crisis is happening right now.

Are we going to ask people to keep tightening their belts, to not eat, to make hard choices and not send their children to their activities until these measures are implemented several years down the road? That is unacceptable. We cannot tolerate it. We cannot accept the government acting this way.

That is why we have introduced an eminently sensible motion that calls on the government to temporarily reduce the tax on gas and diesel and give Canadians a break. The price at the pump right now is \$2.32 a litre.

In addition, we are calling on the government to scrap the carbon tax increase. They keep telling us that the carbon tax will be given back to families. Until those families receive a cheque, which will not be for the exact amount they paid, they need to put food on the table. That cheque will not give them any.

We are also asking the government to eliminate the punitive measures at airports to help the tourism industry and our small businesses across our regions. That will spur economic activity and put more money in people's pockets. That is the reality.

We have been proposing these measures since January. The various measures included in this motion were presented to the government previously. Each time, the Prime Minister said no. He said no to Canadians in need, to the most disadvantaged Canadians. However, more and more Canadians in the middle class, who are working very hard to stay there, are also finding it increasingly difficult to make ends meet.

That is why today we are appealing to the government, the Bloc Québécois and the NDP. We are asking them to support our motion, which will give Canadians a bit of a break, something they currently need. I believe it is the right thing to do. We must avoid partisanship and saying no to the Conservatives simply because it is a Conservative motion. It is not a Conservative motion; it is a common sense motion for Canadians.

• (1045)

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that the Conservatives talk about families and children, but when it comes time to vote on issues of that nature, they consistently vote against progressive policies. The best example I can give offhand is child care. We established a national child care program that would enable thousands of people to enter the workforce. It is going to provide better quality of living for many in our society, yet the Conservative Party, in its wisdom, says no, that is a bad government expenditure.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, when the member talks about helping children and families, why does the Conservative Party oppose a genuine national child care program, which provinces and territories of all political stripes have supported?

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Deputy Speaker: I would remind folks to keep their comments down. They can get on the speaking list to ask some questions, which is the right we have as members, but I ask members to try to keep it down so we can hear questions and comments.

[*Translation*]

The hon. member for Mégantic—L'Érable.

Mr. Luc Berthold: Mr. Speaker, this is what happens when members speak up: they encourage debate.

When members say things to distract the House, some of our colleagues here want to get us back on topic. This was, unfortunately, yet another example of this kind of distraction. The Liberals do not see any inflation crisis. They see no crisis, and they do not think people are having a hard time paying their gas or grocery bills.

Business of Supply

My colleague from Winnipeg North just tried to distract from the real problems by talking about one aspect of the program and one aspect of the budget that the government has implemented. That is what the member just did and what the Liberals are always doing. They would rather talk about other elements of a massive project that will pay off in 10 or 15 years, instead of responding to the inflation crisis that is preventing people from putting food on the table.

Quebec has had a day care system for more than 20 years. Many families still do not have access to this program, but the government thinks it will fix everything. That is not true. There is a crisis right now and we are demanding solutions right now.

A vote in favour of this motion is a vote in favour of solutions for Canadians.

Ms. Andr anne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague from M gantic—L' rable for his speech.

As my colleague from Jonquiere has said, and we saw again this morning, oil companies are making record profits, and so are the banks. With that in mind, I wonder how today's Conservative motion responds to an important notion of tax fairness. Do we really want the oil companies and the banks to keep getting richer?

That said, the member talked a lot about families, which is fine. We are aware that families are affected by inflation, but what about seniors who are on fixed incomes? I wonder if he could comment on why it might be important to support a measure the Bloc Qu b cois has been calling for for quite some time. I am talking about increasing seniors' incomes through the universal old age security pension, beginning at age 65. Inflation does not hit only those who are 75 and over. It affects all seniors aged 65 and up.

It seems to me that today's Conservative motion offers a simplistic solution to a much bigger problem and fails to consider the much broader view of the problem of inflation and rising prices.

Mr. Luc Berthold: Mr. Speaker, there is much in what my hon. colleague said. I must mention that she works very hard for seniors. That is her file and she often speaks about seniors' needs. We are currently facing a crisis.

All consumers who are seniors will get a break with the measures we outlined. Seniors, youth and workers will immediately get a break. That is the goal. We are the official opposition, and therefore I personally cannot say that we will increase all seniors' pensions. Even though we may believe that is a good solution, it is up to the government to implement that measure, but it is not doing so. It is not lowering taxes. Instead it is going to look for more money from taxpayers. Who is paying for all that? It is the entire population, Canadians of all ages. We want immediate measures put in place to provide some financial relief and allow them to buy the food they need every month.

[English]

Ms. Lori Idlout (Nunavut, NDP): *Uqaqtittiji*, I have shared in the House several times the food insecurity issues that are suffered by my constituents and many indigenous peoples. Meanwhile, major corporations, such as Loblaw's and The North West Company are reporting billions and millions in profits, as well as billions and millions in dividends going to shareholders.

Instead of increasing the profits of these major corporations, why do the Conservatives not support taxing their profits to help people before they fall further into food insecurity?

• (1050)

Mr. Luc Berthold: Mr. Speaker, we support a relief on taxes for each and every Canadian, including indigenous people. This is for everyone in the country. It is what we are supportive of. It could be the direct answer and could help everyone right now. This is what we need in Canada, and I hope the member will support our motion today.

The Deputy Speaker: As a friendly reminder, I note that we run out of time very quickly. Members are making very long comments, asking very long questions and giving very long answers. Members are not getting the opportunity to participate in the debate, so I want to make sure that we keep all questions and comments concise.

[Translation]

Resuming debate. The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Tourism and Associate Minister of Finance.

Ms. Rachel Bendayan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Tourism and Associate Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with my friend, the hon. member for Vaughan—Woodbridge.

Canadians are feeling the effects of inflation, especially at the pump and at the grocery store. This situation is largely attributable to the residual effects of the pandemic, namely supply chain disruptions, China's zero-COVID policy and, especially, the economic repercussions of Russia's invasion of Ukraine. This means that Canadians are paying more, especially for energy and food.

I would like to remind my colleagues across the aisle that inflation is being felt around the world and that, right now, in Canada, it is lower than in our peer countries, including the United States, the United Kingdom and Germany. It is even lower than the G7, G20, OECD and European Union averages.

I would also like to remind my colleagues opposite, who like to blame all the world's woes on government spending, that it is thanks to our federal government that Canadian workers were able to continue receiving a paycheque during the pandemic.

Business of Supply

The reason why we implemented so many supports and programs is precisely so that Canadians could continue to put food on the table, heat their home and gas up their car. These programs proved to be absolutely essential for Canadians and the Canadian economy to survive the pandemic.

It is thanks to our support and that fact that we avoided austerity measures during the pandemic that the Canadian government was in the position to withstand the omicron wave, supply chain disruptions and many other situations.

The Canadian economy is recovering strongly right now. We recorded the fastest growth among G7 countries in the first quarter, and our real GDP, taking inflation into account, is now higher than what it was before the pandemic. That is remarkable.

[English]

Canada not only has the strongest and fastest economic recovery, but has one of the strongest and fastest employment recoveries in the G7. In fact, there are more Canadians working now than at any other time in the history of recording unemployment in this country, that is, over the last 50 years.

We have recovered 115% of the jobs lost in the very difficult and awful first months of the pandemic. Compared with other countries, that is an extraordinary recovery. Even in the United States, just 96% of jobs have been recovered. Canadians, our entrepreneurs and small business owners have created 3.5 million jobs in the last two years alone.

As the job numbers continue to increase and our output lost during the pandemic is being recovered, the focus in our most recent budget has been on making life more affordable for Canadians and making targeted investments that will build Canada's economic capacity and support Canadians while doing so. However, before I get into that, let me address specifically what the Conservatives are proposing in their opposition day motion today and why these ideas are at best misguided.

The only concrete economic policy proposals that have come out of the Conservative Party recently are the temporary suspension of GST on gas and diesel and the cancelling of the price on pollution. That is it. This is the extent of the economic policy proposals we have heard from the Conservative Party.

[Translation]

That is all. It is just incredible.

[English]

As pointed out before in the House by many, there is absolutely no guarantee these large oil and gas companies will pass on any savings to Canadian consumers. It rests entirely with these companies to choose whether or not Canadians see any savings and relief at the pumps.

I know the price on pollution is a matter of huge contention in the Conservative leadership race. I know they are still deciding whether there is a climate crisis, and there have been many positions on this issue. In fact, there have been as many positions as there have been Conservative leaders in the past six years. Howev-

er, on this, economists and scientists are very clear: A price on pollution is the most effective way to fight climate change.

• (1055)

The PBO has confirmed that our approach is putting more money back into the pockets of eight out of 10 Canadian families through our climate action incentive. That means Canadians receive more money back than they are paying at the pump with the price on pollution.

It is also ironic that the Conservatives are claiming that our fiscal policies, or perhaps the fiscal policies of the Bank of Canada, which they like to impugn, are somehow to blame for global inflation. They are now putting forward policies in this very motion that economists would all agree increase demand at a time of supply shortage and at a time when these policies would exacerbate inflation, although this may not come as too big of a surprise after the Conservatives campaigned on a \$168-billion deficit.

The Conservative motion also proposes the easing of sanctions against Russia. I would like to tackle this head-on. The Conservatives stood up and applauded the sanctions against Russia and today are asking us to remove them.

When it comes to Russia's invasion of Ukraine, our policy is simple. We have one of the world's leading sanction policies and will continue to target Putin and his cronies. This is what the people of Ukraine are asking for, this is what the global community is asking for and this is what Canadians are asking for. However, for some reason, 100 days into the war, the Conservatives are willing to fold to Russia. Perhaps they are under pressure from Russia. Who knows?

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. parliamentary secretary has the floor. I want to make sure I hear her, and I am sure everyone wants to listen to her speech as well. There are comments and questions right after.

The hon. parliamentary secretary.

[Translation]

Ms. Rachel Bendayan: Mr. Speaker, since we came to power, we have made real improvements to make Canadians' lives more affordable, and these investments are helping Canadians now, despite inflation.

It was our government that introduced the Canada child benefit, which will give Canadian families almost \$7,000 per child in benefits in the coming year. We also expanded the Canada workers benefit to support an additional one million Canadians, which could represent \$1,000 more per year for full-time workers. We are also the government that increased the guaranteed income supplement maximum benefit for single seniors by 10% and decreased the age of eligibility for old age security and the GIS from 67 to 65.

Business of Supply

Conservative members should bear in mind that all our major government benefits are indexed to inflation, including old age security, the guaranteed income supplement, the Canada child benefit, the GST/HST credit and many others. That means that benefits increase with inflation.

[*English*]

The Conservatives have attempted to block, at every turn, our support for Canadians. The Conservatives voted against our tax cut for middle-class Canadians and are now proposing a tax cut for the oil and gas sector, which is making huge profits. We will continue to put forward real, progressive policies that will support real Canadians.

Let me just take one example from our most recent budget. We all know that seeing a dentist is expensive. In fact, a third of Canadians do not have dental insurance, and in 2018, more than one in five Canadians said they avoided getting dental care because of the cost. This is an affordability issue that we are tackling head-on. We are investing in order to support Canadians and in order to help them pay their bills. There are numerous other examples in the budget.

As I am almost out of time, allow me to mention briefly the fact that our budget is tackling the housing crisis. Our budget is ensuring that we are supporting Canadian families by subsidizing child care. I could go on and on. These are real policies helping real Canadians, and I would invite the Conservatives to vote in favour of the budget rather than presenting a motion that is clearly void of any tangible economic policy to help Canadians.

• (1100)

Mr. Tony Baldinelli (Niagara Falls, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary secretary spoke to a number of issues. Unfortunately, none of them touched upon tourism and the impact that the cost-of-living crisis is having on the tourism and travel sector.

Perhaps she should have spoken to two of her colleagues, who are in the House today, both former Ontario ministers of tourism. They know that tourism and travel are discretionary activities and that the cost-of-living crisis will impact them. Over the next four months, the tourism industry will generate 75% of its revenues, but the government has done nothing to help the tourism sector. In fact, all support programs have now ended. The best thing the Liberals can do is get out of the way and allow the tourism sector to do what it does best: welcome people from around the world.

Does the member not agree that cutting gas taxes will assist with this? For the rubber tire market, for example, it means discretionary spending. If Canadians do not have those dollars, they are not going to visit our communities, and that would be one thing to assist them. Also, we need to end the mandates. We need to return to prepandemic travel—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. parliamentary secretary.

Ms. Rachel Bendayan: Mr. Speaker, I was speaking on behalf of the finance team, but I am always happy to talk about our fabulous tourism sector.

Just this morning, I was with the Frontier Duty Free Association. I understand it will be meeting with the member shortly. This after-

noon, I have a fabulous round table with British Columbian stakeholders in the tourism industry.

What is unfortunate is that the Conservative Party voted against Bill C-2, which provided support directly to the tourism industry. Last week, I made a number of announcements to tourism operators for funding. In some cases, non-refundable funding is going straight into the pockets of our small businesses in the tourism sector and supporting them through this difficult time.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Deputy Speaker: Order. We can wait until everyone comes to order.

While I am standing here waiting, I will comment that the quicker we ask questions, the more people can participate in the debate we are having this morning. I can start cutting people off. I really do not like doing that, because I want people to get their comments, thoughts and questions out, but if members get long-winded, I might have to adopt a new way of doing this and cut them off when they hit a minute.

[*Translation*]

The hon. member for Berthier—Maskinongé.

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

It is quite disappointing to see the Conservative Party move an omnibus motion that combines so many issues. That said, the Conservatives are acknowledging some basic points, such as the situation for low-income earners who are struggling right now because of high inflation. I am not getting the impression that the government is doing much about that.

Is my colleague prepared to consider a surtax on oil companies making record profits, as well as a surtax on companies making over \$1 billion in profits?

With this money, we could help the poorest people cope with the cost of gasoline and groceries. We could immediately stop cuts to the guaranteed income supplement for seniors. It is hard to believe that those kinds of cuts are even being made right now.

I would like to hear my colleague's thoughts.

Ms. Rachel Bendayan: Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate that question. We, too, believe that everyone must pay their fair share. That is why we brought in a tax on banks, which made huge profits during the pandemic.

We also proposed a luxury tax on expensive boats and aircraft because we understand how important it is to continue to support vulnerable Canadians. In our budget, we are proposing one-time payments for Canadians who are struggling to find affordable housing. We are proposing measures to help our seniors and to support Canadian families.

Business of Supply

I think we completely agree on the principle. I also appreciate the Bloc's suggestion to tax oil companies. We will also look into that.

• (1105)

[English]

Ms. Lindsay Mathyssen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I did appreciate some of the burns on the Conservatives in the member's speech, but ultimately, this back-and-forth is not necessarily helping Canadians. We have to put forward real solutions. We have to bring forward not only long-lasting ideas that hit the inflation spikes now, but the long-lasting reforms that are required.

One thing the New Democrats have brought forward is tightening the regulation of the oil and gas sector. We have seen a lot of price gouging over the years. The New Democrats have asked for the establishment of a petroleum monitoring agency and an oil and gas ombudsmen to ensure that Canadians are getting fairer prices at the pumps. Could the member support that NDP initiative?

Ms. Rachel Bendayan: Mr. Speaker, I understand I have only a short time. I always appreciate concrete suggestions from opposition members. As I mentioned in my speech, it has been disappointing to hear some of the proposals put forward, including the ones in today's motion, which do not actually address the affordability crisis in this country.

I am happy to work with the member opposite on her proposal.

The Deputy Speaker: That is all the time we have again this time. I know there are a number of members on Zoom who have tried to get in and ask questions but have been unable to do so up to this point. Again, let us keep comments and questions as concise as we possibly can.

We are continuing debate.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara (Vaughan—Woodbridge, Lib.): Good morning to all my hon. colleagues here in the House. It is always a pleasure to rise in this honourable place and speak to Canadians and the residents of Vaughan—Woodbridge on the issues that matter most to them.

Today we are speaking to the opposition day motion put forward by the member for Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, a very good friend of mine, with regard to a matter that is very important to Canadians in terms of where we are in the world today and the pressures that Canadians are facing at home and that my family faces. I am raising three daughters. We know that the expenses Canadian families are facing are elevated and we need to be cognizant of that. Our government is cognizant of that.

Before I begin my formal remarks, tomorrow my oldest daughter is turning 11, so I am selfishly going to take the time to wish Eliana a very happy birthday. I hope to see her tomorrow evening. If that happens, great, but we will celebrate nonetheless tomorrow and in the days to come. I am blessed. God has blessed me with three beautiful daughters. They are the love of our life for my wife and me, and the time I have with them when I am back home is always very special. I try to be as present as possible. Happy birthday to Eliana.

We do know that in this time and in today's world, we are facing very elevated commodity prices, energy prices and food prices as a

result of a number of factors that are unfortunately beyond our control, including the barbaric invasion of Ukraine by Russia and supply chain bottlenecks due to COVID-19 that are still being sorted out. We can look at the price of a container, for example. In my riding a container used to cost about \$3,000 to go FOB from Europe to the port of Halifax, and the same container today costs about \$12,000 to \$15,000 to bring in products. That is just one data point, and there are many others.

One thing that is sort of within our control is how we fight climate change. As an economist, I know carbon pricing is a very effective tool in fighting climate change. We know that is what the international experts are saying. We know the world needs more of Canada's energy, both renewable and non-renewable, but we know there is a transition happening. I have read the opposition day motion from my hon. colleague and friend from Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, and the reference to suspending the pricing on carbon is something I disagree with. As an economist, I know we are doing the right thing.

With that, climate change is one of the most pressing issues of our time, and carbon pricing is the backbone of our climate plan. In recent years, climate change has had unprecedented effects on Canadians. Impacts from climate change are wide-ranging, affecting our homes, the cost of living, infrastructure, health and safety, and economic activities in communities across Canada. We saw that in B.C. with the recent floods, which we had to react to, and we did. The latest science warns us that to avoid severe impacts of climate change, greenhouse gas emissions must be reduced significantly and urgently to hold the global average temperature to 1.5°.

In April 2021, the Government of Canada responded by submitting a strengthened national emissions target of 40% to 45% below 2005 levels by 2030, in addition to its goal of achieving net-zero emissions by 2050. On March 29, the government released the 2030 emissions reduction plan, outlining how Canada would meet its 2030 target. The plan builds on a strong foundation, starting with Canada's first-ever national climate change plan in 2016 and then our strengthened plan, which was released in 2020.

Carbon pricing is central to all of these plans because it is the most efficient and lowest-cost policy to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Unlike the policy of the Conservative Party, which in its platform released a bureaucratic, inefficient program that would not have the desired effect of lowering greenhouse gas emissions, our policy of carbon pricing continues to be the most efficient market-based pricing mechanism to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from coast to coast in Canada. I hope it is emulated throughout the world, as different mechanisms have been. We can look to Europe, of course.

Business of Supply

We have heard from stakeholders across the country that consistency and predictability are key to unlocking investments in this low-carbon economy. We also know that businesses and industries are developing innovative technologies and approaches to reduce emissions. They need clear incentives and supports to put those technologies into practice. Carbon pricing creates those incentives without dictating any particular approach. It lets businesses decide how to best cut their emissions.

● (1110)

At the same time, Canadians are facing an affordability challenge, especially the most vulnerable Canadians. The federal approach to carbon pricing is designed to maintain the consistency demanded by industry and investors while prioritizing affordability for Canadians. We know it is not enough to create a cleaner economy; we have to make sure that Canadians can afford it.

It is true that pricing carbon pollution will modestly increase fuel costs by about 2¢ per litre of gasoline in 2022, and we know every little bit counts when gasoline prices are hitting north of \$2 a litre. We see it, but carbon pricing has never been about raising revenues; in fact, our plan allows most households to end up with more money in their pocket than what they have paid in approximately eight out of 10 households. Wherever federal fuel charge proceeds are returned directly to households, eight out of 10 families actually get more back through climate action incentive rebates than they paid, meaning this system is helping with the cost of living for a majority of Canadian families.

For example, the average cost impact of carbon pricing per household in Alberta is expected to be about \$700 in 2022, but this is less than the average climate action incentive payment of about \$1,040. In Ontario, the average household cost is estimated to be about \$580, but households will receive back, on average, about \$710. These estimates take into account direct costs like paying more for fuel and also indirect costs like paying a bit more for goods and services. Families in rural and small communities are eligible to receive an extra 10%. Households can use these funds in any way they want. They can use them to absorb the extra 2¢ per litre of gasoline if they choose.

Any households that take action to reduce their energy use would come out even further ahead. Zero-emission vehicles are an option, with federal purchase incentives helping reduce the costs. The federal government is also supporting home energy retrofits under the Canada greener homes grant to reduce energy use at home, save money, and yes, cut pollution by reducing greenhouse emissions.

The Government of Canada has also committed to return proceeds collected from the federal output-based pricing system, the OBPS, to the jurisdictions of origin. Provinces and territories that have voluntarily adopted the OBPS can opt for a direct transfer of proceeds collected. Proceeds collected in the other backstop jurisdictions will be returned through the OBPS proceeds fund, which is aimed at supporting clean industrial technologies and clean electricity projects.

Climate change is a serious challenge, and it requires serious but reasonable leadership. This is an opportunity that Canadian industry, businesses and workers are taking hold of and leading globally. It is a very big opportunity. Canadians want to take advantage of

the significant opportunities in the low-carbon economy. Analysis by the Global Commission on the Economy and Climate estimates that transitioning to a low-carbon economy will deliver an economic gain of \$26 trillion U.S. and generate 65 million new jobs globally.

Just as we put a price on carbon pollution, we are also making historic investments in clean technology, innovation and green infrastructure to drive economic growth and yes, reduce pollution and greenhouse gas emissions, including \$9.1 billion in new investments to cut pollution and grow the economy as part of the 2030 emissions reductions plan.

The “2030 Emissions Reduction Plan: Canada's Next Steps for Clean Air and a Strong Economy” reflects submissions from over 30,000 Canadians, provinces and territories; indigenous partners; industry; civil society and the independent net-zero advisory body. This plan represents a whole-of-society approach with practical ways to achieve emission reductions across all of the economy.

Canada is not alone in fighting climate change and pricing carbon pollution. The cost of inaction on climate change is enormous, and as a government and as a society, we must continue to ensure that we achieve our net-zero by 2050 goals and also make sure that the transition is affordable for Canadians.

On the affordability front, through the last several years our government has put in place two major tax cuts for middle-class Canadians. Literally tens of millions of dollars have been returned to the pockets of Canadian families. The Canada child benefit is another measure, along with the Canada workers income benefit. The upcoming 10% increase in old age security for seniors will benefit over 3.3 million seniors.

We understand that we need to assist Canadian families in getting ahead and we will continue to do that.

I look forward to questions and comments.

● (1115)

The Deputy Speaker: We will go to questions and comments, and again my suggestion is that we try to keep them as concise as we possibly can. If we do run out of time, I will call someone whose hand has been up for a long time.

The hon. member for Foothills.

Mr. John Barlow (Foothills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to call into question my colleague's comments that the carbon tax is revenue-neutral. We know from the Parliamentary Budget Officer's report that this is not true, and I want to give the hon. member an example. Through Bill C-8, Canadian farmers are getting \$1.70 for every \$1,000 of eligible expenses as part of their carbon tax rebate. Some of them are paying more than \$19,000 a month right now to run their machinery during seeding. They are getting pennies on the dollar for what they are paying in carbon tax.

Would my colleague not agree that this is not revenue-neutral?

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Mr. Speaker, I know the hon. member for Foothills' interventions in the House with regard to agriculture and farmers are very well respected.

I have the utmost respect for farmers across Canada from coast to coast to coast. We need to make sure we have their backs at all times, particularly at a time when food security, food affordability and food security are of paramount concern. We will be there always to ensure we have the backs of farmers. I know the minister of agriculture is obviously fighting for farmers day in and day out.

[Translation]

Mr. Mario Simard (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, earlier, I pointed out to my Conservative colleagues that it was rather shameful to ask the government to lift the GST on gas, particularly since oil companies are making record profits right now. Big oil companies are the ones robbing the middle class of what little wealth it had managed to accumulate.

I am wondering whether my colleague is aware that the government is supporting oil companies. That is another shameful fact. Think of the \$2.6 billion the budget allocates to carbon capture strategies. Does my colleague agree that that is shameful, given what the greedy oil companies are up to?

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague from Jonquière for his question. I support carbon capture strategies.

[English]

I believe the carbon capture measure we put into our budget is one additional measure that we need to put into place to lower greenhouse gas emissions by working with industry. I will also add that the measures our government has brought into place since 2015 have been directly aimed at helping middle-class Canadians and middle-class Canadian families. We will continue to have their backs coming out of COVID-19 and working through this affordability situation that the whole world faces.

• (1120)

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend happy birthday wishes to my colleague's daughter.

We know that the Conservative motion, by cutting the GST and by eliminating the carbon tax on oil and gas, will actually just lead to an increased amount on our deficit. Also, it will do nothing to stop oil and gas companies from earning skyrocketing profits on the backs of everyday Canadians.

We know that speculation is the biggest factor driving oil and gas prices at the moment. Does the member agree that tighter regula-

Business of Supply

tion of this sector, with the establishment of a petroleum monitoring agency and an oil and gas ombudsman—something we have been urging for several years—would be a good way to ensure Canadians are getting fair prices at the pump?

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Mr. Speaker, as a government and as a society, we always must monitor any anti-competitive practices that are being put in place or practised by whichever sector of the economy where they are in place. It was great to see a number of measures in budget 2022 that are aimed at strengthening the Competition Act and giving more teeth and more resources to that entity.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, happy birthday to Eliana, the hon. member for Vaughan—Woodbridge's daughter.

I feel that my question really is about all of our children's future, particularly someone at 11 years old. Despite the many programs that the Liberals have put forward on climate, they cumulatively are completely inadequate to ensure that we will avoid an unlivable world for our own children. The warnings of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change are clear that we must ensure that emissions begin to drop globally before 2025.

I ask the hon. member for Vaughan—Woodbridge if he would accept that approving Bay du Nord and continuing to build the Trans Mountain pipeline shows that there is an inadequate understanding that we are in a climate emergency.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Mr. Speaker, I also read a report. I think it was from the IAEA, if I have the acronym correct, and there is a chart in it showing the cumulative greenhouse gas emissions and greenhouse gas emissions over time. That chart is very startling.

I agree with the hon. member that this is about our children's future. This is a global issue. Canada needs to lead on it, but we also need to know and also need to understand that this is a transition in place and that we need to ensure that energy security is there for citizens across the world, along with energy affordability. Also, we need to decarbonize. That has to be our priority.

[Translation]

Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by saying that I will be sharing my time with my hon. colleague, the member for Mirabel.

I am pleased to rise today to speak to the motion moved on the Conservative Party's opposition day. This motion comprises many of the motions that have been moved by the Conservatives here in the past, most of which were defeated. They decided to take all these motions and lump them together, claiming that they were right and everyone else was wrong.

Business of Supply

I will begin by quoting Albert Einstein, hoping that my colleagues will not be offended that I am citing a scientist. He said that “we cannot solve our problems with the same thinking we used when we created them”. Let us be clear. Inflation is a real problem that concerns our constituents, but we need more than simplistic solutions to deal with long-standing patterns and complex phenomena. It is not enough to resort to libertarian monetary fads, such as cryptocurrency, to overcome rising prices caused by demand outstripping supply in the context of a labour shortage. Also, the word “cryptocurrency” is strangely absent from the motion, unless we should be expecting an amendment from the hon. member for Carleton. We will see.

We are dealing with a real conflict in terms of the distribution of wealth and equity. I am not saying that this is the crux of the problem, but it is one of them. There appear to be three fundamental differences between Canadian and British Conservatives. First, British Conservatives defend sovereignty. As we know, it was the Conservatives who orchestrated Brexit. Second, they did not fire their leader. Third, they are concerned about their most disadvantaged citizens. Boris Johnson’s government plans to levy an exceptional 25% tax on gas and oil company profits in an effort to return the revenues to households experiencing the greatest difficulties.

Canada’s Conservatives, on the other hand, are proposing that we suspend the goods and services tax on gasoline and diesel. That is pure demagoguery. Obviously, many Canadians get angry when they go to the pumps. Their anger is the most understandable and legitimate in the world and, for many of them, this simple solution may appear to be eminently sensible. They likely think that it would give them a bit of breathing room. The problem is that this is a false solution to a real problem. As long as oil companies control prices, they will obviously be able to increase them.

Oil companies understand full well that, despite people’s anger, they have no other option right now than to go to the gas station and fill up their tank. If we were to suspend the tax, the oil companies would only increase their prices. It is that simple. That is the problem. Even if consumers were to pay less in the short term, which is not guaranteed, prices would soon increase. One could even say that this motion moved by the Conservatives is a gift for their oil company friends.

An hon. member: Oh, come on!

Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to have unsettled my colleagues with this surprising revelation this morning.

In this morning’s *Journal de Montréal*, Michel Girard, in an article entitled “Les pétrolières nous pompent des milliards”, or oil companies are siphoning billions out of our pockets—another article that will prove to be unsettling for some—reported on the expected and past profits of several major oil companies. Suncor Energy pocketed \$11 billion in 2022, Imperial Oil made \$6.2 billion in profits in 2021, and Valero Energy made \$6.5 billion in profits last year. Internationally, Shell is expected to pocket more than \$40 billion this year. Moreover, the energy sector subindex has risen by 43% since the beginning of the year, and that followed a 42% increase in 2021.

I will now address the Quebeckers and Canadians who are listening to us. Here is the proof: Your inflation is their loot. It is that simple. We need a transition plan out of fossil fuels. We have been saying that for a long time, and we will continue to say it. We need to take action.

• (1125)

Obviously, it will not happen overnight. We do not want to lay anyone off tomorrow morning. There are workers in the sector. The aim is not to lay them off, but it goes without saying that decreasing our dependence on fossil fuels means decreasing our dependence on fossil fuel price fluctuations. That is just logical.

Today, as drivers are going broke, shareholders are celebrating. Sadly, there is nothing in the Conservatives’ motion about that. Still, the oil companies are not the only ones to be making record profits we could easily describe as obscene. Consider banks, with their astronomical senior executive salaries and profits in 2021.

Combined, the National Bank, Laurentian Bank, Royal Bank of Canada, Bank of Montreal, TD Bank, Scotiabank, CIBC and Desjardins Group earned \$60.68 billion in profits. That is a 39% jump, or about \$17 billion more, over the previous year, which was also a pandemic year.

The Royal Bank of Canada was the biggest profit maker, raking in \$16.05 billion, an increase of over 40%. It was followed by TD Bank, with \$14.3 billion, an increase of 20%. Scotiabank pocketed \$9.99 billion, an increase of 45%. The Bank of Montreal posted profits of \$7.75 billion, an increase of over 52%. CIBC took in \$6.45 billion, an increase of more than 68%. National Bank made \$3.18 billion, an increase of more than 53%. Only Laurentian Bank did not do as well as in the previous year.

Now let us look at salaries. The CEOs of these eight financial institutions took home \$88.87 million, compared with \$71.52 million in 2020. Not everyone is experiencing the crisis in the same way.

According to Canadians for Tax Fairness, 111 publicly traded companies headquartered in Canada recorded profits over \$100 million in the first nine months of the year. Thirty-four of these companies posted record profits during a crisis. Let me repeat that: during a crisis. The top earner was TC Energy, formerly TransCanada, whose Keystone project has been in the news for years. The company made \$3.5 billion in profit on sales of \$9.7 billion in the third quarter.

Meanwhile, SMEs are going into debt. We need to levy a tax on profits exceeding \$1 billion for banks, insurance companies, oil companies and big box stores. The tax revenue should be used to fund assistance programs, particularly for SMEs. That is how wealth is redistributed. That is also how the impact of the crisis is evenly distributed.

Business of Supply

The Biden administration in the United States has proposed a tax on the super-rich to finance its postpandemic investment plan. There would be a tax on unrealized capital gains, in other words, a tax on dormant income, which would apply to approximately 700 taxpayers and would raise hundreds of millions of dollars, guaranteeing that the wealthiest Americans pay their fair share to finance the historic investments needed for a strong recovery.

Last year in Canada, the Parliamentary Budget Officer estimated that a tax on excess profits earned by big firms in 2020, during the pandemic, would have generated \$7.9 billion for the federal treasury.

One promising solution that should be considered is a global minimum tax. In June 2021, the G7 finance ministers met in London and reached an astonishing landmark agreement to establish an international corporate tax rate of at least 15% and improve the distribution of tax revenues from multinationals.

I only have six seconds left, but I still have so much to say.

• (1130)

Before I take questions, I will conclude by thanking my colleagues for listening so carefully and by stating that the Bloc Québécois will not support these bogus solutions to real problems.

Mr. Richard Lehoux (Beauce, CPC): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his speech.

I do not know if he really took the time to read the motion, but the solutions we are proposing are perhaps not long-term solutions as he suggests. I still feel it is important that we discuss them.

However, in the short term, for all Canadians and those living in his riding, measures like temporarily suspending the GST on gas and diesel would benefit taxpayers in his riding.

We understand that it is a short-term measure, but if we want to give our constituents a break, I feel it is important that we do it.

Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: Madam Speaker, first of all, there is no problem with the part about fertilizer, and I want to make that clear. That is probably one of the things that is having a very big impact on my riding as well.

The member is talking about giving people a break, but this motion would give a break to the oil companies. There is “short term”, and then there is “short term”. It will only take the oil companies a few months to realize that they can raise prices. They will be even happier. We will end up with the same price at the pump, with more money going to the oil companies and less to the government.

Ms. Rachel Bendayan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Tourism and Associate Minister of Finance, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his speech and for the work that he continues to do on international trade.

I did not quite hear the last few seconds of his speech. Is the Bloc Québécois planning to vote against this motion, given what we just heard about the oil companies not needing a break and the Conservative proposals not really going to help Canadians?

• (1135)

Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: Madam Speaker, my colleague is correct; the Bloc Québécois will be voting against this motion.

I am also happy to see my former colleague from the Standing Committee on International Trade, and I give her my regards.

That said, I am appealing to our government colleagues. The energy transition ball is also in the government's court, and I would encourage them to listen to us. There needs to be a real transition. As my colleague said, the oil companies are making enough and do not deserve any more profit. We urge the government to take action in this area as well.

Ms. Niki Ashton (Churchill—Keewatinook Aski, NDP): Madam Speaker, I enjoyed hearing my colleague's comments.

Does he agree that, if we truly want to support ordinary people in crisis, we need to make the rich pay? They need to be taxed fairly so that the government can invest in our social systems and support the people, families and communities who are going through very difficult times.

Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for her question, because I would have liked to speak to that point if I had had more time.

If I understand the question correctly, in terms of those who are struggling the most, that is exactly what we must do. We need to help those with the lowest incomes. We also need to help seniors by giving them a real pension increase starting at age 65, not a one-time cheque. In other words, we must help the real victims of inflation, with fairer taxes, taxes on obscene profits and on the ultrarich. That will get us somewhere.

Mr. Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot for that excellent speech.

I have here the Conservatives' opposition day motion. The motion is quite detailed and long. It includes all their failed initiatives from this parliamentary session. For their sake, I am glad it all fits on a letter-sized page. It includes a number of whereases that are hard to argue with, especially the ones about the high cost of living. That is a simple fact. We know inflation has gone up and the price of goods has gone up.

The whereases are fine. Things are off to a good start. For example, we know the price of gas is over two dollars. We are aware of that. People in my riding are worried about it. The same goes for the price of food, which has gone up over 9%. Other goods have gone up even more. We know that.

Business of Supply

The motion also says that heightened inflation is projected to persist longer than was reasonably believed a while ago. Obviously, economic projections are made with the best information available at the time, and nobody predicted the war in Ukraine. The point is, it is true that the cost of living is higher and will remain higher for some time.

Based on the solutions offered in the motion, however, it is clear that, although they identified the symptoms of inflation correctly, the Conservatives do not understand the causes. They did not do their homework, and the facts cannot lie. Facts can be checked. The Conservatives are laughing, but they will learn.

The facts show that household demand has continued to increase, but it is not much higher than it would have been without the pandemic. Habits have changed and people are consuming less services and more goods, which has led to supply chain issues. This is true in Canada, it is true in Quebec and, because we cannot ignore the rest of the world, it is true in the majority of other developed countries.

On top of that is the war in Ukraine. The war in Ukraine has most certainly had an effect on supply chains, an effect that is still present today, for example, on the Chicago Mercantile Exchange. Russia is using supplies of grain, food and fuel as a weapon of mass destruction, which has made food prices here skyrocket. This weapon is also being used to make developing countries suffer because they are being held hostage. This is very real.

If we look at the figures, we can see that 70% of the factors driving the price increases are what we call supply-side factors. Neither we nor the Bank of Canada have any influence over these factors. That is our economic reality. It is unpleasant, hence all the grandstanding we are seeing, but that is our economic reality.

The Conservative motion proposes solutions to all these supply shock problems. The first solution is to end all federal restrictions on travel, masks and so on. There are not many federal restrictions left, but a few still remain. That is already out of touch.

I am a member of the Standing Committee on Health, and last week we heard from Dr. MacDonald, a professor at Dalhousie University who specializes in pediatrics and infectious diseases. I asked her if she thought that politicians should stop meddling in health measures and including specific health measures in motions in Parliament. She replied that she agreed, that it did not make any sense. She said that parliamentarians should stop dictating health measures and that these decisions should be made by public health authorities.

This is true of the Conservatives' motions, but it is also true of the Liberals, who may be using the health measures for political purposes. This has to stop. That is one reason this motion is problematic. It is not the Conservatives' job to dictate health measures in a motion.

There is also the cost of living. We know that the cost of living is going up. The Conservatives are saying that we need to do something about it and that they will propose something smart. Since March 2022, the solution of the motion's sponsor, the member for Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, has been to support the member for Carleton in the leadership race. We know they are pop-

ular. They are saying that what they will do, since everyone is suffering, is fire the Governor of the Bank of Canada. What a brilliant idea, as if firing the Governor of the Bank of Canada is going to help people in Mirabel and Beauce, or our farmers.

They want to fire the leader of one of the most credible central banks in the world when 70% of inflation is not his responsibility. As for the other 30%, the Conservatives who said he was not taking action are now complaining because he is taking action by raising interest rates. The last time a party or a government was irresponsible enough to propose such a thing was in 1961, when Minister Fleming, who was a Conservative, shockingly enough, said he was going to fire the Governor of the Bank of Canada, James Elliott Coyne.

● (1140)

What happened? The government did it by passing legislation, because it was illegal. However, the Senate slammed the door on their faces. Things must be going badly if the Senate is giving lessons on democracy. The Senate told the government that the head of a central bank cannot be fired. Nevertheless, that is where today's Conservatives are headed under the member for Carleton. They are going to be given a lesson on democracy by the Senate. Lucky them.

There are solutions, and we have proposed some. The first is to tax oil companies in order to fund our public services and launch assistance programs. I am sure the Conservatives will say this is a Bloc fantasy.

There is only one entity in the world that is proposing to abolish gas taxes, and that is the Conservative Party of Canada. However, on May 26, the U.K. proposed a 25% windfall tax that is expected to bring in \$6 billion U.S. I did not make this up; their Conservative friends in Britain proposed it.

On June 4, the Biden administration suggested a similar tax, which is now being studied. India is also thinking about this. How amazing to think that India is a step ahead of the Conservatives.

The Conservatives' solution is to lower taxes. As my colleague from Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot said, the oil companies are going to lie low for a few weeks, like they did in Alberta. Then, once the public relations crisis is over, they will raise prices. They know full well that people are not going to run out and buy electric vehicles tomorrow morning, and that they will have to keep filling up their tanks. The Conservative motion will not help farmers in the member for Beauce's riding, I can promise him that.

What should we do instead? First, we need to increase seniors' purchasing power. Where in the motion is the increase to the federal pension for seniors? Nowhere.

There needs to be a program to support the people who are most affected, such as farmers, who cannot buy a Tesla combine. Where is the targeted program for them? Nowhere.

There needs to be a program to help taxi drivers, including Uber drivers. Where is that program in the Conservative motion? Nowhere.

Business of Supply

We need to address the labour shortage. There was nothing in the budget tabled by the Liberals, who are no better. Where in the Conservative motion are the solutions to the labour shortage? Nowhere.

We are talking about real people who are being affected by these higher prices. Where is the proposal for increasing the GST rebate and issuing cheques more frequently every month? It is nowhere to be found, either from the government or from the Conservatives.

We asked that fertilizers that had been ordered and paid for before the crisis in Ukraine started be cleared for delivery. That is not in the motion, although we do support the part about the tariffs on fertilizer. It just goes to show that there is always a little light in the darkness.

Where is the Conservatives' proposal for fixing social housing? We need 60,000 units in Montreal just to start getting back on track. Where is the Conservatives' proposal for sending that money to Quebec, since the Liberals think sending money to Quebec is even harder than building housing? Nowhere.

Where is the money for real housing, for real families who are on a real budget, with real children who go to real schools? Rather than helping people, the Conservatives are fixating on the governor of the central bank.

Where is the tax credit for experienced workers in our supply chains? It is nowhere to be found in the Conservative motion.

Where is the Conservatives' proposal for handing over control of the temporary foreign worker program to Quebec so that farmers in Oka, Mirabel or Sainte-Anne-des-Plaines get the people they need, so that the process is efficient and there is no need to conduct the same labour market impact assessment twice? Nowhere.

Where is their aerospace policy that will help us become more efficient at research and development, seeing as Canada is the only country with such a large industry and no aerospace policy? Nowhere. The Liberals will tell us that they gave \$800 million to Bell Textron. We know that, and we are happy about it. However, Canada still has no policy.

This Conservative motion is devoid of substance. As for the Liberals, they will do what they always do, which is stand up and tell us that they have increased family benefits indexed to inflation. However, indexation is always one year behind, and people are living with 6% to 7% inflation right now.

There are solutions out there, and we have proposed some, but they are nowhere to be found in this motion.

• (1145)

Mr. Stephen Ellis (Cumberland—Colchester, CPC): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his speech about the economy.

However, this is just a motion. It is not the Conservatives' budget. It is just a motion designed to help all the people in our ridings, be they in Nova Scotia or Quebec. It is just the Conservatives' straightforward way of trying to help all Canadians.

Mr. Jean-Denis Garon: Madam Speaker, my colleague is a great person and I thank him for his question.

They have the right idea. They identified a problem and they want to find solutions. However, the Bloc Québécois and I find that these solutions are short term and not a good fit for the situation. These are not the right solutions.

I realize that this is not a Conservative budget, thank God. However, it does give us some indication that, if the Conservatives were in power, oil companies would take precedence over the people of my riding.

Ms. Rachel Bendayan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Tourism and Associate Minister of Finance, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I agree with what my colleague just said in the House.

He talked about the importance of coming up with solutions. Does the Bloc Québécois have some solutions and some concrete, long-term economic policy ideas that can help us develop well-thought-out policies in the House?

Mr. Jean-Denis Garon: Madam Speaker, I just spent 10 minutes proposing solutions that were not in the motion, as I said. The Bloc Québécois has obviously been proposing plenty of solutions.

However, the government keeps saying that inflation is temporary, that we are in a supply and affordability crisis because of what is happening in Ukraine. In question period every day, when ministers read their talking points prepared by the Prime Minister's Office, they keep saying it is temporary.

Today I am suggesting concrete solutions for people who are experiencing these problems right now. Obviously, long-term solutions do exist. We have been asking for an aerospace policy in Quebec for 10, 12, 15 years, and we have yet to see one. We are proposing solutions. I spent 10 minutes doing just that.

Obviously, we are in a crisis, and this calls for crisis solutions, which need to be brought in immediately. Unfortunately, the budget was devoid of these kinds of solutions.

• (1150)

Mr. Daniel Blaikie (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): Madam Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for his speech.

I think we can agree that, in this time of inflation, while some things are indeed out of the government's control, there are some measures it could be taking.

What is missing from the Conservative analysis is a real assessment of the role of the private sector and how it is contributing to inflation. We must not forget that aspect in our analysis. I wonder if my hon. colleague could elaborate on that.

Mr. Jean-Denis Garon: Madam Speaker, the Conservatives think that the private sector is the solution for everything. That is because they took economics 101, but did not bother with economics 102. Public goods is a real thing.

Business of Supply

The governments that are the closest to the people on the ground, providing them with services to support them, are the governments of Quebec and the provinces. That is why I invite our NDP colleagues to support the unconditional increase of health transfers, so that the money goes directly to the provinces. I also invite them to support unconditional transfers for housing, so that the provinces can house people. These solutions rarely come from Ottawa because Ottawa is not in touch with people and Canada is a big country where there is a lot of diversity in the economic structure and in mentalities. The federal government needs to trust Quebec and the provinces and give them the money.

I am not a huge federalist, on the contrary, but if my colleague believes in federalism, he has to believe in the ability of the governments of Quebec and the provinces to help people. That is all.

[English]

Mr. Daniel Blaikie (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): Madam Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the member for Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke.

I want to speak to what is a bit of a grab bag of various initiatives that we have largely seen before in the House in other Conservative opposition day motions. I take it that my colleagues on the Conservative side will not be surprised at the fact that New Democrats do not intend to support this motion because we have actually debated and voted on most of these initiatives already in the House. In fact, one wonders if there is not a procedural question about revisiting some of the same decisions in the House, but I will put that procedural point on hold to address what I take to be the substantive issues in the motion.

The motion is talking about a very real problem that Canadians are experiencing and, frankly, cannot get away from, which is the incredible price increases at the grocery store, at the pump and elsewhere on just about everything, which is making it really difficult for Canadians to operate within their normal budget. We all know that wages are not keeping pace with the extent of the price increases we are seeing, so we certainly welcome an opportunity to talk about the impact that inflation is having on Canadians and to propose solutions, even where we disagree about what those solutions ought to be.

One of the solutions proposed in the motion is to simply lift all public health restrictions. New Democrats have said many times in the House that we support public health officials leading those conversations, as they have in provinces, where they have come to certain conclusions and federal public health officials, at the moment, have come to different conclusions. We support public health officials making those decisions.

We also believe that Canadians have a right to know the evidence and information on which those decisions are based. I think the government's refusal to table that evidence and make it public has created a problem of public trust in our institutions, which is growing. I would beseech the government to make that information public and to be very frank about the recommendations it is getting from public health, including the data and evidence that support them, because that is important to building and maintaining public trust in our institutions. It is something that we need now more than ever, and the government is doing a disservice to Canadians and

our institutions by not being more forthcoming with the information it is receiving from public health officials.

Even as we support public health officials, we certainly have our own critique of the how the government has handled the file and what that has meant in Canadians' own attitudes toward our public health officials at the federal level. As I say, we call upon the government to do better in supporting those institutions and Canadians by being frank, open and accountable about the information that drives its decision-making.

However, that is not the call here. The call here is to substitute politicians for public health officials and say that the House of Commons should decide, rather than experts based on the best available evidence, and that is a wrong turn. It is not one that we have supported at anytime during the pandemic, and it is not one that we are going to support at this time or anytime in the future, even as we encourage the government to do a better job of making that information available.

I will speak more generally now for a moment about the motion because it talks about a number of things. It talks about lowering the GST and the carbon tax on the price of gas, even though that is a solution that does not touch as many people as it needs to because we know there are a lot of people who do not drive vehicles who are also suffering from inflation. They are the people who ride their bikes and take public transportation and cannot afford to own a car, and this solution helps perpetuate a culture that is driving climate change. It is bereft of any kind of meaningful thinking about the next real economic crisis, which has already started to make itself felt and is only going to continue to make itself felt to a greater and greater degree.

Our solution to inflation in the present moment cannot be one that is going to compound a growing economic problem, which is the problem of climate change. We have to find solutions to inflation now that also set us up for success moving into the future. We are going to have to continue to grapple with serious economic challenges that will cause economic displacement and will continue to cause upward cost pressures on goods of all kinds as climate change will continue to interfere with supply chains beyond the life of the pandemic.

● (1155)

When I said I wanted to speak a little more generally, what I meant was that what is characteristic of Conservative solutions, as they call them, is that they are completely blind to the role the private sector plays in driving inflation. It is as if the private sector is completely innocent, that corporate board members are completely innocent, that the CEOs of large companies like oil and gas companies, big box stores, insurance companies and banks, which have all made a killing during the pandemic with profits way above their prepandemic norms, are somehow innocent, and if we only left it more to them, everything would work out.

They do not talk about the kind of good work that has been done by the member for Windsor West on gas prices to actually do something. When we talk about raising taxes on oil and gas companies, they say that this will just get passed onto the consumer and, in the next breath, they say, "Let us cut taxes on gas." As if those same companies, which have been known to jack up the price of gas by 8¢ a litre just because of a long weekend, are not going to take that space up themselves, now that they know that people are prepared to pay for it. The blind spots are inexcusable.

The way to take meaningful action on gas prices is to follow the lead of the member for Windsor West, who has talked about establishing a price monitoring board that would look at real data from the oil and gas industry and determine what their pricing might be. We then need to have an ombudsperson who would be able to take complaints from Canadians who notice that the price of gas jumps every time somebody sneezes internationally and there is worry that it might cause a crisis. Well, actually, they are not worried. They see it as an opportunity for speculation.

That is what needs to be reined in, and the only way to do that is by properly regulating the market. When we do that, we could increase taxes on oil and gas companies that have made record profits over the course of the pandemic, and we would know that this money can be reinvested back into Canadians without them having to pay for it at the pump. That is how one sets up an infrastructure to actually look after Canadians and make sure that they are being treated fairly. We do not hear that except from the NDP in this place.

I hope that we will start to hear about it from more than New Democrats because it is something that actually ought to get done. However, the idea that, somehow, just by giving a little bit of a break at the pump for those who are driving vehicles is going to be the solution to inflation is facile. It puts us on the wrong track in the much bigger economic problem we are facing, which is climate change.

We talk about housing. The solution for housing proposed here is to have a public inquiry into money laundering. Well, we should be looking into money laundering and the role it is playing, but if we are talking about urgent action to help people during the pandemic, people would be much better off getting a bigger GST rebate, paid for by the largest companies that are making the biggest profits. I named those industries earlier: oil and gas, insurance and banking. Big box stores have also seen giant increases in profits.

That is something that would go directly to Canadians who are the most in need. It is something we can do now. It is something that the government has already done during the course of the pandemic, and that is why we know it can be done. We know it can be done quickly, and we know that it helps. Providing an extra \$500 on the Canada child benefit this year is another way to help families that are struggling with rising costs. That is something that we can do right away.

We know that there are companies operating in Canada that have made additional profits that Canadians have paid for, so I ask what the difference is between that and a tax. Canadians go to the grocery store to buy food for their family, and Loblaws or somebody else has decided to jack up the price in a moment of opportunity, as

Business of Supply

they see it, or whatever the rationale is, maybe to shield themselves from future risk. Whatever it is, they have decided that Canadians are going to pay more for things they cannot do without and that is going to go into their bank account. The difference between that and a tax is that this never gets reinvested into Canadians at the bottom and the services that they need.

That is where a tax, if it is done well, is better than what we too often hear from the Conservatives.

On the question of tariffs on fertilizer, I think there is an interesting point here. The Conservatives clearly have put together a list of things with people that they want to be able to talk to and please, and there are some important points about the tariff on fertilizer that I will get to in the questions and comments, but the fact of the matter is that this reads more like a target demographic list of people they want to fundraise on.

• (1200)

Mr. Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC): Madam Speaker, I was happy to listen to the member opposite's speech, but the NDP has truly fallen far from being the party of hard-working Canadians.

In this motion, we talk about getting rid of restrictions and mandates so people can go back to work. These are people in the public service and the RCMP across this nation. There are three million to four million people who have not been able to go to work.

Also, those same people cannot travel within their own country, yet all this member wants to talk about is big corporations and how they are bad for Canadians and never help Canadians. What we want to do is talk about a few things, and one of which is getting Canadians back to work.

How far has the NDP fallen that its members do not even care if people can provide for their families anymore? This member should be ashamed of that speech.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Madam Speaker, I am certainly not ashamed to stand up to talk about something we will never hear from the Conservatives, which is the extent to which corporate Canada is also putting pain on Canadians. We are also not embarrassed to be proposing real solutions about that.

I will suppress the unparliamentary phrase that comes to mind as an appropriate response to the member's question and just say that people who want to go back to work also want to go back to safe workplaces. For as much as there are people who are frustrated they have not been able to go to work because they did not get the vaccine, there are also a lot of people who are glad to be in a safe workplace and glad to follow the directives of public health officials.

Business of Supply

As I said, we believe government should do a better job of reinforcing faith in those public officials by being open and transparent about the information they are getting from them, but a safe workplace is also about standing up for workers. That is something we are proud to do on this side of the House.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the motion talks about tariffs on fertilizer, and we all know Russia is a major exporter of fertilizer. This is not necessarily about previous contracts but contracts moving forward. Does the member have any thoughts regarding the issue?

An hon. member: That is not true and you know it.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, does the member believe the federal government should be relieving tariffs on fertilizer?

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): There are questions and comments coming from members of the official opposition, and I would just ask them to please hold off until I recognize them. They have already had the opportunity to ask a question.

The hon. member for Elmwood—Transcona has the floor.

• (1205)

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Madam Speaker, the motion simply says “eliminating tariffs on fertilizer”. The member for Winnipeg North is right to point out that tariffs were imposed on fertilizer coming from Russia as part of our effort to punish Vladimir Putin.

The legitimate issue here is that there are farmers who signed contracts to buy fertilizer as part of their pricing for the year before the invasion of Ukraine, so there is a real question of fairness in retroactively imposing a tariff on farmers who had already signed contracts to get that fertilizer and who had built it into their pricing structure for the year.

We are not hearing that kind of conversation from the Conservatives. They are not trying to build a parliamentary consensus. They are trying to build a fundraising list. That comes across very clearly in the motion.

An hon. member: That is wrong.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I want to remind members of the official opposition that it is not time for questions and comments unless I recognize them, and if they have other questions and comments, then they should stand and attempt to be recognized. Otherwise, I would ask them to please hold on to their thoughts, jot them down and wait for the appropriate time to do that.

Continuing with questions and comments, the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot has the floor.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Madam Speaker, thank you for recognizing that I have the floor.

I would like to ask my colleague, with whom I had the pleasure of serving on the Standing Committee on International Trade during the last Parliament—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

[*English*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Once again, it is really disrespectful what is happening in the House right now, and I would ask the parliamentary secretary not to take part in discussions going back and forth with the official opposition when somebody else has the floor.

I know most members who are participating in this right now have been in the House for some time. They should know what the rules of the House are.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: Madam Speaker, I am pleased to be able to hear myself talk without anyone talking over me when I am trying to ask a question.

In 2021, we floated the idea of a type of minimum tax for G7 countries to prevent competition among the tax systems and to prevent multinationals from taking advantage of that competition to engage in blackmail, for example, by threatening one country that they would move to a neighbouring country if the former did not lower its tax rate. That is a good idea that seems to break with the neo-liberalism that has prevailed for several decades.

What does my colleague think about that?

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question, which was asked in the appropriate way.

I think we have been in a race to the bottom for far too long. An agreement that would guarantee a fair minimum tax rate is a very good idea. I think it would be a good thing for companies that want to stay in Canada but are in competition with companies whose operations are located in countries with lower tax rates.

[*English*]

Mr. Randall Garrison (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to speak to this Conservative opposition day motion because I think it identifies a very real problem facing Canadians: inflation generally, and the price of gas, the price of food and the price of housing.

Unfortunately, it does something the Conservatives are wont to do recently, which is ignore the ongoing pandemic. It asks us to ignore health experts in favour of so-called freedom from mandates. I would just remind members of the House that in my home province of British Columbia, in the last week of May, 44 people died from COVID. We have many people, some of whom I know quite well, who are suffering from long COVID, and many members, or certainly many citizens of British Columbia, are receiving things like cancer treatments that compromise their immune systems, so there are lots of reasons why we should continue to listen to the health experts and not simply adopt some political position on mandates.

Business of Supply

I would agree with the Conservatives on only one small aspect, which is that I think the government has an obligation to show its work, as we say, when it comes to mandates. I believe that public health officials will do what is right, but the government needs to show us the evidence it is using for the decisions it is making, which it was pretty good at during the early stages of the pandemic, but seems to have forgotten about now.

Having identified the affordability crisis, of course the Conservatives like to say the solution is more money in Canadians' pockets. Strangely, there is some agreement here. I believe there are some Canadians who need more money in their pockets. The problem is this: Which Canadians need that money in their pockets? The Conservative solution is to make sure that the pockets that get filled are those of large corporations and not the people who are actually facing an affordability crisis in their families.

When it comes to gas prices, let us look at the profits of oil companies. In the first quarter of 2022 only, Imperial Oil recorded \$1.17 billion in profits. This was its best record in 30 years. Sunco recorded a profit, in the first quarter only, of \$2.95 billion, which is four times its profits last year. What is going on here is profiteering. These are companies that are taking advantage of the international situation, of the climate crisis and of all kinds of things to line their own pockets. The Conservative solution here, first of all, is a bit ironic, because it is to increase the deficit by decreasing our tax revenues. It is also to trust that the oil companies would not just fill that space with their own price increases and scoop up all the benefits of any tax reductions. There is no mechanism to prevent that, and we have seen the record, over and over again, of the oil companies: they will take any advantage to increase their profits. The Conservative solution risks lining the pockets of big oil and providing nothing for families who are struggling with high gas prices on a daily basis.

The New Democrats have instead called for an excess profits tax not just on oil companies, but also on big banks and large food retailers. Scotiabank recorded profits of over \$10 billion last year, the Bank of Montreal had over \$8 billion, Loblaws had a net profit of \$1.2 billion, and Sobeys, a smaller player, had over \$600 million in profits. The Conservative proposal would increase the deficit and inflationary pressures, and there would be nothing about these record profits being racked up by the big corporations. It would take away necessary revenues for providing some help to those who really are hit by the affordability crisis. We know who is hardest hit: It is the seniors living on a fixed income, people with disabilities, indigenous people and northerners.

We must never forget that these impacts are strongly gendered, I will say, in that when we look at women over 65, a vast majority of them are living in poverty, especially single women over the age of 65. When we look at single-parent families who are living in poverty, the vast majority are headed by women, so when we are talking about these impacts of affordability, we have to remember that they hit particularly hard at Canadian women, no matter their age or their family status.

I want to thank the member for Nunavut, who continually raises the food insecurity problem in the north, for bringing our attention to it again today. The biggest impact of these rising costs for Canadian families is food insecurity.

I want to draw the House's attention to the report released yesterday by Food Banks Canada. Canada, one of the richest countries in the world and one of the major food-producing countries in the world, now reports that 23% of Canadians, over seven million Canadians, reported going hungry in the past year because they could not afford to buy food. One-third of Canadians earning less than \$50,000 a year reported having to skip meals because they did not have enough money, and 43% of indigenous people, to the enormous shame of this country, reported food insecurity that caused them to go hungry for more than one day.

• (1210)

What is the solution? Food banks do their best to fill that gap in our income system and in our food system, but we cannot keep asking charitable, hard-working volunteers to solve the food insecurity crisis. We need to step up and solve that crisis by putting more money in the pockets of those who face food insecurity, immediately and in the long term.

Conservatives point to that problem of food insecurity in their preamble, but then when we look down into the solutions in today's motion, there are none. There is nothing to actually help people who face food insecurity, unlike New Democrats' proposed measures to put money in the hands of those most vulnerable to food insecurity right now and in the long term. We have always called for an increase to OAS and GIS benefits for seniors. Seniors cannot do anything about rising food prices, because most of them already spend all of their fixed income. Their only choice is to eat less and put their health at risk. Again, we would like to see an increase to OAS and GIS.

We have called for an immediate hike to the Canada child benefit. Even a modest hike as we are calling for, of \$500 a year, would provide an increase on a monthly basis to families with kids trying to meet food costs. We know there are lots of parents who go hungry and will not report it so they can feed their kids. They skip meals. They do not eat the nutritious meals they need as adults, so they can provide that food to their kids. An increase right away to the Canada child benefit would help meet that crisis, and would continue in the long run to help people with food security.

A doubling of the GST tax credit for low-income Canadians would go a long way in the short and long term to helping to meet that crisis of food insecurity.

Business of Supply

It is interesting that the data that was released yesterday by Food Banks Canada also shows that 60% of those who use food banks report that housing costs are the main reason they are at the food bank. They cannot afford to buy healthy, nutritious food for their families because they are already paying way too much of their limited income to meet their housing needs.

This time, the Conservative motion acknowledges the affordability crisis in housing, but it proposes a national inquiry in money laundering as if this would have some impact on the provision of affordable housing units. I believe that we need to crack down on money laundering, absolutely. I do not think we need an inquiry to know what we need to do. Nevertheless, I cannot find the connection between the Conservatives saying there is a crisis in affordability and that we should have an inquiry into money laundering. It just does not make any sense to me.

New Democrats, instead, favour measures to curb the use of housing for speculative investments. We need to crack down on corporate landlords who are gobbling up affordable housing in many cities across Canada, and then renovicting the people who have lived in that affordable housing and forcing them out onto the street or into their families' overcrowded housing units.

We also need to crack down on real estate investment trusts. Real estate investment trusts get privileged tax treatment. They get tax breaks for buying up affordable housing. I just cannot imagine why we think that is good public policy in this country. I would love to see us eliminate the special tax treatment for real estate investment trusts. Obviously, we would have to phase in something like that, because people have done a lot of their financial planning based on it, but still it is something in the short and long term that we could do to address using the housing market for speculation and profit.

Instead, we should be doing something that I have always called for as a New Democrat and that we have always worked for. That is to get the government back into the business of building non-profit housing in very large numbers. The market will never provide the housing that we need at the low end. It will continue to build high-end housing until the cows come home, as they used to say where I was raised, but it will never provide those affordable housing units.

Non-profit housing could provide the housing security that is necessary for families. They do not necessarily have to own a single family house to feel secure in their housing. They could get a unit in a non-profit housing co-operative, for instance, and raise their kids in that security. It also creates a sense of community: of people who live together and have a common interest in taking care of their housing needs.

New Democrats are not the only ones who make the obvious link between the high cost of housing and homelessness, but it is something I do not hear the Conservatives talking about. It is something I rarely hear the Liberals or the Conservatives talking about. When I look in my community, I see the unfortunate complaints that are coming up about people feeling unsafe in the streets because of homeless people.

What is the solution? First of all, I do not think homeless people are the problem, in terms of safety locally. The solution is housing

in the short term, so that those people are not forced onto the streets.

• (1215)

Of course, the member for Winnipeg Centre has been very vocal, this week and always, in calling for the government to immediately fund a low-barrier, safe shelter place for indigenous women in Winnipeg Centre, and it is a good example—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I am sorry, but the hon. member's time is up. I have been trying to give him some signals to let him know that it was coming to an end. The hon. member will have an opportunity to say more during questions and comments.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo.

Mr. Frank Caputo (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is always a pleasure to rise on behalf of the people of Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo.

I do not know where to start here. As I understand his speech, the member said reducing the sales tax is repugnant and should not be supported because it contributes to the overall deficit. Is it not the whole point that we are trying to put money back into people's pockets based on their consumption? I do not understand that.

The member has spoken at length about the government's response when it comes to a failure to tax this and failure to tax that, yet for every single vote of matter, whether it is for shutting down debate in the House or curtailing debate, his party stands up and supports the government.

Given his issues with the government and all that it has stood for, which he pointed out today, will he be supporting the government tonight? I ask because it sounds like he should have no confidence in the government.

• (1220)

Mr. Randall Garrison: Madam Speaker, I thank the member for the question because it gives me time to talk about the confidence and supply agreement we reached with the government.

Some of the goals in the confidence and supply agreement are things like providing dental care, which will help poor families take care of their kids and help seniors take care of their teeth. What is most important to me in that agreement is the early launch of a for indigenous, by indigenous housing strategy, which will get secure housing built for first nations across this country.

There are many reasons in that confidence and supply agreement to support the government, but there are no reasons that I would support a cut to the GST or HST that would only benefit the wealthy and the big corporations.

Business of Supply

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I want to pick up on one of the points the member raised, because I have been a long-term advocate for it. In fact, back in the late 1980s, we advocated for Weston, a community in Winnipeg's northwest end, to develop the Weston housing co-op.

It has been a long time since we have seen the development of co-ops, but for the first time, we are seeing how the Government of Canada can ensure that we see co-ops grow across this country. There is a great value to that. I always say that in a housing co-op, one is not a tenant but a resident, and that is a huge difference.

I wonder if the member could provide his thoughts and perspective on housing co-ops giving many people the opportunity to have a sense of ownership in an affordable fashion.

Mr. Randall Garrison: Madam Speaker, I thank the member for Winnipeg North for his question on co-operatives. I am a big fan of co-operatives, and there are lots in my riding.

One thing I would like to see Canada Mortgage and Housing do right now is invest in the redevelopment and rebuilding of co-ops. Many of the co-ops in my riding are quite old, are quite low density and have only relatively large family-style units. People who want to stay in those co-operatives need that redevelopment. If we build some new one-bedroom units, they can stay in their communities. People have learned that co-ops provide housing security in the long term.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Madam Speaker, what worries me about this Conservative motion is the tax that could benefit oil companies. If we truly want to be free from the rising cost of oil, then we need to be less dependent on oil overall. My colleague from Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot illustrated this quite well. Right now, we need to be talking about investing in a green energy transition and divesting ourselves of oil.

How does my colleague explain his support for a government that, unfortunately, continues to invest in Bay du Nord and in the oil industry?

Also, we have not truly embarked on a transition. How does my colleague feel about the Liberals' failure to take action on the energy transition, which is an important step in distancing ourselves from this industry?

[*English*]

Mr. Randall Garrison: Madam Speaker, my answer is quite clear. Outside of the confidence and supply agreement, we have complete freedom as New Democrats to oppose the government on things like its failure to respond adequately to the climate crisis.

I would point out that the motion in front of us today really exacerbates the climate crisis by providing a way for big companies to get more profits that they can reinvest in oil in the long term, instead of addressing things like food insecurity and homelessness in this country.

Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC): Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of the opposition motion before this chamber. While obviously I cannot

speak for other members of this place, I can state that the affordability crisis in many parts of my riding is critical. I am reasonably certain that other members of this place also hear similar concerns from some of their citizens.

The recent rise in interest rates is taking as much as \$700 or more out of people's household budgets. Gas and diesel prices are also taking a huge toll. I recognize that there are members who represent ridings where gas and diesel prices probably do not matter as much, perhaps those with a large urban city and good public transit.

I know that often in this place we debate how the carbon tax only drives up the price of gas and diesel, causing hardship on many Canadian families. I also know that in response, the Prime Minister will often say that this is not true because of carbon tax rebates. Here is the thing. Someone who lives in a large urban city and seldom uses a car, even if they own one, probably does come out ahead with the carbon tax rebates. However, we seem to have hit a situation here in Canada where, under the Liberal government, vast amounts of policy are geared toward those who live in urban centres.

We must be mindful that we collectively represent the national interests of all Canadians, and many Canadians, particularly in parts of my riding, absolutely depend on owning a vehicle that must be driven daily. In parts of my riding, there is still no high-speed Internet, despite seven years of Liberal promises to the contrary. In fact, there are even a few areas where people cannot get a wireless signal. Many secondary roads may only see a snowplow once a day in harder winter conditions, if that. People not only need a car, but need one with all-wheel drive and significant ground clearance to navigate these roads in the winter.

I should also add that in many of these small rural communities, public transport is not available. Even Greyhound is now gone. For most, there might be one grocery store or possibly two. Prices were always a struggle in these communities due to a lack of competition and high transport costs, but right now, with record high inflation, things have never been worse.

● (1225)

[*Translation*]

Many families are really struggling right now.

I heard about a senior on a fixed income who volunteers at a local thrift shop. She has been volunteering there for many years and understands how important these thrift shops are to low-income families. She can no longer afford the gas to get to her volunteer job at the shop.

Business of Supply

I have heard about young families that had to cancel their summer vacations because of the high price of gas. Many local small business owners have spoken about having to pass on the much higher shipping costs, which makes them less competitive with on-line retailers.

[*English*]

I have heard from contractors who bid on jobs that they have to commute to complete them. Now the higher costs have eaten away at their profit margins. Everywhere I look, I am hearing from citizens who are being hit hard by the lack of affordability. High inflation and higher interest rates are causing the perfect storm.

Again, I feel the need to point this out: This is not the case everywhere in Canada. Wealthy citizens are largely not impacted by this. Likewise, for those people in larger cities where they are less car dependent, I am certain they are less severely impacted. However, we must recognize that we are here for all Canadians.

While I am on my feet, I would like to mention that I am splitting my time with the hon. member for Brandon—Souris, who will be giving an excellent speech that I am sure this chamber will approve.

We must recognize that we are supposed to be here for all Canadians. That includes people who live in smaller communities, such as Princeton, Merritt, Keremeos, Cawston, Olalla and Logan Lake. Of course, there are also unincorporated rural areas where these problems are even more challenging.

This opposition day motion cannot cure all of the challenges facing Canadians who live in these areas, but these measures could and would provide some assistance. They send a message of hope that people who are elected and sent to Ottawa are listening and that we are trying to do what we can to make life a bit easier for Canadians who are not wealthy and who live in rural areas.

Let us make no mistake that these challenges disproportionately impact those who live in rural areas of Canada. These are good people who send a significant amount of their paycheque here to Ottawa. They watch a federal Liberal government that does not think twice about giving \$12 million to a multi-billion dollar grocery corporation so it can buy new refrigerators. I mention this point because imagine what it feels like for people struggling financially in a small community like Hedley, where there is no high school and they must drive their kids to school, to hear some members of Parliament say these proposed savings do not add up to much. To them, every dollar counts.

Let us keep in mind that many citizens who live in rural areas often do so because those are the only areas where they can find affordable housing for their families. They hear the Prime Minister say that gas prices are exactly what he wants, but in a place like Hedley, where people must commute to either Princeton or Keremeos and where a car or truck is the lifeline for services, school, groceries, supplies and a job, what do they do? Sometimes in this place I think the Prime Minister has forgotten places like Hedley and that those who live there absolutely need and depend on owning and driving a car. They should not be demonized for that fact.

The proposed measures in the motion would help them and would send a valuable and important message: that in a time of need, this Parliament tried to help, or at least those who will vote in support of the motion can take some comfort in knowing they tried to do something. Those who oppose it can, I suppose, ask themselves differently.

The bottom line is that I believe these proposed measures are a small but important step to help make life more affordable. Other G7 leaders are taking these actions to help make life more affordable for the citizens they serve. I am calling on all hon. members of this place to take action, vote in support of the motion and send a message that we are trying to make life more affordable for our citizens, who are struggling right now. The Prime Minister once said better is always possible, but after seven years under the Prime Minister, the reality for many Canadians is that more expensive is always possible, because their costs are going up and up and nothing is getting more affordable, despite the promises of the Prime Minister to the contrary.

We have a critically urgent situation in many parts of Canada, and it is indeed now the time to take action by voting in support of the motion, in support of giving Canadians a break at the pumps and in support of our farmers, so they can keep their input costs down, particularly for fertilizer, and can plant food and feed the world. The Russians have been bombing key strategic areas in Ukraine to block wheat transports. This is a crisis of affordability not just for Canadians, but for people around the world. Canadian farmers can be part of the solution, but they cannot do this if they cannot get some certainty and cannot plant accordingly.

We can also start to address long-term issues. Despite what other members of this place say, money laundering has been a major focus of the Cullen commission in my province of British Columbia. The Cullen commission has now reported to government, and the first thing that happened with money laundering in casinos is the government tightened things up. Guess what happened then. Suspicious transaction reports in Ontario immediately doubled. When one jurisdiction within Canada starts to tighten its rules, we will see that pushed to other areas.

The Government of Canada owes it to every Canadian to make sure it is doing everything it can, particularly when so many millennials feel the system is rigged. They feel they cannot get a mortgage because they have been excluded by the Liberal stress test. They feel that other speculative forces, such as money laundering, are entering the market and making things difficult. They will feel alienated if we do not allow them to get a home.

There are some common-sense measures in the motion, and I hope that all hon. members will look at them. We may not be able to make life easy in a time of struggle, but we can always make it easier. We can let Canadians know that Parliament, the House of Commons, is on their side.

• (1230)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have a very specific question for the member, for clarification purposes. Clause (c) says that the Conservative Party is now proposing to eliminate tariffs on fertilizer. In other words, one could actually purchase fertilizer from Russia and not have to pay a tariff.

Is that really what the Conservatives are saying in this motion?

Mr. Dan Albas: Madam Speaker, I am glad the member brought that up. No other G7 country is putting these tariffs on.

Let us remember who pays the tariffs. The tariffs are actually eaten up by the farmers who have to pay to get them. The money is not going to Russia; the money is going to the government. If we want to be able to feed the world, particularly given the focus by the Russian military on destroying the strategic access to market of Ukraine's grain, such as wheat, it has to come from somewhere, and it is not coming from the current government so far. The government is not willing to give the tools farmers need to be able to put food on people's plates. That is bad for Canada, bad for farmers and bad for the world.

• (1235)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his speech. I have a great deal of respect for him.

I am disappointed because today the Conservative Party has an omnibus motion for us after they slammed Bill C-19 for being an appalling mammoth of a bill, and that was echoed by the Bloc Québécois. Now they present us with this motion in a sort of giant lump. There is so much in there that I am surprised it does not say “build more pipelines” somewhere. It is mind-boggling.

There are a bunch of issues we agree on, such as fertilizer and the real estate market. It really upsets me that we cannot vote on those issues because they are all lumped together with many other things, such as scrapping the carbon tax, for example.

Here is my question for the member: Does he really expect to get support for this motion, or is this just a ploy to make all the other parties look like the bad guys?

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I would like to remind the hon. member to address his questions through the Chair and not directly to the member.

The hon. member for Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola.

[*English*]

Mr. Dan Albas: Madam Speaker, I am disappointed that the Bloc is not seeing the bigger picture here.

British Columbia has its own provincial carbon tax. That is something this motion would not affect whatsoever, but what it would affect is the GST. The goods and services tax is actually a tax on all provincial tax excise and the provincial-federal gas tax excise, as well as any carbon taxes. When we pay at the pump, that GST gets added to the total of it. This is one way in which that par-

Business of Supply

ticular portion, that 5% on every dollar, would stay in the pockets of Canadians and it would not go to anyone else. This is a way we could actually start to help people, both on commuting and also on groceries, because groceries are heavily dependent on gas prices.

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Madam Speaker, the New Democrats continue to put forward proposals to double the GST rebate and to increase the child tax credit by \$500, yet the Conservatives do not support that. In fact, they continue to stand up for big oil. The member talked about the system being rigged; it is rigged, because Liberals are afraid to tax oil and gas. Who needs oil lobbyists, when we have the Conservative Party?

This motion is quick to cut taxes and other sources of revenue for government, but it offers nothing to protect consumers. In fact, all it would do is increase profits for oil and gas.

Mr. Dan Albas: Madam Speaker, that member should come to see some truths here.

First of all, when the Harper government lowered the GST from 7% to 5%, it maintained the 7% rebates for those on low income, which helped out seniors. Conservatives have always tried to help people with the lowest means. At the other side of this, New Democrats keep saying this will help oil companies, but the GST is applied on the transaction after everything else has been taken into account. This motion would mean money in people's pockets, which they can spend on things like food. Doug Porter from the Bank of Montreal has said that we should stop trying to entrench inflation, and gas prices are a way to do that at grocery stores. This motion would help.

Mr. Larry Maguire (Brandon—Souris, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is my privilege today to speak to our opposition day motion.

The number one issue facing my constituents right now is the fact that they cannot pay their bills, put fuel in their tank and put groceries on their table. Inflation is costing everyone an extra \$2,000 this year alone. Seniors, students and working families are getting crushed by the dramatic rise in the cost of almost everything they purchase. Food is up almost 9.7% in the last year alone. Gas is at record highs and there seems to be no end in sight. Housing is now out of reach for millions of Canadians, who will never be able to have a home of their own, which, as a grandparent, greatly concerns me.

Business of Supply

The government should be seized by this issue, but all it has are empty talking points. It still does not have a plan to address inflation and fix the supply chain issues. In fact, in a recent consumer debt index survey from MNP, 53% of Canadians surveyed said they are \$200 a month away from being unable to pay their bills at the end of every month and meet their debt obligations. That is proof in itself that families are struggling to get by.

I want to focus my speech on the dramatic rise in the price of energy. Driving to work or heating or cooling one's home is not a luxury. It is a necessity in Canada. For those thinking the government cannot do anything to ease the price at the pump, let me just remind them, as we have heard from some of our opposition colleagues, that a significant portion of every litre of gas they pay for is heavily taxed.

If a constituent in Brandon, Manitoba went to the gas station and filled up an F-150, which is probably one of the most widely owned trucks in Canada, it would cost an astonishing \$266.56. Out of that \$266 to fill up the tank, the GST and the carbon tax combined would amount to \$28.26. In my constituency, it is not unusual for residents to have to fill up their tank at least three times a month, as they have to drive long distances to go to work, drop the kids off at school, get groceries or go to the hospital.

If we pass this Conservative motion, we would provide immediate relief from the record-high energy prices by suspending the GST and the carbon tax. That would result in tax savings of close to \$85 a month. For some, that may not seem like a lot, but I can assure my colleagues that for a working family, that is a lot of money.

Constituents of Brandon—Souris are disproportionately affected by the carbon tax. The Liberal government needs to start realizing that its policies affect rural and urban Canadians quite differently. My riding covers a span of well over 17,000 square kilometres. That figure may be hard to picture for the Minister of Finance, who lives in downtown Toronto, the ninth-smallest riding in Canada, but that is roughly the same size as three Prince Edward Islands put together.

I am a proud Manitoban. I am also proud to be from rural Canada. Unfortunately, I do not believe the government has any regard for the livelihoods and concerns of those who are from that portion of our great nation. Many members of the Liberal government probably do not understand what life in rural Manitoba is like. Let me paint a picture of it for them.

In my entire riding, there are only nine police stations and one Walmart. For many, the nearest full-scale hospital is a drive of up to two hours away. There is little to no public transportation in my riding, and many have to drive upwards of 30 minutes just to go to the nearest grocery store. I and the rest of the Conservative caucus believe in public transit but, let us face it, across rural Canada it is non-existent. Families need to take their kids to school and to hockey practice and to drive long distances to get to their jobs. With the price of gas hovering around \$2 per litre, that is making life very difficult. I fear things are only going to get worse, as the Liberals are planning to hike the carbon tax even further: in fact, to actually quadruple it.

If the Liberals are concerned about those who live in rural Canada and all those who are struggling to pay their bills, they should vote in favour of our motion and suspend, not get rid of but suspend, the GST and the carbon tax on fuel.

The other part of our Conservative motion I want to touch on is taking the GST and the carbon tax off people's residential energy bills.

● (1240)

According to Manitoba Hydro, the carbon tax is equal to 9.79¢ applied to each cubic metre of natural gas that a household uses. The typical household in Manitoba will use around 2,250 cubic metres of natural gas in a year, resulting in \$220 in carbon taxes. If we remove the GST from the average person's energy bills, it would result in even more savings.

We need to look no further than the Liberals' budget implementation act to see how their carbon tax is impacting people's pocketbooks. Part 1 of the budget implementation act aims to enact certain tax measures by "changing the delivery of Climate Action Incentive payments from a refundable credit claimed annually to a credit that is paid quarterly". There is only one reason the government would have a need to change these rebates from annual to quarterly, and that is because the carbon tax is taking so much money out of people's pockets.

We also know from the Parliamentary Budget Officer's report released on March 24, 2022, that "[m]ost households...will see a net loss resulting from federal carbon pricing". The report revealed that the average Manitoban will be giving \$1,145 to the federal government due to the carbon tax. However, they will be receiving only \$832 from the incentive payments, and \$1,145 is a lot of money for those who are struggling to pay their bills.

The PBO report proves what we have been saying all along: The carbon tax is not cost-neutral and it is costing people a lot of money. To make matters worse, the Minister of Environment has been claiming that eight out of 10 Canadians get more money back from the carbon tax, but the PBO declares that not to be the case.

Let us just end the charade and suspend the carbon tax. It is one of the easiest things the government could do to immediately help families and seniors who are getting squeezed by record inflation. Instead of taxing hard-working people, a responsible government would come up with a plan that not only protects the environment, but also protects people's bank accounts.

The Liberals can make the climate action incentive payments as frequent as they want, but that is not going to change the fact that more Canadians are going to be worse off than not. Making the climate action incentive payments quarterly does not relieve financial stress for those who cannot afford to put gas in their tank this weekend. The fact that the government is ignoring the calls for help should be much more concerning to them. I know it certainly is for me.

I recently put out a survey on the price of fuel, and I am starting to receive responses. I heard from my constituent Chelsea, who said, “The middle class...and those who drive to work every day are the ones who are suffering most”. Maybe the finance minister needs to hear from Keith and Marlene, who are seniors living on a fixed income. They are worried about not being able to stay in their home. They said, “We are seniors and the only pensions we have are OAS and CPP. Our world is crazy with high prices. We own our home [but] for how long?”

Folks across the country are in difficult situations. With the price of fuel and, quite frankly, most other essential items being so high, it is no wonder that young adults are having such a hard time saving up for big purchases, such as a new car or a home.

I also want to stress how the Liberal government is continuing to leave farmers behind and putting them at a competitive disadvantage. Just a couple of weeks ago, almost every single Liberal MP voted against our Conservative bill to finally exempt farmers from the carbon tax.

In closing, I implore my Liberal colleagues to vote in favour of our Conservative motion, suspend the GST and the carbon tax, and give people some much-needed relief. It is time for action and it is time to help those struggling to make ends meet. People are tired of hearing nothing but platitudes. This proposal would guarantee immediate financial relief and put money back into people's pockets.

• (1245)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is interesting that a number of years ago, the Conservatives were criticizing the government, saying that because of the Government of Canada, the price of oil was too low, when gas was being sold for 88¢ a litre, and now they are criticizing the government because the price of gas is too high, at over \$2 a litre. Obviously, the Government of Canada is concerned, but to try to give a false impression that the war that is taking place in Europe today is not influencing the price of oil and gas is dangerously close to misleading.

Does the member believe that the world price of oil has anything to do with what people are paying at the pump?

• (1250)

Mr. Larry Maguire: Madam Speaker, of course it does, but the government added to inflation long before there was ever a war in Ukraine. When \$5 billion a week is printed for a year and a half, it is bound to put a lot of money into circulation in a country like Canada. When COVID hit, we had to help people out off the hop, but the government helped itself out by continuing to spend money

Business of Supply

that even the Parliamentary Budget Officer cannot keep track of, and he admits that only two-thirds of it was being used for COVID.

The member for Winnipeg North says that there is not enough input from the petroleum industry in Canada, if I can put it that way. It pays \$20 billion a year in taxes. How much more does he think it should pay?

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Madam Speaker, I thank my esteemed colleague for his intervention. Rather than eliminating the taxes on gas, does he not think that we should charge a special tax on the profits of oil companies, which have reached a record high this year?

We could also introduce a special tax on businesses that made more than \$1 billion in profit last year in order to help those most affected. We could stop decreasing the guaranteed income supplement for seniors and increase old age security.

We could find solutions other than eliminating a tax, whose only impact will be to make oil companies die of laughter in a few months, when they will have quietly increased their prices to recover those amounts and once again line their pockets, even though they are already handsomely benefiting from the current situation.

[English]

Mr. Larry Maguire: Madam Speaker, I just indicated to my colleague from Winnipeg North that these oil companies already pay \$20 billion in tax to Canada, and that goes a long way to help us have the health, education and social programs that we have in this country.

I want to say how ironic I find it that both the NDP and the Bloc today are saying they are against lowering the GST and carbon tax. Why are we asking to do that? It is put dollars in people's pockets. They say they do not want to do it that way; they think that we should instead raise the OAS and CPP to put money in people's pockets. It is a difference in view on how to help people in this country. I get where they are coming from, but this is a very quick way of doing it. It could be done with a stroke of a pen. We are in the middle of a crisis right now, at a time when this measure would be most helpful.

Ms. Lori Idlout (Nunavut, NDP): *Uqaqtittiji*, The North West Company is a multinational Canadian grocery and retail store, which, according to its reports in October, said its profits were 57.6% higher than at prepandemic levels. Does the member agree that taxing the windfall pandemic profits of big corporations is a better way to help Canadians?

Mr. Larry Maguire: Madam Speaker, I had the opportunity of being in my colleague's home city in Nunavut in a previous provincial life due to my responsibilities there.

Business of Supply

I do agree that companies should not be taking advantage of a situation that we had with COVID. There is no doubt about that, but as I said earlier, while a lot of these corporations are making money, they are paying huge amounts of tax back into our Canadian coffers and we need to make sure that we are looking at the whole tax system and not just one specific region.

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz (Davenport, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Winnipeg North.

On behalf of the residents of my riding of Davenport, it is absolute honour for me to speak on today's opposition day motion regarding inflation and taxation.

Our federal government understands that Canadians are being hit hard by rising prices and, more importantly, we are taking effective action to meaningfully support Canadians so that they can deal with this challenge.

Inflation is a global phenomenon that is being driven by unprecedented supply chain disruptions resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic, not to mention the severe commodity disruptions arising from Russia's brutal and illegal invasion of Ukraine. It is a complex and multi-faceted problem, and with today's motion for debate, the hon. opposition is offering what appears to be simple solutions.

Unfortunately, the proposed solutions are not simple. Rising prices are the product of market forces, and these market forces are powerful. Taxes on gasoline and diesel, for example, represent only a very small portion of the total price that Canadians pay at the pump. Cutting them, as the opposition is proposing, would be ineffective in protecting consumers from these powerful global market forces.

Even if our federal government were to cut gas prices in Canada by 5% today by removing the GST on gasoline and diesel, the benefits to consumers would be completely wiped out by market forces within a matter of days. The federal government would then be in an uneasy position of having spent tens or hundreds of millions of dollars trying to unsuccessfully fight powerful market forces over which it has completely no control.

Instead of proposing unrealistic and ineffective solutions, our federal government is focused on implementing realistic measures to help families make ends meet, and we have been doing so since we were first elected in late 2015. Our government has already cut taxes for the middle class while raising them on the wealthiest 1%. We have also increased support for families and low-income workers through programs such as the Canada child benefit and the Canada workers benefit.

Thanks to the Canada child benefit, nine out of 10 Canadian families have more money to help with the cost of caring for their children than they did with previous benefits, and our expanded Canada workers benefit, which provides support to low-income workers and also encourages many to enter the workforce, 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 federal government laid out an ambitious plan to provide Canadian parents with, on average, \$10-a-day regulated child

care spaces for children under six years old. In less than a year, we have reached agreements with all provinces and territories. This means that by the end of this year in 2022, families across Canada will have seen their child care fees reduced by an average of 50%. That is huge. That is an average of \$6,000 in savings per child for families in provinces like Ontario, where my riding of Davenport is located.

These are not savings that will appear in five or 10 years; these are savings that are going to occur by the end of this year. Over the past weekend, I had the chance to meet many parents across the riding, and they were very excited about the national child care plan and very much appreciated the additional dollars that are going into their pockets to help cover their living costs. By 2025-26, our national child care 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.

To support vulnerable Canadians at the other end of the demographic spectrum, we have increased the guaranteed income supplement top-up benefit for low-income single seniors. We have enhanced the GIS earnings exemption and we are increasing old age security for Canadians aged 75 and older in July of this year. This 10% increase will provide more than \$766 in additional benefits to full pensioners over the first year. About 3.3 million Canadian seniors will benefit, and no action will be required on their part. They will automatically receive the payment if they are eligible. This is the first permanent increase to the old age security pension since 1973, other than adjustments due to inflation.

● (1255)

Seniors in my riding of Davenport are really happy to hear this. They have been struggling with their fixed incomes and struggling with rising costs, and they are so happy to hear of this significant increase, which will have an impact on affordability in their lives.

Seniors and Canadians who receive federal government support or benefits will also be happy to note that most of our federal government programs are indexed to inflation in order to protect Canadians from its impact. 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 Canadians.

To further offset the impact of inflation and make life more affordable for Canadians, we have increased the basic personal amount that Canadians can earn before paying federal income tax. To ensure the support is targeted at the middle class, the benefits of the increased basic personal amount 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 each year. There are a number of measures that our federal government is enacting and implementing in order to support families and support Canadians in dealing with the affordability crisis that is currently under way in Canada.

Our federal 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, those being Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, approximately 90% of direct proceeds from the fuel charge are being returned to residents in those provinces through the climate action incentive payments. In 2022-23, these increased payments mean that a family of four will receive \$745 in Ontario, \$832 in Manitoba 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 climate action incentive payments, most households are getting back more than what they are paying in increased costs as a result of the federal carbon pollution pricing system. What is more, the remaining fuel charge proceeds are being used to support small businesses, farmers, indigenous groups 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 ensuring that taxes are appropriate and fair. Our federal government knows that those who can afford to buy expensive cars, planes and boats can also afford to pay a bit more. Canadians agree. Our government campaigned on this promise in 2019 and 2021, and we were elected to enact this measure. To that end, we are following through on this commitment to introduce a tax on the sale of new luxury cars and aircraft with a retail price of over \$100,000 and on new boats priced 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 on non-resident, non-Canadian-owned residential real estate that is considered to be vacant or under-used. This tax would become effective as of January 1, 2022. While this tax would not be paid by individual Canadian homeowners, it would definitely benefit Canadians. That is because the recent and rapid rise in housing prices has made finding an affordable place to call home increasingly difficult, and the under-used housing tax would help support investments in housing affordability so that all Canadians could have a safe and affordable place to call home.

Our recent 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.

Business of Supply

In conclusion, the federal government has been seized, and will continue to be seized, with how we can make life more affordable for Canadians and provide offsets to the impact of inflation.

On behalf of the residents of Davenport, I want to express my thanks for the opportunity to speak today on this important opposition motion.

● (1300)

Mr. Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am so happy the member for Davenport got to her feet today to take part in this debate.

The member said it was a fact that eight out of 10 households are getting money back from the carbon tax. I would like to quote the PBO, who said in a report from March 24, 2022:

Most households in provinces under the backstop will see a net loss resulting from federal carbon pricing.

That is a direct quote from the PBO from the March 24, 2022, report. Are Canadians and the constituents of Regina—Lewvan supposed to trust what the PBO says or the misinformation this member is peddling?

● (1305)

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz: Madam Speaker, I would say to the hon. member that I am very big on making sure that I stick to the facts, and I do not like to be accused of anything to do with misinformation or disinformation because that is never my intention.

The climate action incentive is going to be increased in 2022-23. I do not have the exact number for Regina, but I know that in Manitoba a family of four will receive \$832.

I would also say to the member that if Manitoba or any of the provinces that receive the climate action incentive now want to put their own decarbonization plan in place, they can choose to do so, and then the price on pollution would not apply to those respective provinces.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Simard (Jonquière, BQ): Madam Speaker, I agree with my colleague. Carbon pricing is certainly a worthwhile way to fight climate change. However, given what we have learned today and what I read in *Le Journal de Montréal* on the huge profits that oil companies like Suncor will be making—to the tune of almost triple the profits—I think the Conservatives' proposal is shameful. I also think it is shameful that the government is still agreeing to provide funding for carbon capture strategies and has allocated \$2.6 billion in the budget for that.

Business of Supply

It is going to be you, me and all Quebec and Canadian taxpayers who will be paying for oil companies to produce net-zero oil, which many people feel is completely outrageous.

Does the member agree with me that we need to put an end to oil and gas subsidies as quickly as possible?

[English]

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz: Madam Speaker, I would say a couple of things.

First, I am hoping the oil and gas companies are going to use some of those profits to start decarbonizing and help Canada move to a low-carbon economy. We need the private sector to be stepping up. The private sector has not been stepping up in recent years, and we really need it to do so.

Second, with respect to the federal investment in carbon capture technologies, I would say that our federal government needs to be investing in as many technologies as possible in order to decarbonize, reduce our overall carbon emissions and meet our overall target of net zero by 2050. We all play a role. We have to look at all of the technologies and employ as many of them as possible.

Ms. Lindsay Mathyssen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Madam Speaker, I certainly agree with the essence of what the Conservatives are trying to bring forward in this motion with respect to addressing inflation and Canadians suffering. I know we are all feeling that. Our constituents are feeling that, and we know we need to address it. However, the way they are going about it is not the way the New Democrats would.

As the hon. member mentioned in her speech, it does not appear she agrees with it either, but I know that she is a huge proponent of long-lasting solutions, such as a guaranteed basic livable income and how that would address the poverty issues people are facing. I would like for her to maybe expand on not only how she believes a guaranteed basic livable income could help Canadians in all of our ridings, but also if she would be supporting it and if her government would be bringing that forward as we go forward in this session.

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz: Madam Speaker, I do indeed support a guaranteed basic income or a guaranteed livable income. The world of work has changed. We have a social welfare system that was set up in the 1940s that does not easily meet the current needs of Canadians in the 21st century. I think a guaranteed basic income is something we need to look at very seriously as a new foundation to our social welfare system.

I thank the member for the opportunity to allow me to speak to that today.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise and speak to this particular motion, even though I will be voting against it.

Often, the Conservatives are pretty good at using their imagination, which, at times, can be confusing and possibly even misleading in a number of the things they try to put on the record.

If we listen to the Conservative Party of Canada, we would think that it is just Canada that is experiencing inflation. What they fail to

recognize is that there are things happening around the world that have had an impact on the cost of living for all of us, whether it is coming out of a pandemic or what is taking place in Europe with Russian aggression and the illegal invasion of Ukraine. All of this plays a significant role, which is why I think that, at least in part, for fairness, when we talk about the inflation rate in Canada, we also need to take into consideration what is happening around the world.

The inflation rate is higher in the United States than in Canada. In many European countries, the inflation rate is higher than it is in Canada. Relatively speaking, with the G7 or the U.S. and many of those European countries, we will find that Canada's inflation rate is actually lower. Does that mean that our communities are not impacted? Of course they are impacted.

I do not like to see inflation any more than any other person, let alone for my constituents. They want the government to do what it can with the tools and levers we have in government to try to minimize the harm of inflation, and we have seen that in many ways. The Conservatives will talk about supporting Canadians during these times, but members opposite know that things such as our guaranteed income supplement for seniors, the old age supplement for seniors and the Canada child benefit program are indexed according to inflation.

When the Conservatives say, "Well, give some tax breaks here and give some tax break there", we see there is a Conservative mindset on tax breaks, and that is what they like to say to Canadians. However, we know that the Conservatives have been afforded the opportunity to support tax breaks. Members will recall the first budget that we brought in and the legislation that provided a tax break to middle-class Canadians. The Conservatives actually voted against it.

The Conservatives have come up with a motion today, and this is their policy, their alternative to the budget. However, I would suggest that there are significant flaws in what they are suggesting.

They say, "Let us reduce the tax on gas." Yes, let us continue with all the government expenditures to support Canadians, as I just finished citing, but let us reduce the price of gas by lowering it from the consumption tax or from the price on pollution. However, there is absolutely zero guarantee that this price decrease would actually be passed on to consumers. The Conservatives cannot guarantee that price saving.

Earlier today, I asked a question of my Conservative friends. When Alberta was experiencing a significant decline in economic activities, we were being criticized by the Conservatives because the price of oil was too low. They were saying that gas prices were too low, and it was damaging the Alberta economy. We were being criticized for that. Now we are being criticized because the price of gas is too high.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Business of Supply

• (1310)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I want to remind members that it is not time for questions and comments yet, but the official opposition will have the first question. I would ask individuals to be mindful of this point until the hon. member has finished his speech.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, the world price on oil and gas is not set by the Conservative Party of Canada. I would suggest there is no way the Conservative Party can guarantee any sort of savings by cutting a consumption tax or a price on pollution. There is no guarantee of that.

The motion talks about the housing market. At the end of the day, and we have had discussions about the housing market in Canada, the national government does have a leadership role to play. There is absolutely no doubt of that. We have done that, whether it be in the fall economic statement, which the Conservatives voted against, or within this budget, which the Conservatives are voting against.

Things like the annual tax on homes that are not being used as residences or the freeze being put into place through the budget on foreign ownership related issues are all having an impact. Most importantly, for the first time in a generation, we have a government that has been very proactive on the housing file. We have invested far greater amounts of money into housing and providing supports to the non-profit sector, to provincial and territorial governments and to indigenous communities. We are talking about hundreds of millions, going into billions, of dollars that has been incorporated into the national housing strategy, which is something that did not exist prior.

We have the intergenerational housing credit within this particular budget to encourage families to build onto homes or have something built on their property. This is an excellent program. We have encouraged community members to look at ways in which they can make their homes more energy efficient. For the first time in many, many years, we have a government that has been spending a great deal of resources and efforts at improving Canada's housing stock.

• (1315)

It takes more than a national government to deal with this problem, whether it is municipalities in the areas of zoning and making accessible properties or individuals who want to purchase property. If someone is a normal resident, it is very difficult to buy an individual building lot, especially in urban centres.

We can take a look at the amount of administration provinces are ultimately responsible for when it comes to housing. The federal government provides hundreds of millions of dollars on an annual basis to support low-income housing, not to mention the rapid housing program and other housing projects the Minister of Housing has put into place.

The Conservatives will criticize the housing file, but when they were in office, they absolutely failed in comparison to some of the initiatives we have put into place. We can take a look at the speech that was given by the leader of the Conservative Party. Unlike the Conservatives, the Government of Canada and the Prime Minister will continue to focus our attention on the real issues that are facing

Canadians every day of the week. It is why we are concerned about housing, inflation and many other issues, such as the pandemic. We will continue to do what we can to assist Canadians from coast to coast to coast.

• (1320)

Mr. Pat Kelly (Calgary Rocky Ridge, CPC): Madam Speaker, I listened to the member's speech and heard him say something we heard earlier today. I would like him to very clear about it. Is he telling the House that the reason the Liberals cannot eliminate, even temporarily, the GST on fuel and the carbon tax, or even just on fuel, is they believe retailers would collude to prevent the tax savings from going to consumers? Yes or no, is that the reason you cannot do this?

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I just want to remind the hon. member that he is to address questions and comments through the Chair.

The hon. parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I think we need to recognize, when we talk about consumption taxes, that there is absolutely no guarantee, and the Conservatives cannot guarantee, that any sort of savings could be passed on in that direction.

I would suggest to the member that there are other things the government does. For example, a GST rebate and a price-on-pollution credit are given out so that individuals in the most need are receiving benefits. Those are the types of things that I believe a government could be more focused on, as opposed to the simple solutions the Conservatives like to put on paper while they say to get rid of this or get rid of that. It is a populist attitude, and is much like when the leader of the Conservative Party says he will fire, banish or punish the Bank of Canada governor, or makes irresponsible statements of that nature. We are not going to do that on this side of the House.

Mr. Frank Caputo: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not know if the member did it deliberately or not, but referring to the leader of the Conservative Party as somebody who is a leadership contestant is offside. He should refrain from doing that.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): That is debate.

The hon. member for Berthier—Maskinongé.

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Madam Speaker, as my colleague opposite so often says, "at the end of the day", knowing that no other parties are going to support this omnibus Conservative motion, not much is going to change. "At the end of the day", nothing will change.

Business of Supply

However, I would like to know if my colleague opposite is prepared to do something that, “at the end of the day”, would make a big difference, for example, helping seniors. They need to stop cuts to the guaranteed income supplement immediately and agree to increase old age pensions, as we have been calling for for so long. That has fallen on deaf ears.

I have no desire to hear, once again, that they have always been there for seniors and that they have handed out a one-time payment of \$500. A \$500 payment is a joke, given today's inflation.

Increases to old age pensions: Yea or nay?

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, first of all, to my friend across the way, I should not make the presumption that the member for Carleton will ultimately prevail. I know it does scare a lot of his colleagues, but a vast majority seem to want to support him.

With regard to seniors, virtually from day one, this government has been supportive of seniors. The member might not necessarily like to hear that, but we can talk about substantial increases to the GIS at the very beginning of the pandemic, when there were \$300 and \$200 direct payments, depending on whether someone was collecting GIS. At the very least, that went to every senior who was 65 and above. We have seen 10% increases for seniors who are 75 and over. We have seen hundreds of millions of dollars invested into many non-profit organizations throughout Canada that provide support services for seniors. We have also invested a huge amount of money into long-term care and issues of mental health, and have reduced the cost of pharmaceuticals, all to the benefit of seniors.

Ms. Niki Ashton (Churchill—Keewatinook Aski, NDP): Madam Speaker, as we have all expressed here, we are opposed to this Conservative take on supporting Canadians who are struggling.

Are the Liberals prepared to ensure tax fairness and make sure the rich are paying their fair share of taxes so we can reinvest that money into supporting Canadians, who are struggling so much right now?

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, yes, absolutely. From the very beginning, we saw the issue of income inequality. It is one of the reasons we put a tax on Canada's wealthiest 1% at the beginning of the mandate. If we take a look at this particular budget, we will see a luxury tax of just over \$100,000 and \$250,000 on boats. This is a government that genuinely believes that for us to move forward, we need to continue to support our middle class and those who need the support of government to get into the middle class.

• (1325)

Mr. John Barlow (Foothills, CPC): Madam Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the member for Simcoe North.

We are talking about an affordability crisis in the House today. I am very confident that I am not the only member of the House who is getting dozens and dozens of calls and emails every single day from constituents who are very concerned about their ability to put food on the table, put fuel in their cars, heat their homes and put their kids in the activities they enjoy the most. What we are talking about here in our opposition day motion is reducing taxes to make

life more affordable for Canadians by eliminating the GST on fuel and the carbon tax.

What I am hearing is somewhat unbelievable. The argument from the Liberals and the NDP is that somehow eliminating a point-of-sale tax does not put more money in the pockets of Canadians. I am not sure how one can even argue that. In fact, their argument against this is that retailers are going to collude to ensure that savings are not passed on to Canadians. I can say from experience that in Alberta, where the provincial government has removed the provincial sales tax on fuel, fuel is about 20¢ cheaper than anywhere else in Canada. Albertans are benefiting from a government that has seen the difficulties Canadians are facing, has taken action to address them and has passed savings directly to Canadians.

What I am hearing from my constituents, after two years of the pandemic, is that they are exhausted; they are tired. They want to get life back to normal. While they are seeing the light at the end of the tunnel, that the pandemic is all but over and that businesses are opening back up, they see the affordability crisis, where fuel prices are exorbitant, grocery prices are going up and housing prices are going up. A lot of this has to fall at the feet of the Liberal government.

I know the Liberals like to say this is a global issue and that the war in Ukraine with Putin is causing prices to increase. However, I have been in the House pretty much every day and I do not ever recall Vladimir Putin sitting across the way and voting in favour of a carbon tax. I do not recall Vladimir Putin putting forward legislation or a bill to increase the carbon tax on April 1. Maybe I missed that. I am not sure if my colleagues around the House can confirm that Vladimir Putin is the reason the carbon tax went up 25% on April 1, despite an affordability crisis around the world and a war in Ukraine. I am not sure how we put this all at the feet of Vladimir Putin.

Instead of the government offering relief to Canadians when they need it most, the Prime Minister is travelling around the world with no mask in sight, and here at home he is punishing Canadians over and over again with his draconian mandates and travel restrictions, which are not in place anywhere else around the world. That really seems to be the modus operandi of the Liberal government. It is going to punish Canadians at home and do something completely different around the world.

Business of Supply

A good example of that is the fertilizer tariff. My colleague across the way does not seem to think that this is a problem and thinks this is a way of punishing Russia. I would invite my Liberal colleagues talk to any farmer, especially in eastern Canada, and ask them if the fertilizer tariff is hurting Vladimir Putin. The only people this fertilizer tariff of 35% is punishing are Canadian farmers. Vladimir Putin, once again, is not paying this tariff; Canadian farmers are paying this tariff. Even before the war in Ukraine, fertilizer prices in many parts of the country were more than double what they were the year before, as a result, in many cases, of the carbon tax. Do members know what makes fertilizer? It is natural gas. Carbon taxes put on natural gas cause prices to increase.

Canadian farmers are being punished and we have offered solutions. We have asked the Liberal government to provide an exemption on fertilizers purchased before March 2, before Russia invaded Ukraine. The Liberals said no. We then asked them if they would offer compensation to farmers who have had to pay an exorbitant price for that tariff. Again, the Liberals said no.

Let me put this in perspective. Canada is the only G7 country putting a tariff on Russian fertilizer, meaning that Canadian farmers are now at a severe competitive disadvantage to our compatriots around the world. They are paying an exorbitantly high carbon tax and they are paying a tariff on fertilizer.

• (1330)

At the same time, we are in the midst of a global food crisis. Food insecurity is probably the number one priority on earth and we are the only country on earth that is increasing taxes and putting a tariff on fertilizer. How does that make us competitive? How does that give us the ability to carry the burden of helping in a global food crisis, which our farmers absolutely want to do? They want to be there to help, but the Liberal government is doing everything possible to ensure that we cannot do that and do not meet our potential.

Despite the Conservatives offering these solutions, the Liberals carry on with this activist agenda, let us say, or the theatrics they are putting on that this is somehow punishing Putin when it is only punishing Canadian farmers. However, it is not just Canadians farmers who are going to feel the impact of this. If Canadian farmers have to reduce their use of fertilizer simply because they cannot afford it, yields are going to go down and the prices of commodities are going to go up. We have already seen the price of groceries go up. In many cases they are up 15%, depending on the product. This is only going to get worse. We are not only talking about countries that have been relying on Ukrainian commodities such as barley, wheat and sunflower oil; this is going to be felt here at home.

My NDP colleagues have been talking about food insecurity here at home in Canada. A lot of that is the result of Liberal policies. The Liberals are the ones increasing the cost of those groceries by increasing the carbon tax, putting a tariff on fertilizer and having additional red tape, making it very difficult for our farmers to do the job they do best and better than anyone else in the world. We are the only country with a government, in a food security crisis, that is asking Canadian consumers to pay more. It is the only government asking farmers to pay more. How does this make any sense whatsoever?

I want to get to another part of our opposition day motion. I talked about fertilizer, but I also want to talk about the carbon tax.

The carbon tax is something for which the Conservatives have offered a solution. My colleague from Huron—Bruce offered a private member's bill that would eliminate the carbon tax on farm fuels, Bill C-234. The Parliamentary Budget Officer, in assessing the carbon tax, has said a few things that I think are very enlightening: The carbon tax is not revenue-neutral, the carbon tax increases inflation and the carbon tax does not reduce emissions. This is everything the Liberals are saying the carbon tax will accomplish, and the study by the Parliamentary Budget Officer has refuted all of those claims. Why are we charging this carbon tax on our Canadian farmers? We put forward a solution in Bill C-234 to eliminate the carbon tax from farm fuels.

The Canadian Federation of Independent Business has done the math. In the first year of the carbon tax, Canadian farmers paid on average about \$14,000 a year. With the increase on April 1, that goes to \$45,000 per average farmer. The Liberals are going to say there is a carbon tax rebate and eight out of 10 families make more off the carbon tax. Again, the Parliamentary Budget Officer, an arm's-length officer of the House, has said that is not the case. In Bill C-8, with the carbon tax rebate, farmers get \$1.70 for every \$1,000 of eligible expenses. They are getting pennies on the dollar for what they are contributing to the carbon tax. Farmers are price-takers. They cannot afford to carry the burden of the carbon tax when we are asking them to improve yields and their efficiency. It does not make sense.

At a time when we are talking about global food security, we also need to talk about affordability. Our farmers, producers and manufacturers need to be able to do what they do and do it efficiently. I have talked about the carbon tax and the fertilizer price, but there is another issue where the Liberals continue to throw on red tape and obstacles, which is going to be coming out in the next little while. It is front-of-package labelling. That is a direct attack on beef and pork producers in Canada. The United States has already identified this as a trade irritant that will impact our beef exports and increase grocery costs here at home, making things even more unaffordable for Canadians.

In conclusion, our motion is very prudent. It would ensure that we address the affordability crisis facing Canadians, and, most importantly, help our farmers, producers and ranchers, who are doing all they can to address a global food security crisis, ensure that groceries are affordable for all Canadians.

Business of Supply

• (1335)

Mr. Francis Drouin (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have noticed that the motion calls for eliminating tariffs on fertilizer. Some Canadian companies have reorganized their supply chains, have said they agree with Canada and do not want to buy Russian fertilizer or Belarusian fertilizer, and have gone somewhere else and paid a higher price.

Does the member not believe that they too should get a break from high fertilizer costs?

Mr. John Barlow: Madam Speaker, they were going to find those new resources only because of the tariff put on Russian fertilizer by the Liberal government. Again, we are not arguing that there should not be sanctions on Russia, but they should be sanctions that actually impact Russia and its economy. This tariff is only punishing Canadian farmers. If we have realized anything through COVID, it is that we must diversify our trade agreements and be much more self-sufficient.

The tariff that the Liberals put on Russian fertilizer is the only reason farmers are paying higher costs. I might add too that the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance did not even realize that Canada purchased fertilizer from Russia before putting on that tariff.

[Translation]

Ms. Andr anne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague, who spoke at length about agriculture, which is near and dear to my heart because there are a lot of farmers in my riding of Shefford.

The Bloc agrees with the Conservatives on the fertilizer issue. However, I would like to talk to my colleague about drought, which is causing problems for a lot of farmers. Climate change is a crucial issue. My colleague talked about the importance of eating properly. If we are to achieve true food sovereignty, we need to work on farming here. To protect that, we also need to tackle climate change.

Farmers are also asking for support as they try to go green. It is important to encourage that for a lot of our farmers. The tax is not what matters to them. They want us to work on climate change and reward good green practices.

[English]

Mr. John Barlow: Madam Speaker, I agree, but I think the part that we are missing here is that there is an assumption that Canadian producers are not doing everything they can to protect their land, their water, their soil and their livestock. They want to be as efficient as possible, because that is how they remain environmentally sustainable and socially sustainable, but the one critical point is to remain economically sustainable.

Yes, our farmers are always concerned about being stewards of their land. They are the ones who are on the ground. I appreciate that this is an important message as well.

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Madam Speaker, one thing we do agree on is that we need to provide relief to Canadians from skyrocketing inflation. We agree on that, but how

we get there has been challenging. We have seen skyrocketing oil prices and we have seen bank fees go up and we have seen grocery costs go up. We have seen record profits for big corporations, including oil companies, grocery companies and banks. Conservatives do not believe that they should be paying their fair share of taxes, more taxes, and giving that back to Canadians through doubling the GST or the child tax benefit.

My concern is that my colleague's proposal could still lead to skyrocketing oil prices. That does not preclude the oil companies from raising their prices. Does he believe that they should be paying more taxes and contributing more to Canadians, given the fact that they are making record profits right now?

Mr. John Barlow: Madam Speaker, I really do appreciate the NDP dance on this issue. With their proposals to increase the carbon tax because it is not doing enough and needs to be higher, they should be celebrating really high gas prices, but now they are trying to dance around it because now the politics are against them. Canadians have to pay more than \$2 a litre, likely in his riding, and they have to figure it out. Maybe they do not really support really high gas prices, the climate change and the carbon tax and whatnot.

They have to make a decision here: Either they want to tax Canadians to the point of unaffordability in a crisis or they do not. Our position is to give Canadians a break as quickly as possible, get rid of the middleman, which is big government, and give Canadians a break in their pocketbooks.

• (1340)

Mr. Adam Chambers (Simcoe North, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise in this chamber to talk about the Conservative opposition day motion on a very important issue affecting Canadians: affordability and the cost of living.

Before I talk about the motion, I would just like to set some context for individuals who are here. Food prices have increased 9.7%; in many cases fuel is up, depending on what time it is measured, almost 65% to 70%; in some cases diesel has doubled in about 12 months; and retail prices, the prices paid for clothing and other goods, are also significantly higher.

It is also important to recognize that we were on an incredibly high trajectory of inflation before the war in Ukraine started. Inflation was at a 25-year high of 5.5% in February, before the Russian Federation's invasion in Ukraine. To suggest that it is all explained by the war misses the point that we were on a quite high inflation trajectory before that war started.

For full disclosure, I will concede to the members across the way that there are multiple reasons for inflation. Of course there are supply chain issues and of course there is the war. However, there are also serious structural issues that are leading to inflation. By its definition, a consumption tax is inflationary. The Bank of Canada even says this. At least half a percentage point of inflation can be attributed to the carbon tax, according to the Bank of Canada.

The challenge that I have, or perhaps some of the members on this side of the House have, is that every time questions about inflation or costs of living or affordability have been raised, they are waved away and explained away by referring to these external factors that are out of the government's control. I do not believe that to be true. Yes, there are things that are outside of the government's control, and I just mentioned a few of them, but there are simple things that the government could do to provide immediate relief to Canadians.

The challenge is about not acknowledging that inflation is perhaps not transitory. If we take a long enough view, everything is transitory. Even life is transitory, if we take a long enough view. The challenge is that the facts are changing on the ground. The government is now out of step with the rest of the world because it has yet to acknowledge the challenge of inflation and the tools that it has to deal with it.

In fact, just last week President Biden wrote an op-ed to the American people. In it he vowed to take action on inflation immediately and provided a three-point plan on how the federal government in the United States was going to deal with it, acknowledging that of course the central banks have a role to play.

Secretary Yellen said last week in an interview that she was wrong about inflation, that inflation was persisting longer than they had thought. We have also heard this from the Federal Reserve chair in the U.S. We have also heard it from Bank of Canada officials, who admitted that they had all underestimated inflation, but we have not heard it from the Liberal government. The government refuses to even acknowledge that it might be behind the curve.

I think Canadians would appreciate a little bit of humility in hearing, "Look, we were a little slow on the inflation front, but we have tools that we can use to combat inflation." The question I have every day is this: How long does inflation need to persist or how high does inflation need to get before the government realizes that it must act?

We have put forward an opposition day motion, which I think some would even call an omnibus motion, with some interesting ideas. In the interest of constructive discussion in this House, there may be some ideas that individuals feel strongly opposed to, but they are ideas. The government could feel free to take any of these ideas it might like and act on them. We do not need to pass this entire motion. It does not sound as if we will have support from some other parties, but certainly there are some reasonable ideas. I would like to highlight a couple that speak to me.

• (1345)

With respect to suspending the GST on fuel, both regular gasoline and diesel, the price for diesel has doubled in 12 to 16 months. That also means that the HST the government receives on diesel

Business of Supply

has doubled. The revenue the government is making has doubled because the price has doubled, and it is applied right before people pay the final price. In fact, the government has never made as much money as it is making right now. That is why I have significant concerns about the idea that the answer to inflation is for the government to tax companies more so it can take that money and do something with it. The government does not need that money. It has never made as much money as it is making right now.

If we consider the budget of 2021 and what we believe the government will be making in revenues over the next five years and compare it to budget 2022 and the revenue it is going to be receiving now, it has found an extra \$170 billion. The question is this: What is it doing with it? Why is it not returning that money to Canadians? It is coming from Canadians in the first place.

I think we have to be a little more realistic and pragmatic, because increasing taxes on companies is not going to all of a sudden solve our inflation problem. We have a bunch of extra revenue now and we still have inflation, so making the government bigger is not the answer to our worries.

The hon. colleague from Foothills talked about fertilizer, and because of the significant farming community in Simcoe North, I will mention it just for a moment.

I have phone calls every day, and I visit farms to talk to farmers in my riding. They are all saying they want to help Ukraine and do their part and that they do not mind paying a fertilizer tariff on fertilizer that is purchased after March 2. However, they prepaid for fertilizer in December and are still being hit with this tariff. The government did not even understand the impacts of that tariff before it brought it in, nor did it have very clear and defined rules, which shows a lack of understanding or an unwillingness to understand the farming community.

There is an element of this motion that talks about money laundering. Some members will wonder why we are talking about money laundering and will think it is incredible to be talking about money laundering when it is such a long-term problem. Well, the best time to plant a tree, if not yesterday, is today. The Cullen commission is coming out with an 1,800-page report, which I hope becomes public very soon, about the challenges of money laundering in British Columbia, but it is going to expose a significant challenge nationally that we must take head-on. We have to understand the impact of money laundering, especially on our real estate sector, because it distorts our real estate markets.

Business of Supply

In Orillia, which is in Simcoe North, we have seen a 300% increase in the price of housing in six years. That is unsustainable. I believe some of that is due to the distorting effects of money laundering in our big cities, because people are now moving out and looking at other places.

It is in this context that I think most of the ideas in our motion are quite reasonable. We may not expect the motion to pass, but I hope we have a great debate and I would welcome the government to take any of these ideas as its own.

In closing, I will make a brief comment about leadership. True leadership is recognizing that perhaps one's original plan needs to change when the facts on the ground change. True leadership is showing a level of humility by acknowledging that humans can sometimes get things wrong. There are some interesting examples from the previous government, but I will only mention three: It decided to change its mind and tax income trusts in the face of different facts changing on the ground; it reversed its decision on interest income deductibility; and when the global financial crisis hit, it reversed its ideological position on running deficits and saved Canada from significant financial ruin.

I am thankful to have been afforded this opportunity today.

● (1350)

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons (Senate), Lib.): Madam Speaker, I thank the member for his intervention today, although I am not exactly sure where he was getting his information from. The government has certainly pointed towards the war in Ukraine as something to explain the global increase in the price of oil, and of gas more specifically.

However, as it relates to inflation, I think it is fair to say, and I would certainly say, that there have been a whole host of things over the last two years that have played into that. I am willing to accept that, and I am willing to state that. Would the member also be willing to state the fact that inflation is not a problem that is unique to Canada? As a matter of fact, in looking at all the developed countries, we see that Canada is among those at the bottom end in terms of the rate of inflation that we have seen over the last year or so.

Mr. Adam Chambers: Madam Speaker, I welcome the question from the member across the aisle. I will make two quick points. One is that inflation is measured differently in all of these different countries, so it is very hard to compare them. Yes, inflation is a challenge in all of these other countries, but—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): There are side conversations going on across the way, and I do not think that is very respectful. The hon. parliamentary secretary had time to ask a question, and he should not be engaging with other members as well while someone is trying to answer the question.

The hon. member for Simcoe North.

Mr. Adam Chambers: Madam Speaker, yes, inflation is a global problem, but guess what? All of the countries where inflation is a problem are countries that did the exact same economic, monetary and fiscal policy expansion that we have seen, and that is why there is an inflation problem.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order. Again, it is not time to respond until I actually acknowledge individuals.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Berthier—Maskinongé.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the member for his intervention. My question will be a very simple one.

Do you not think that you would have been more successful had you presented something more specific instead of lumping everything all together?

There are a lot of things on which we agree, but we cannot vote in favour of all aspects of the motion.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I would like to remind the hon. member to address his comments through the Chair, and not directly to the member.

The hon. member for Simcoe North.

Mr. Adam Chambers: Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for his question.

[*English*]

I appreciate the suggestion. I think we would welcome the hon. member's suggestion on the items that the Bloc Québécois and this member do support. Maybe we could find some common ground to advance some initiatives for the next opposition day motion. Let us call this a good first step on putting some ideas forward that we can all perhaps get behind.

Ms. Lori Idlout (Nunavut, NDP): *Uqaqtittiji*, Suncor reported net profits of over \$4 billion. It distributed \$3.9 billion to its shareholders. The motion before us seems to indicate that the Conservative Party is acting as a gatekeeper for such corporations.

I would like to ask the member why his party thinks that cutting taxes at the pumps will stop big oil and gas from simply raising gas prices.

Mr. Adam Chambers: Madam Speaker, perhaps this will expose a slight difference in approach between the Conservatives and the NDP on this issue. We believe that cutting taxes at the pump by the government will reduce prices for consumers, as evidenced by some actions by provincial governments, including the Government of Alberta and the soon-to-be Government of Ontario.

I do not believe that increasing taxes on companies and giving the federal government more money is going to solve our inflation crisis. I would just point out that when companies pay dividends, most of those dividends go to Canadians, pensioners and elderly individuals who are living on a fixed income, so companies that are making money and paying dividends happen to be a very good thing for Canadians.

• (1355)

[Translation]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Resuming debate, the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food.

However, I would like to inform him that I will have to interrupt him and that he will be able to continue his speech later this afternoon.

[English]

Mr. Francis Drouin (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Scarborough—Guildwood.

We are speaking today on the opposition motion, and the first point of the motion is that “high inflation rates are driving the cost of living up for all Canadians”. Well, of course, that is what inflation is. However, I would argue that it is driving up the cost for everyone living across the world, and I want to put this into context. Let us look at the Czech Republic. What is its rate of inflation? It is 14.2%. Let us see what Poland's rate of inflation is—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I am sorry. There are more cross-discussions happening. I would ask those members to maybe step out to have those conversations, in order to be respectful. There are individuals in the galleries who would like to hear what is going on and individuals at home as well.

The hon. parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Francis Drouin: Madam Speaker, I am glad to reiterate what the rates of inflation are for different countries across the world.

The Czech Republic is dealing with a rate of inflation of 14.2%. Poland is dealing with a rate of inflation of 13.9%. Romania is dealing with a rate of inflation of 13.8%. Greece is dealing with a rate of inflation of 10.2%. The Netherlands is dealing with a rate of inflation of 9.6%. Hungary is dealing with a rate of inflation of 9.5%. The United Kingdom is dealing with a rate of inflation of 9%.

[Translation]

Belgium has an inflation rate of 9% as well. Germany has an inflation rate of 8.7%. The United States has an inflation rate of 8.3%. Portugal has an inflation rate of 8%.

[English]

Austria is dealing with a rate of inflation of 7.9%. Italy is dealing with a rate of inflation of 6.9%. Finally, Canada is dealing with a rate of inflation of 6.8%.

This is a world problem. Obviously, we are all suffering the consequences of the illegal war of Vladimir Putin in Ukraine, but that particular motion does not offer many solutions.

Let us talk about the fertilizer prices: “eliminating tariffs on fertilizer”. The hon. members offer that as a simple solution that will cause a great relief for all farmers. Do they not realize that fertilizer went up by 70% to 100% before the Ukraine war? Yes, now there is a 35% tariff on fertilizer, but do they not realize that there are Cana-

Statements by Members

dian companies that realigned their supply chains to ensure that they are not going to be penalized by that 35% tariff? Yes, they are paying higher prices, but I believe we should be advocating for a solution that offers all farmers a reduction on prices, not just those who have paid that 35%.

Obviously, for next year, the point of a tariff is for Canadian companies to stop dealing with the Russian government and Russian companies. We heard loud and clear from a Ukrainian MP yesterday that Canada should be doing everything to stop doing business with Russia. I believe that question was asked by the member for Beauce, who heard it loud and clear from that Ukrainian MP, and I thank her for her testimony at the agriculture committee.

The motion talks about the solution to address housing affordability being, let me get this straight, to launch a public inquiry. I just do not understand how that is going to provide immediate relief to Canadians. I am surprised that this actually came from the Conservatives, because the Conservatives are usually about smaller government. Now they are proposing a bureaucracy to look into how we could make sure that housing affordability is available through a public inquiry. Come on—

• (1400)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Unfortunately, we have to go to Statements by Members. The hon. member will have six minutes when he continues his speech in the House.

I would ask members who are coming in to please keep it down a bit, because parliamentarians are going to be making their statements.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

ISLAMOPHOBIA

Mr. Mike Morrice (Kitchener Centre, GP): Madam Speaker, they were going for a walk: Salman, Madiha, Talat, Yumna and Fayez. A year ago, three generations of the Afzaal family were victims of an Islamophobic terror attack in London, Ontario, just down the road from us in Waterloo region. Four were murdered simply for being Muslims, while Fayez was left orphaned and injured.

Yesterday, the Coalition of Muslim Women of Kitchener-Waterloo held a vigil to mark this difficult anniversary as our community continues to stand in solidarity with our neighbours in London.

We must all recognize that white supremacy kills. Islamophobia kills. We must denounce all forms of racism, Islamophobia and xenophobia, but words are not enough. All levels of government must act more quickly to eradicate Islamophobia and ensure that this never happens again.

*Statements by Members***ISLAMOPHOBIA**

Ms. Arielle Kayabaga (London West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it has been a year since the Afzaal family was tragically murdered while walking in Hyde Park. Salman loved gardening. Yumna loved art. Madiha loved caring for others. Talat simply loved her grandchildren. The void they left on this earth is immeasurable. It was felt during the many events honouring their lives that I attended over the weekend.

In the nine months after this tragedy, Yumna's friend founded YCCI, a youth-led organization to combat Islamophobia in Canada by offering key educational material to teach us how to see the human behind the hijab. Members of the Youth Coalition Combating Islamophobia made it very clear that they will not stop until this country is safe for Muslim families and all families. They made it clear that their love for Yumna is what drives their work, but that is not all they said.

They asked that I remind this place of how much they have accomplished in the last few months, and that we, as a collective, look among ourselves to reflect on how we can continue to build on what they have started. They also asked that I let all members in this place know that they never want to plan another vigil.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Mr. Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the goal of the Liberal government is the redistribution of wealth. It is not just me saying that. That is directly from former Liberal finance minister Bill Morneau, who said he was forced to spend way too much energy finding ways to redistribute wealth.

The redistribution of wealth is the goal of the Prime Minister and his Liberal cronies. Now it all makes sense. That is why he wants to tax the principal residence of Canadians. That is why he wants to shut down our energy sector. That is why he keeps attacking small businesses. It is why he continues to double down on his carbon tax, the biggest wealth redistribution scheme the Liberals have concocted yet. They want to pick the winners and the losers. They want control, control, control. Why else are China, North Korea and Canada the only countries to have ridiculous vaccine mandates and restrictions?

The Prime Minister took advantage of COVID to pick winners and losers, not only in the economy, but in society. As Canadians struggle, the government is doing cartwheels because everything is going according to its redistribution plan. It is time for the nonsense to end.

* * *

PEEL MEDICAL OFFICER OF HEALTH

Ms. Sonia Sidhu (Brampton South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I want to recognize in this House someone who worked very hard in the region of Peel to ensure the good health of our residents.

Peel was one of the hardest-hit regions in this pandemic, and our medical officer of health, Dr. Lawrence Loh, worked tirelessly on vaccination, isolation centres, mental health and wellness. I had the opportunity to work with him through the health committee, where

we got valuable grassroots feedback from Dr. Loh, which set us on the path to recovery. Thanks to Dr. Loh's leadership, more than 90% of eligible Peel residents over 12 are double-vaccinated, and Brampton became a national leader in vaccination.

This fall, Dr. Loh will be stepping into a new role. I send him my best wishes on behalf of all Brampton residents. We are very grateful for the service and dedication of Dr. Loh and his team, and all the frontline health care workers.

* * *

● (1405)

[Translation]

PRIDE MONTH

Ms. Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in June we celebrate pride and what a well-earned feeling for the entire LGBTQ+ community. They have come a long way and accomplished a lot.

From fighting for decriminalization to fighting for equality, all these battles were fought with determination, courage and love and have made members of the LGBTQ+ community role models in the art of peaceful protest at a time of positive advocacy. That is something else to be proud of.

June is Pride Month. We are proud of who we are, proud of the way we live, proud of who we love and proud to love. The greatest pride is rooted in these two sentiments: self-affirmation and love for others.

In Quebec, pride celebrations are held in August, when our cities are bathed in sunshine, bright colours and rainbows. We will be there with the communities in August, as we are in June, to celebrate pride and to keep fighting together.

Happy Pride Month, everyone.

* * *

LAWYERS WITHOUT BORDERS CANADA

Mr. Joël Lightbound (Louis-Hébert, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Lawyers Without Borders is celebrating its 20th anniversary this year. For two decades, it has been advocating for the respect and promotion of fundamental freedoms as defined by international law.

With deep roots in my riding, the magnificent Quebec City, these exceptional legal experts, lawyers and volunteers are the voice for those who, all too often, do not have one. Whether in Africa, Latin America or the Caribbean, their smart, caring and enthusiastic team is working to bring more justice to the world.

I would like to give special recognition to Pascal Paradis, executive director and co-founder of Lawyers Without Borders Canada, who left behind the stability of a large law firm to be true to his convictions.

I wish Lawyers Without Borders Canada continued success and thank them for making us proud through their commitment, intelligence and humanitarianism.

* * *

[English]

COVID-19 MANDATES

Ms. Michelle Ferreri (Peterborough—Kawartha, CPC): Mr. Speaker, if we want our country to recover mentally and financially, we need to support our tourism sector. We hear the Liberals tell us the pandemic is not over and people are dying from COVID, but why are they not talking about the people who are dying from stress-induced diseases after losing their businesses, their jobs and their livelihoods because of the unnecessary restrictions?

Independent duty-free shops located at land borders are in a crisis, and they need help now. Before COVID, the average wait time at a land border was 45 seconds per vehicle. Today, it can be as long as 38 minutes. Every second counts to move people and help our tourism sector recover.

Today I implore the Liberal government to immediately step up and help our land border crossings and all the locally owned tourism businesses that benefit from them. The Liberal government has two options. Number one is to create further debt for both business owners and Canadians and provide more loans so they can survive. Number two is to do the right thing and lift restrictions and barriers such as the ArriveCAN app, restore travel confidence and show the world Canada is open for business.

* * *

WORLD HAKKA CONFERENCE

Mr. Shaun Chen (Scarborough North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, at the end of this month, thousands of Hakka people from around the world will descend upon Markham, Ontario, for the 31st World Hakka Conference.

As a proud Canadian of Hakka Chinese descent, I am honoured and privileged to welcome everyone attending this first-ever global Hakka event in Canada. Recognizing our rich and diverse histories, cultures and traditions, this is an opportunity to celebrate the unique achievements of the Hakka people while reflecting on the challenges we have faced along the way.

Allow me to recognize the Hakka Canadian Association and its chair, Markham regional councillor Joe Li, who has been instrumental in organizing this monumental occasion.

I welcome the many Hakka diasporas visiting Canada from around the world, and hope they enjoy all this beautiful country has to offer. Together, let us honour the Hakka spirit and cherish the values that unite us.

The Speaker: Before we go to the next statement, I would like to call order to make sure everyone can hear the statements. These are very important statements to the individual MPs who make them, so if members could keep the talk down a bit, we would all be able to hear them.

Statements by Members

• (1410)

PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Ms. Leah Taylor Roy (Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, “We don’t give people with developmental disabilities enough credit. You never know what is possible until people are given the opportunity.” This quote from a business owner who hired persons with disabilities could not better describe my cousin, Gwen, who we lost in May of 2021, just over a year ago. When she was born, her parents were told it would be best if she was institutionalized, but with their bottomless love and dedication, Gwen went on to live a full life. We still miss her indefatigable joy.

Community Living, which serves York region, was an important support for Gwen and her family, as was her associate family, and they enabled her to be integrated into the community. Last week, my parents and I visited Community Living to see the tree planted on their grounds in honour of Gwen. While there, we had the pleasure of talking with CEO Andrew Fagan. He explained how organizations such as his play a critical role in the health and well-being of persons with disabilities. My father had been a member of the board of the organization since 1961.

Our government is committed to becoming a more accessible, more disability-inclusive Canada, but this cannot happen without all of us doing our part.

* * *

WORLD SAILING CHAMPIONSHIPS

Mr. Rick Perkins (South Shore—St. Margarets, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today I would like to express my pride in welcoming the 49er, 49erFX and Nacra 17 World Sailing Championships to my beautiful riding of South Shore—St. Margarets from August 31 to September 5.

This international sailing regatta will bring the best competitors of the world to my own backyard in St. Margarets Bay and will be hosted by the community of Hubbards. This world championship will see a field of 400 sailors from over 35 countries competing in three Olympic classes: the wickedly fast 49er, the 49erFX and the Nacra 17.

I know that residents in my community are eager to host the thousands of visitors and spectators we will be bringing to our community. As a sailor myself, I look forward to not only appreciating the hard work and dedication of these athletes, but also cheering on our own team of Canadian competitors.

I encourage others to show their support for our Canadian team in its mission to take home the gold in this world championship event.

* * *

ST. JOHN'S EAST

Ms. Joanne Thompson (St. John's East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as we near the end of this session of the 44th Parliament, I would like to extend my appreciation to the residents of St. John's East. It has been a busy nine months, and I look forward to seeing many of them soon.

Statements by Members

This summer I will be on the ground, celebrating funding announcements and meeting with seniors, businesses, local service centres, not-for-profit organizations and as many residents as I can. Their voices matter, and I am here to work with them and hear their needs and concerns.

I thank my team for its shared commitment and dedication to the people who call this riding home. To the Prime Minister and the many ministers who have demonstrated their support for my work and the riding through visits and in-person announcements, I am thankful. To my family and all those who have sent notes of concern, encouragement and offers to help, their support has not gone unnoticed.

We work best when we work together, and I am excited to see all of them in the riding this summer.

* * *

CHRISTOPHER PRATT

Mr. Clifford Small (Coast of Bays—Central—Notre Dame, CPC): Mr. Speaker, flying the provincial flag at half-mast in Newfoundland and Labrador on June 5 had an extra special meaning, as this was the day we lost its creator: Mr. Christopher Pratt.

Mr. Pratt was a proud Newfoundlander and Labradorian, an artist, one of Canada's prominent painters and print makers, and the designer of our Newfoundland and Labrador flag. He will be sorely missed. Born in St. John's in 1935, Mr. Pratt first started painting watercolours in 1952. He served on many committees, including the Canadian government's Stamp Design Advisory Committee and the board of the Canada Council for the Arts. In 1973, he was appointed an officer of the Order of Canada before becoming a companion of the Order in 1983. He was awarded the Order of Newfoundland and Labrador in 2018.

He was known not only for his brilliant artwork, but also for his great sense of humour. On behalf of the House of Commons of Canada, I offer sincere condolences to the Pratt family as we say goodbye to this legendary Canadian who left his mark on our great province.

* * *

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S FOOT GUARDS

Mr. Dane Lloyd (Sturgeon River—Parkland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to pay tribute to Canada's senior army reserve infantry regiment, the Governor General's Foot Guards, as it celebrates its 150th anniversary of its founding on June 7, 1872. The foot guards have a proud history as old as Canada itself. The regiment has fought in every war Canada has been a part of, and its members have received the highest decorations, including two Victoria crosses and 34 battle honours.

During the Second World War, the guards fought their way from the beaches of Normandy to the liberation of the Netherlands. The guards have also served in many United Nations and NATO operations, including service in Afghanistan, the former Yugoslavia, Somalia and Cyprus. Guards have also answered the call to help Canadians affected by severe flooding, forest fires and the pandemic.

The guards are also well known for their annual ceremonial guard. The changing of the guard ceremony on Parliament Hill is greatly anticipated by Canadians and tourists alike, and I know we all look forward to it coming back next year.

I am a proud foot guard myself, so please join me in paying tribute to the Governor General's Foot Guards on this milestone of 150 years of service to Canada. I wish a happy birthday to the regiment. Up the guards.

* * *

● (1415)

[Translation]

AEROTECHNICAL SCHOOL AWARDS GALA

Mrs. Sherry Romanado (Longueuil—Charles-LeMoyne, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the École nationale d'aérotechnique, the ENA, holds an annual gala to reward its students. This year, the ENA, which is affiliated with the Édouard-Montpetit CEGEP, had a record number of corporate sponsors and was able to award scholarships worth \$45,000.

Thanks to the unprecedented generosity of aerospace companies, over 50 students each received a scholarship. These valuable partners signalled their support for students in a very tangible way by offering them real recognition and helping offset the cost of their studies.

[English]

Concrete recognition of this kind can have a huge impact on a students' progress and perseverance. I applaud the aerospace firms that provided these bursaries for their foresight in investing in the future.

[Translation]

My hearty congratulations to the students, the participating companies and the ENA for its essential contribution to our aerospace cluster.

* * *

[English]

EVENTS IN ELMWOOD—TRANSCONA

Mr. Daniel Blaikie (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, even though the pandemic is not entirely behind us, it is heartening to see more things return to normal. On Saturday, I enjoyed spending time with my family at Transcona's Hi Neighbour Festival after a pancake breakfast at the legion. Baba's Country Kitchen was back in action and as delicious as ever. On Sunday, I was pleased to join with tens of thousands of people for the Winnipeg pride parade.

Next weekend, I look forward to celebrating with people in Elmwood as Happy Days on Henderson makes its return after a two-year hiatus. As usual, there will be live music, children's games and a lot more.

Winnipeg had a long, cold winter, and it has been a difficult year so far. As the little bit of sunshine we are getting now warms our faces, these events are helping to warm our hearts. I thank all the amazing people who have worked hard to put these events back together.

* * *

[Translation]

KIDNEY DISEASE

Ms. Monique Pauzé (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, during the night of June 25 to 26, there will be a moonlight tennis challenge in my riding in support of the Kidney Foundation. The name of the event is “Get on the ball and make a donation”. Tennis players from across Quebec will face off on the court to raise money for people with kidney disease, many of whom undergo dialysis at night. Dialysis is not a solution. Transplants do not necessarily guarantee a cure. That is why this athletic event will be raising awareness about the vital importance of kidney health.

The money raised will give hope to the thousands who have kidney disease or are waiting for a transplant. In Quebec, more than 550,000 people suffer from kidney failure, including 1,300 in the Lanaudière region.

Rates are not going to go down. American studies clearly link increased levels of fine particles due to pollution with the risk of developing chronic kidney failure. I encourage everyone who wants to get on the ball and make a donation to do so at tennisnocture.ca.

* * *

[English]

OWO CHURCH ATTACK

Mr. Michael Barrett (Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this past Sunday at St. Francis Xavier church in Owo, Nigeria, as the choir was singing the closing hymns for their Pentecost celebration, gunmen commenced what would be a massacre of the gathered faithful. For 20 minutes, the gunmen fired. Children running to their parents had their last breaths snatched away. Survivors saw life-long friends, neighbours and family members murdered. When the vicious attack was finished, at least 50 men, women and children lay dead.

These innocent people were murdered for carrying out their faith and for simply being Catholic. At Pentecost, we celebrate the fullness of the paschal mystery and the birthday of our church. For this holy day to be chosen for the attack is beyond heinous. More and more, we see churches burnt down and vandalized, Catholic holy sites desecrated and, far too often, Catholics killed for their faith.

We must call out hate anytime it is manifested with words or with actions. Nobody should be targeted or made to feel inferior because they live their faith. I ask Canadians and all members in this place to join me in praying for the victims and their families during this unthinkable hardship.

Oral Questions

• (1420)

[Translation]

EDWARD LABA

Ms. Lena Metlege Diab (Halifax West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate a young man from Halifax West, Edward Laba, on his graduation from École secondaire du Sommet. He is an outstanding student, an accomplished athlete, and has been legally blind since birth.

[English]

In March, Edward, who is the assistant captain of the See Kings hockey team, competed in the 2022 Canadian National Blind Hockey Tournament in Toronto where he played as junior defence alongside his more senior teammates and won the gold medal.

Just last month, Edward was off to Mississauga to play goalball with the Nova Scotia junior team at the Ontario Parasport Games. He was the heart of his team and once again returned home with a gold medal in hand.

Throughout Edward's academic life, his proud parents, Peter and Rita, have been his biggest supporters. The sky is the limit for Edward. I ask all parliamentarians to join me in congratulating him on his graduation and applauding his success.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[English]

HEALTH

Hon. Candice Bergen (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has jetted off on another international trip, with no airport lineups for him. I bet we are going to see some more pictures of him with his mask off having a great time. He flaunts the personal freedoms he is enjoying abroad, while back here Canadians are suffering under his out-of-date restrictions. Tourism, federal employees, small businesses and families are all suffering. They are all pawns in the Prime Minister's COVID game.

Is it not true the Prime Minister knows he needs to lift these restrictions but would rather do COVID theatre than do what is right?

Mr. Adam van Koevorden (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health and to the Minister of Sport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, from the beginning of this pandemic, we have been there for Canadians. Of course, it is the Prime Minister's job and obligation to travel to other countries to do his important work.

When we hear the opposition speak positively about public health measures but badly about vaccination, it confuses the public. We should be encouraging our neighbours to consider a third or fourth dose. We cannot have relaxed public health measures and more freedom without vaccination as COVID-19 continues to progress. We all have an obligation to ensure that our neighbours are aware of the opportunity for a third dose.

*Oral Questions***THE ECONOMY**

Hon. Candice Bergen (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians would like to be planning their summer vacation right now, but too many are focused on how they are going to afford fuel for their cars or to feed their families. Over 20% of Canadians are actually skipping a meal in order to save money. The Liberal solution is blame: blame COVID, blame Putin and blame the Conservatives.

Today, our Conservative caucus motion provides real solutions so that Canadians can take that summer trip, send their kids to camp and not worry about missing a flight. Will the Liberals support giving Canadians a break or are they going to double down on their vindictive, petty approach?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we absolutely understand that affordability matters for Canadians. That is why we are taking action by increasing the Canada workers benefit. This year a family of three is getting \$2,300 more. We are increasing the OAS for seniors 75 and over by 10% this year, and there is a \$500 top-up for people facing housing affordability challenges.

Hon. Candice Bergen (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that is great. A few piddly cheques might dribble in through the mail, and the government thinks that is having any impact on what Canadians are dealing with.

Thirty-eight per cent of Canadians are worried more about money than anything else they are dealing with, so these Liberal cheques, which are coming from the pockets of Canadians because their taxes are going up, are doing absolutely nothing. The Liberals are so massively out of touch that they do not understand gas prices, they do not understand high food prices and they do not understand long lineups. They understand nothing about what Canadians are dealing with and they do not care.

• (1425)

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what is out of touch is for someone who lives in government accommodation to suggest that a cheque for \$2,300 for a family of three working at minimum wage is piddly. It is out of touch to suggest that for a senior over 75 to get an additional \$815 is piddly. This is real support for Canadians who need it most.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of the crisis, we have seen that the Minister of Finance is totally out of touch with the reality of Canadians.

According to the Liberals, gas prices are not too high. According to them, Russia, the pandemic and even Canadians are to blame. They are going to criticize the Conservatives today for introducing a motion calling on them to act, to give a little breathing room to Canadians who are having trouble making ends meet at the end of the month.

Will they help Canadians, yes or no, or will they continue to play their vindictive little political games, which are preventing 25% of Canadians from putting food on their tables?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives love to quote from the Parliamentary Budget Officer's reports so now I would like to quote the Parliamentary Budget Officer, who talked about inflation today. Here is what he said: "The ultimate impetus for the resurgence of high inflation can [be] traced back to the COVID-19 pandemic. More recently, the Russian invasion of Ukraine has compounded inflationary pressures."

That is exactly what is happening.

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, working Canadians and everyone else do not care what is causing inflation or why everything costs more.

What they do care about is being able to afford to buy groceries at the end of the month, making sure that their kids are not going to bed hungry, and being able to afford to fill up their vehicle so that they can get to work.

Whether it is the pandemic, COVID-19, or anything else that the Liberals are going to blame, the reality is that they are doing absolutely nothing right now to help Canadians who need it.

Why are they so out of touch with Canadians?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that is simply not true. The reality is that we understand very well that affordability is important to Canadian families.

That is precisely why we have taken action such as increasing the Canada workers benefit, which gives a single worker an extra \$1,000 in benefits. We are providing an additional one-time \$500 payment to those struggling to find housing.

* * *

PASSPORTS

Mr. Alain Therrien (La Prairie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Quebecers are furious about passport wait times. Even in the midst of a crisis, none of the passport offices are open on the weekend, even for people who are leaving within 48 hours.

The Liberals are forcing people who have been waiting for three months to miss a day of work in order to make an urgent application. Worse, they are charging \$50 to \$110 in extra fees. That is crazy. They are making citizens pay the price for their incompetence.

Will they open offices on the weekend and process urgent applications at no extra cost?

Hon. Karina Gould (Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have said in the House before, we are seeing an unprecedented increase in the number of passport applications.

Nevertheless, people should not have to pay to have their application processed more quickly if it occurs outside normal service hours.

Also, a dozen offices are open almost every Saturday to ensure that we can respond to urgent requests.

• (1430)

Mr. Alain Therrien (La Prairie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the government says it is doing everything in its power, but only between the hours of eight and four and at people's expense. That is outrageous.

They have to open passport offices on the weekend for people who need to travel within 48 hours. They have to stop charging extra fees for people who submitted their application and are still waiting 20 business days later.

When will they actually do everything in their power to fix their mistakes and deliver passports on time without fees? Enough is enough.

Hon. Karina Gould (Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I said, those fees should not apply if the passport is not delivered within the normal 20-day period.

I will raise the matter with Service Canada again. I know Service Canada employees are working extremely hard, including evenings and weekends, to serve Canadians. They are there, and we will do everything in our power to make sure Canadians receive their passports before travelling.

* * *

[English]

TAXATION

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Mr. Speaker, one out of every four Canadians in this country is going hungry because they cannot afford groceries. At the same time, corporations are making record profits. They are breaking record after record.

Our plan is to tax the excess—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: I will ask the hon. member to start from the top so we can all hear his question.

The hon. member for Burnaby South.

Mr. Jagmeet Singh: Mr. Speaker, I just mentioned that Canadians are hungry and I hear laughter in the chamber. They should be ashamed of themselves.

One out of every four Canadians is hungry because they cannot afford groceries, while corporations are making record profits and are responsible for one-fourth of the inflation that Canadians are experiencing. Our plan is to tax the excess profits of these corporations and put the money directly into the pockets of Canadians who need it.

When will the government stop protecting the wealth of these corporations and start standing up for families that need help right now?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government is absolutely committed to making sure everyone in Canada pays their fair share and we have taken concrete action. We have permanently raised the

Oral Questions

corporate income tax on the largest and most profitable banks and insurance companies in Canada by 1.5%. We are introducing a Canada recovery dividend on banks and insurance companies of 15%. We are also putting in place a luxury tax on cars and planes worth more than \$100,000 and on boats worth more than \$250,000.

Mr. Jagmeet Singh (Burnaby South, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we need to expand the tax that has been proposed for banks to the profitable oil and gas sector and corporate big box stores that are making record profits while Canadians are hungry and cannot afford food.

[Translation]

A quarter of Canadians are going hungry because they cannot afford groceries, while corporations are making record profits. Our plan is to tax those excess profits and redistribute the money directly to families.

When will this government stand up for families instead of protecting the profits of big corporations?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government is committed to making sure that everyone pays their fair share. We have taken concrete action by permanently raising the corporate income tax on the largest and most profitable corporations, banks and insurance companies and by introducing a 15% Canada recovery dividend on banks and insurance companies.

[English]

Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, almost every G7 country has a plan to deal with high gas prices and runaway inflation. For example, Germany has a \$16-billion plan to lower gas prices. The Americans have released their strategic reserve. Even the British government has cut gas taxes and is considering more. From our Prime Minister we have word salad.

Besides blaming Putin or suggesting that people buy an electric vehicle, can the Prime Minister cobble together a plan to deal with rising gas prices, or is that just way too much to ask of him as a leader of a G7 country?

• (1435)

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the party that needs a coherent policy is the Conservative Party, and it just does not have one. As usual, the Conservatives are failing to pick a lane on fiscal policy. Half of the time they like to talk about deficits and complain about government spending, but the other half of the time, like just now, they praise the expensive multi-billion dollar programs put in place by the governments of other countries, so really, what is the fiscal policy of the Conservative Party of Canada?

Oral Questions

Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, despite having lower gas prices, the Americans have acted to help struggling families fill their tanks and keep life affordable. The Prime Minister likes to import the divisive politics that occur to the south of our border and claims that if we do not act firmly and rapidly it will only get worse and be more difficult to counter. As our largest importer of American politics, when will the Prime Minister finally try to import something positive, like helping Canadians deal with gas prices?

Hon. Jonathan Wilkinson (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. colleague knows, the current situation in Ukraine and the unprovoked attack by Russia have resulted in a geopolitical crisis in Europe and elevated energy prices around the world. While Canada's energy security remains intact, we are working with our international allies, and very much with our friends in the United States, to stabilize energy markets around the world. In this regard, we have committed to increasing oil and gas production by 300,000 barrels per day by the end of the year. At home, we have instructed the Competition Bureau to ensure there is no collusion around gas pricing.

We are working to ensure that we are putting money back in the pockets of Canadians through the Canada child benefit, tax cuts for the middle class, and other items to ensure we are addressing the affordability of—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Louis-Saint-Laurent.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, people in my riding woke up to some bad news this morning. The price of gas is up to \$2.24 a litre. That is a record high. This is the reality for every Canadian family in my riding and from coast to coast.

As we know, when the price goes up, the tax also goes up. Basically, the government makes more money when the price goes up. However, what differentiates Canada from other countries like Germany, England, Australia and South Korea is that those countries have lowered the gas tax.

Why does this government refuse to do that?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to pick up on what my finance colleague said. On the issue of carbon pricing, in 2007, the Harper government proposed a \$15 tax. In 2008, it proposed a cap-and-trade system, only to change its mind in 2011. In the end, it decided not to do anything about climate change.

Surprise, surprise, during the last election campaign, the Conservative Party went back to supporting carbon pricing. Now, as of a few weeks ago, it no longer supports it. What Canadians want is action on climate change, not a party that changes its mind all the time.

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians have been clear about what they want, and that is effective policies to fight inflation.

As gas prices continue to rise, the tax rises too, so the government is pocketing more and more money. The government is

putting more money in its own pockets and less in the pockets of Canadians.

This is a direct measure that Canadians want. Other countries have adopted this measure, so why does the Liberal government refuse to do so?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again, the Conservatives need to pick a lane on fiscal policy. Half of the time, they talk about the deficit and complain about government spending, but the other half of the time, they praise expensive programs proposed by other governments. What are the Conservatives actually advocating for: spending or fiscal responsibility?

[*English*]

Mrs. Laila Goodridge (Fort McMurray—Cold Lake, CPC): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, Canadians need answers, not talking points. People in my riding and in northern and rural communities all across Canada have to drive just about everywhere. Fuel prices are at record highs, which is making life harder for all Canadians.

When will the government drop the talking points, do the right thing, drop the GST on fuel and make life more affordable for Canadians?

Hon. Jonathan Wilkinson (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as my hon. colleague knows, the unjustified invasion of Ukraine by Russia has driven up energy prices around the world. The government is working actively with partners in the United States and with other countries around the world to ensure that Canada is increasing supplies to stabilize energy pricing globally. We are also working actively within this country to ensure that we are addressing affordability challenges.

The opposition voted against tax cuts for the middle class. It voted against the Canada child benefit and it voted against day care programs, all of which are aimed at ensuring affordability for Canadians from coast to coast to coast.

● (1440)

Mrs. Kelly Block (Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals' high taxes and high inflation policies are hurting Canadians. Shaughn, a veteran and a constituent in my riding, recently emailed me to say that as a result of the carbon tax and the impact of inflation, he has had to sell his home in order to get by. Shaughn's home was his nest egg and safety net for the future, but thanks to the Prime Minister's policies, it is gone.

Will the Prime Minister acknowledge the harm his policies are having on Canadians like Shaughn?

Oral Questions

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our plan is designed so that the majority of households in Canada receive more money from the climate incentive payment than they pay. This has been confirmed through the analysis of the Parliamentary Budget Officer. As carbon prices increase, these payments also increase. For example, this year a family of four will receive up to \$745 in Ontario, \$830 in Manitoba, \$1,100 in the member's province of Saskatchewan and more than \$1,000 in Alberta.

* * *

[Translation]

PUBLIC SAFETY

Ms. Kristina Michaud (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is official: 2021 was Montreal's most violent year in a decade. The police released its annual report, and there were 25,000 crimes against the person. Incidents where shots were fired doubled compared to last year. This wave of violence can be traced back to organized crime and its illegal weapons.

The federal government must do more than restrict legal firearms. Illegal weapons are plaguing Montreal. Will the minister admit that Bill C-21 does not solve this problem?

Hon. Marco Mendicino (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I completely agree with my colleague that shootings and tragic events caused by firearms are unacceptable. I am always ready to work with my Bloc colleagues.

However, today, we are studying Bill C-21 in the House. I very much look forward to starting the debate on this bill, because the measures it contains can make all communities and all Canadians safer.

Ms. Kristina Michaud (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia, BQ): Mr. Speaker, putting a freeze on legal handgun sales is a step in the right direction, I will give him that.

As for illegal firearms, we need to face facts. Criminal groups do not buy their guns at the store, and they are the ones who made 2021 Montreal's most violent year.

The minister may well increase prison sentences, but we still need to be able to arrest these individuals, seize their illegal weapons and lay charges. The numbers show that we did not manage to do it in 2021. Organized crime groups are not worried. Does the minister realize that?

Hon. Marco Mendicino (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my colleague is quite right. This bill is an important step. Why is that?

It is because it introduces a national freeze on handguns. It is because it introduces many criminal penalties for organized criminals. It is because we can now do what needs to be done to curb intimate partner violence. That is meaningful action. These measures need to be passed into law to protect all Canadians.

Mr. Rhéal Fortin (Rivière-du-Nord, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we need to give the police more resources so that they can take action. One of those resources is a list of criminal organizations, like the Bloc Québécois suggested. That would greatly ease the burden of proof when the police want to lay charges against members of

criminal groups. Given that 2021 was the most violent year of the past decade in Montreal, the minister simply cannot afford to deprive the police of such a tool any longer.

Does the minister realize that this sad statistic obligates him to consider our proposal and create an organized crime registry?

Hon. Marco Mendicino (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that is exactly why we introduced Bill C-21. As I already said, I am always willing to work with my colleague. I agree with the Bloc Québécois's goal, vision and concept, but we still need to examine the bill.

It is too bad that the Conservatives picked a fight on Friday when we had time to start this debate. We really need to move forward on this. We need to pass this bill as soon as possible.

* * *

● (1445)

[English]

JUSTICE

Hon. Rob Moore (Fundy Royal, CPC): Mr. Speaker, under this government, Canada is becoming less and less safe. The Liberals have brought in Bill C-5, legislation that is soft on gun crime, while the Supreme Court has ruled that one can drink one's way out of a conviction for a serious crime and receive a discounted sentence for multiple murders.

It is about time the Liberals put victims first. Will the government provide a legislative response to these court rulings?

Hon. David Lametti (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our hearts go out to victims and we will always stand with victims. With respect to the Supreme Court ruling on serious intoxication, we are looking carefully at that ruling. The Court has presented us with a number of different options, and I have already said publicly that we will evaluate those options and come back to this place.

Serious crimes in this country will always carry serious consequences. The failed tough-on-crime Conservative policy needs to be put in the past, and that is precisely what we are doing.

Hon. Rob Moore (Fundy Royal, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court ruling means that the killer of three Mounties in Moncton, New Brunswick has had his parole ineligibility reduced from 75 years to 25. This will put the victims' families through future misery.

Will the government respond?

Oral Questions

Hon. David Lametti (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our hearts go out to anybody, to any families and communities that suffer from the ravages of multiple murders. The Supreme Court ruling is clear and unanimous. We have said and we have pointed out that the ability of a mass murderer to get parole is extremely rare. Celebrated murderers and mass murderers like Paul Bernardo do not get parole. The system is, in itself, one that punishes criminals seriously.

Hon. Kerry-Lynne Findlay (South Surrey—White Rock, CPC): Mr. Speaker, not all mandatory minimum sentences have been struck down by the Supreme Court of Canada. Bill C-5 punishes legitimate gun owners and gives violent criminals a ticket back to ruining more lives. In Surrey, two men, including one wanted on a Canada-wide warrant for human trafficking, have been charged after Mounties seized a loaded handgun in a traffic stop.

Violent repeat offenders should be taken off the streets. What does this government not understand about protecting victims and putting violent criminals behind bars?

Hon. Marco Mendicino (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if my colleague had read the bill, she would see that this initiative tackles organized crime head-on by raising maximum sentences against serious hardened criminals who would terrorize our communities.

I was in my hon. colleague's province just last week to speak with Eileen Mohan, who lost her son some 15 years ago to gun violence, unnecessary, harsh, needless, senseless violence.

If my hon. colleague is interested in protecting her community, then she will vote for Bill C-21. It enjoys the support of survivors. It enjoys the support of women's groups. It enjoys the support of law enforcement.

We should all unite behind this bill, because that is how we will protect Canadians.

Hon. Kerry-Lynne Findlay (South Surrey—White Rock, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Surrey, B.C., has seen a troubling spike in gun violence, with 28 reports of shots fired and three confirmed deadly shootings by April of this year. Fatal gun violence by gangs linked to the drug trade continues to rise in my riding, putting our community in jeopardy, yet this government chooses to play politics at the expense of people's lives.

Why does the Prime Minister refuse to protect victims—often racialized and indigenous Canadians, by the way—by ensuring repeat violent offenders go to jail for their crimes?

Hon. Marco Mendicino (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what playing politics looks like in this chamber is exactly what we saw last Friday and what we are pretty sure we are going to continue to see from Conservatives. Rather than allowing for debate to commence on Bill C-21, they are stalling it, filibustering it, which is

Notwithstanding that, we are going to continue to have this debate—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

• (1450)

The Speaker: Order.

Can we continue?

I will ask the hon. minister to take it from the top, please.

Hon. Marco Mendicino: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, what playing politics looks like in this chamber is when there is filibustering, which is exactly what the Conservatives engaged in last Friday when we were supposed to start debating Bill C-21.

What we need to do is move forward with a national freeze on handguns. We need to move forward with the tools that will allow us to take on organized crime and gun violence.

When we actually look at the Conservatives on this issue, they have no plan except for legalizing AR-15s and assault-style rifles, which will make our communities more dangerous. Our bill will protect communities. That is why they should vote for it.

* * *

AIRLINE INDUSTRY

Mr. Taylor Bachrach (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Mr. Speaker, security workers continue to bear the brunt of the chaos at our airports. In Vancouver on Friday, I met directly with airport workers who told me about missed breaks, excessive overtime and low wages. It is no wonder this government is having trouble filling positions. Now, in Amsterdam, the public airport just reached a deal with the union that sees a pay raise during the busy summer travel season, but this government leaves workers at the whim of private contractors.

Will the minister tell us if he is concerned about the working conditions faced by our airport workers? Does he even care?

Hon. Omar Alghabra (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, of course our government is concerned about working conditions for all employees, including those who work for CATSA. We are also concerned about the experience of travellers.

My hon. colleague mentions Amsterdam. Let me read this headline: "Amsterdam Airport Boldly Asks Airlines to Cancel Flights to Alleviate Chaos".

We are witnessing a global phenomenon, and in order for us to serve the public properly, we need to increase resources and be there working with the airlines, working with the airport, working with CATSA to ensure that we address these issues.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Ms. Heather McPherson (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it has been over 100 days since the illegal war in Ukraine began, and this government still is not transparent on sanctions imposed on Russian oligarchs. Global Affairs will not tell us what assets have been frozen, because it says that its data may not be complete, so the government does not know what has been sanctioned and Canadians do not know what has been sanctioned. Do the Russian oligarchs being sanctioned know what is being sanctioned?

When will the minister finally tell us the number and the amount of assets seized so Canadians can tell if the government's plan is actually working?

Hon. Robert Oliphant (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, one thing that has brought this House together over this last number of months is our solidarity in our support for Ukraine and our condemnation of the illegal invasion by Russia into Ukraine. What we have also done is work in an unprecedented fashion in imposing sanctions upon Russia to level that playing field and bring Russia down as we lift Ukraine up in this battle of their lives.

Those sanctions are unprecedented. Since February 24, we have levelled sanctions at over 1,400 individuals and entities, and we will continue to do that until the job is done.

* * *

HOUSING

Ms. Valerie Bradford (Kitchener South—Hespeler, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on April 7, our government put forward its plan to make life more affordable for Canadians through the 2022 budget. A top area of concern in my riding of Kitchener South—Hespeler is the issue of housing affordability. We know that Canadians deserve a safe place to call home and that it should be affordable.

Can the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance tell us what the government is doing to make the dream of owning a home a reality for more Canadians?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member, my colleague, for the very hard work that she is doing in her constituency.

We are committed to making housing more affordable for all Canadians. That is why the budget included a tax-free first home savings account, a ban on foreign buyers for two years, a one-time payment of \$500 to help people in need, \$1.5 billion to support new housing co-ops and a new \$4-billion housing accelerator fund.

I look forward to working with my colleague on these important projects.

* * *

• (1455)

HEALTH

Mr. Stephen Ellis (Cumberland—Colchester, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the government clearly does not know its own policies with respect to travel on federally regulated boats. The Marine Atlantic policy clearly states that travel is open to unvaccinated Cana-

Oral Questions

dians because the voyage is less than 24 hours and the service is essential. Clearly, all plane trips in the world are less than 24 hours. Also, the parliamentary secretary's assertion that the hardy folks of Newfoundland will spend the entire voyage outside on the North Atlantic in the wintertime is nothing short of ridiculous.

Canadians need a commitment that this government will put an end to their hypocritical and vindictive political mandates.

Mr. Adam van Koeverden (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health and to the Minister of Sport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the hard work and the advocacy of the member opposite.

As I said yesterday, it is a lot different travelling on a boat versus a plane. When we are in an airplane, we are in a confined space, seated right next to somebody, as we are here in the House of Commons. That is why we on this side wear masks. When somebody is on a ferry, they can be far more socially distant. They can go outside. Windows are available. I would not recommend opening the window when one is up in the air.

Mr. Stephen Ellis (Cumberland—Colchester, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the other thing we hear from the government is lots of statistics with respect to health care: We hear that 6,000 people die every month from heart disease, 3,500 die from diabetes, 7,000 die monthly from cancer and 600 people die every month from overdoses, which is four times the pre-pandemic number.

Clearly, these numbers are meant simply for context. These diseases are a reality in our lives, but Canadians do not live in fear. It is time for us to learn to live with COVID also. These mandates are clearly political science and not medical science. Is that not right?

Mr. Adam van Koeverden (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health and to the Minister of Sport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am not a medical doctor like the member opposite.

I would take note of the fact that he just referred to a few deadly diseases. However, COVID-19 is one—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: I am just going to interrupt for a moment. I am sure the hon. member for Cumberland—Colchester wants to hear the answer, but we cannot hear it if people are talking or shouting.

The hon. parliamentary secretary.

Oral Questions

Mr. Adam van Koeverden: Mr. Speaker, as I said, I am not a medical doctor like my colleague opposite, and we have been collaborating on the health committee. However, I do not think that just because Canadians unfortunately die from things like coronary artery disease, strokes and heart attacks means that COVID-19 is less of a priority for this government. COVID-19 is beatable. With vaccines and social distancing and by wearing masks, we can beat COVID-19, but we need everybody in this House to participate.

Mr. Michael Barrett (Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister and the government continue their hypocrisy and virtue signalling with their vindictive mandates as airports are in disarray, people are blocked from travelling and others remain unable to return to their jobs. We will hear in their response that they are following the science, but let me offer a quote on the government's mandates from a well-known infectious disease specialist, Dr. Isaac Bogoch: "At the end of the day, the current policy probably isn't doing a whole lot."

So mandates are not stopping the spread. They are not saving lives. They are hurting Canadians. When will the Prime Minister and the government end the mandates?

Mr. Adam van Koeverden (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health and to the Minister of Sport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for his collaboration at the health committee as well. I was also there when we heard from Dr. Bogoch, who has been a consistent and sage advocate for vaccines from the first day of this pandemic. He was, this morning, on the news as well.

It is incontrovertible that vaccines will continue to save lives in this country. Only in the last month, over 1,800 Canadians died from COVID-19. We cannot wish COVID-19 away. We must continue to be vigilant. We must continue to ensure that our neighbours are aware of where they can get a third or a fourth dose, and we must be wearing our masks when we are in public.

Mr. Michael Barrett (Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would encourage the parliamentary secretary to take a—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes is trying to ask a question and his own side is talking over him. Let us keep it down and let the hon. member ask his question.

The hon. member.

Mr. Michael Barrett: Mr. Speaker, they are excited to tell the parliamentary secretary that he should offer that advice to the Prime Minister. He is out not wearing his mask when he is in enclosed spaces, but he has people wear them when he does not.

Now that we have heard political spin, let us hear from another infectious disease specialist, Dr. Neil Rau, who said, "The policy seems to lag the science and it has become incredibly political."

It is well past the time for the Prime Minister and the government to accept that dividing Canadians and pitting neighbour against neighbour was wrong. People want their jobs back. They want to travel. They want to be able to visit with their families.

Is the Prime Minister finally ready to drop the politics of stigmatization and division and end the mandates?

• (1500)

Mr. Adam van Koeverden (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health and to the Minister of Sport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, of course Dr. Neil Rau is renowned in my community as well. He has helped my mother. When I was travelling a lot, he supported our team when we were travelling. He is a very good infectious disease doctor.

However, I would posit that it is that side that is making this political. Vaccines are not political. They are not controversial. These vaccine mandates have done a very good job, and of course all of the regulations and all of the public health restrictions are constantly being reviewed, as they will be.

* * *

[Translation]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Quebec's Bill 96 makes federally regulated businesses subject to the Charter of the French Language, but the Liberals' Bill C-13 contradicts Bill 96 and gives businesses the choice to make French optional.

For the Quebec Community Groups Network, offering this choice already goes too far. Yesterday they demanded that only the federal legislation apply, so that its businesses can continue to operate in English only. Does the minister believe that her allies such as the QCGN care one bit about the decline of French in Quebec?

Hon. Ginette Petitpas Taylor (Minister of Official Languages and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question.

As I have said many times, our government is the first to recognize that French is in decline in Canada, including in Quebec.

That is why we are moving forward with an ambitious bill, one with teeth, to ensure that we can do our part. The federal government wants to take responsibility and make sure that we are doing everything we can to address this situation, as it is a top priority for the government.

Mr. Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ): Mr. Speaker, English is not threatened in Quebec or anywhere in North America, and yet that is what the English Montreal School Board believes. It has announced plans to challenge Bill 96, and it is calling on all like-minded groups to provide financial support for its challenge.

I have a simple question for the minister: Does she agree with us that the English Montreal School Board should not get one penny of taxpayer money to challenge Quebec's Bill 96?

Hon. Ginette Petitpas Taylor (Minister of Official Languages and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again, we have been very clear that our government is the first federal party to recognize that French is in decline in Canada, including in Quebec. That is why we are moving forward with an ambitious bill to address this situation.

What is really disappointing is that yesterday, at the Standing Committee on Official Languages, we saw time being wasted in the first hour of the committee meeting. Rather than taking the time needed to begin a thorough analysis of Bill C-13, we saw members of the opposition, including the Bloc, simply waste that time.

* * *

JUSTICE

Mr. Bernard Généreux (Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, CPC): Mr. Speaker, shootings are happening more and more often in the greater Montreal area. Fear is taking hold in some neighbourhoods, and children have been traumatized by shootings in broad daylight.

What is the government doing to address this? With Bill C-5, it is eliminating mandatory prison time for armed robbery, armed extortion and weapons trafficking.

What is the world coming to? Why is the government so soft on crime?

Hon. David Lametti (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, serious crime will always have serious consequences.

What we are doing with Bill C-5 is completely different. We are targeting the overrepresentation of Black and indigenous people in the criminal justice system. We are talking about offences where public safety is not at stake. For serious offences, there is Bill C-21. I hope the opposition will support both of these bills.

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I invite the Minister of Justice to listen to the following quotation: “while the federal government is using the overrepresentation of indigenous peoples and people of diverse backgrounds in our prisons to justify abolishing many minimum sentences, it seems to forget one important fact: Members of these same communities are equally overrepresented among the victims of these armed crimes”.

This quotation came from Murielle Chatellier, who is a member of Montreal's Black community.

Would the Prime Minister like to discuss Bill C-5 with her, or does he think she is racist, too?

• (1505)

Hon. David Lametti (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, these attempts to spread misinformation about Bill C-5 are appalling. It is important remember that serious offences will always carry serious consequences.

Bill C-5 targets offences where public safety is not threatened. The idea is to give judges the latitude they need to hand down sentences that can help society as well as the victims.

Oral Questions

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, when something comes from the Liberal side, it is always perfect, but when it comes from the opposition parties then it is always disinformation.

I would like to know what the minister thinks about what Quebec's public safety minister said when she announced her strategy to combat gun violence. She said, “To all those gang members terrorizing our citizens...you are going to have to deal with our police officers”. Minister Guilbault wants to enforce the law the way it is meant to be enforced, regardless of colour and without playing political games like the Prime Minister.

If Minister Guilbault agrees with our position and the Prime Minister thinks our position is racist, does he also believe that Minister Guilbault and the Quebec government are racist?

The Speaker: Before we continue, I want to remind members that they are not to refer to their colleagues by name, but rather by their title, even if they are quoting.

Some hon. members: It is a minister from Quebec.

The Speaker: Pardon me, my mistake. Even the Speaker makes mistakes.

The hon. Minister of Public Safety.

Hon. Marco Mendicino (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have spoken several times with my Quebec counterpart, Minister Guilbault, and we will continue to exchange views on Bill C-21. Minister Guilbault announced her support for this bill. She said that it was a step in the right direction for the protection of Quebecers and even all Canadians.

We must start debating this bill so we can implement measures to protect Canadians, and I hope that the Conservatives will now change course.

* * *

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Mr. Angelo Iacono (Alfred-Pellan, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada has committed to reducing greenhouse gas emissions by at least 40% by 2030. Farmers are on the front lines of climate change and their efforts are essential to achieve Canada's climate goals.

Could the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food inform the House of the most recent initiatives that will make a real difference in helping farmers reduce their GHG emissions?

Oral Questions

Hon. Marie-Claude Bibeau (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question. The agricultural sector must be an important partner in our fight against climate change. That is why I was very pleased to recently announce 47 projects totalling \$15 million under the agricultural clean technology program.

These projects will provide subsidies for the purchase of energy efficient equipment, for precision agriculture and for reducing emissions. They will also include investments in research and innovation.

* * *

[English]

ETHICS

Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC): Mr. Speaker, when it comes to ethics violations, the Liberal government has already reached the super-elite status. Whether it is a \$1-billion sweetheart deal with WE Charity or SNC-Lavalin bullying, clam scam nepotism or the \$200,000 illegal vacation by the Prime Minister, it is as though the Liberals are competing for who can be the most unethical.

The Minister of International Trade knew Amanda Alvaro was a close friend who ran her election campaign, and yet she awarded her a \$17,000 contract anyway. When will the minister quit blaming her own department officials and take ownership of and responsibility for her own scandal?

Hon. Mary Ng (Minister of International Trade, Export Promotion, Small Business and Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, here are the facts. This contract was proactively disclosed to the public over two years ago. I was not involved in the awarding of it, and this contract was reviewed by the civil service to ensure compliance with the rules.

Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the minister is being investigated by the Ethics Commissioner because she advanced the personal interests of her friend. Now we understand the Liberals need to pay a premium for spin doctors, given all their scandals. The Minister of International Trade is being investigated because she gave a \$17,000 sole-sourced contract to a CBC pundit who is her dear personal friend and former campaign organizer. This is ridiculous.

Will the minister apologize for her unethical behaviour and hand over all records on this contract to the Ethics Commissioner immediately?

• (1510)

Hon. Mary Ng (Minister of International Trade, Export Promotion, Small Business and Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I said, all information related to this contract was disclosed proactively two years ago.

I might remind the hon. member that at the height of this pandemic, it was critical to ensure that our small businesses and our workers knew what was available to them. I think our record speaks for itself. Five million jobs were—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: The hon. minister will start from the top, please.

Hon. Mary Ng: Mr. Speaker, all of the information related to this contract was proactively disclosed over two years ago.

Let us remember that at the height of this pandemic, it was really critical that small businesses, workers and Canadians understood what was available to them in support. Now the record speaks for itself. Over five million jobs were saved as a result of the wage subsidy, and over 900,000 businesses got small business loans as a result of CEBA.

Mr. Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the contracting authority must not issue multiple contracts against a single requirement or back-to-back contracts to the same supplier in order to avoid obtaining the approval required by statute. These are Treasury Board contracting rules, yet the government has refused to address the rampant splitting of contracts that benefit government insiders.

Internal government documents show several hundred of these violations of the law. Will the President of the Treasury Board commit to the law or commit, instead, to Liberal insiders?

Hon. Mona Fortier (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, all TBS contracts are issued in accordance with government contract regulations and Treasury Board contracting policy, guidelines and procedures.

One of the fundamental principles of federal contracting is openness in providing suppliers with opportunities to submit bids for government contracts. When departments choose a non-competitive procurement strategy, it must be fully justified and recorded. From the perspective of value for money, the cost of awarding a contract outweighs any economic advantage associated with competing for goods under \$25,000 and services in construction contracts under \$40,000.

* * *

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Mr. John Aldag (Cloverdale—Langley City, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in the 42nd Parliament, I introduced Bill C-374, an act to amend the Historic Sites and Monuments Act. That bill responded directly to call to action 79, which calls for the development of “a reconciliation framework for Canadian heritage and commemoration”. It would also help to promote recognition and understanding of the history of indigenous peoples, including their significant ongoing contributions to Canada. This ensures representation for indigenous peoples on the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada.

Could the Minister of Environment and Climate Change tell the House how we are advancing on call to action 79?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my colleague from Cloverdale—Langley City for the important work he did on advancing this very important issue.

The Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada plays a central role in our country's official historic designations. Ensuring representation for indigenous peoples on the board is an important step in responding to call to action 79.

Today, I introduced Bill C-23. The strong legislative framework, the first of its kind in Canada, would help ensure that Canada's treasured historic places are protected. The proposed legislation not only strengthens indigenous voices at the table, but also provides flexibility to adapt and reuse historic places as sustainable ways of addressing the climate change crisis.

* * *

HEALTH

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, experts are clear that we will not control COVID until the world is vaccinated, yet only 10% of people in low-income countries have received a vaccine, compared to 77% in high-income nations. The Liberals promised to send 200 million doses to COVAX, but fewer than 15 million have been delivered to date.

Last year, the WHO said we stood “on the brink of a catastrophic...failure”. Today, Doctors Without Borders says that we have fallen off the cliff.

Why are the Liberals failing to deliver for Canadians and the world?

• (1515)

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan (Minister of International Development and Minister responsible for the Pacific Economic Development Agency of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada has stepped up to vaccinate the world. In fact, the 200 million doses we promised we have actually been delivering to multiple countries around the world.

In fact, tomorrow I have another meeting with multiple nations to discuss the next steps. This is also a supply chain issue. We are making sure we provide the appropriate therapeutics, but we also need to make sure the misinformation that is in our own country does not spread and prevent the acceptance of vaccines around the world.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow members of all parties will have a chance to send Bill C-248, regarding Ojibway national urban park, to committee. It has the support of Windsor and, most importantly, members of the Caldwell First Nation. It is their territory, and their voices need to be heard.

Oral Questions

Caldwell has waited for years for this park to become a reality, and Chief Duckworth has written a letter to every MP requesting that this bill move forward. The government is putting up needless obstacles.

Will the Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations stand up for Caldwell First Nation, or will he side with petty politics and shut it out?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in fact, I stood in this House to announce that we were moving ahead with this very project. I would hope that the member would be happy about that, as we are on this side of the House. We have worked and we will continue to work with indigenous people to build and co-manage national parks in this country.

* * *

CHURCH ATTACK IN NIGERIA

The Speaker: Following discussions among representatives of all parties in the House, I understand there is an agreement to observe a moment of silence in memory of the victims of the church attack in Nigeria.

I now invite hon. members to rise.

[A moment of silence observed]

The Speaker: The hon. member for Edmonton Griesbach is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Blake Desjarlais: Mr. Speaker, there have been consultations among the parties, and if you seek it, I believe you would find unanimous consent for the following motion: That, in the opinion of the House, the government should recognize that (a) young people, particularly indigenous, Black, racialized, disabled and 2SLGBTQQI+ youth, face the most significant and severe impacts of climate change, yet are left out of the decision-making spaces and (b) it, along with the House, has an opportunity to build inclusive and intergenerational decision-making processes around the climate crisis and ensure young people are integral decision-makers by making immediate investments in training young people and equipping them with the skills and resources to lead climate solutions, including, but not limited to, employment opportunities, finances, mentorship, educational grants and scholarships for climate-related fields and equitable access to opportunities and training for youth in remote areas.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: I would like to remind hon. members, if they are seeking unanimous consent, to please consult the other parties before bringing motions to the chamber, just to make sure there is unanimous consent. We will have a lot more positive outcomes.

The hon. member for Windsor West.

• (1520)

Mr. Brian Masse: Mr. Speaker, I believe there were consultations, but that is another story.

Government Orders

I have a document from Caldwell First Nation, in both official languages, that I would like to table for the benefit of all members, seeing as the Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations did not rise to answer my question.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2022, NO. 1

The House resumed from June 6 consideration of Bill C-19, An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on April 7, 2022 and other measures, as reported (with amendment) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

The Speaker: It being 3:20 p.m., pursuant to an order made on Thursday, November 25, 2022, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division at the report stage of Bill C-19.

[*Translation*]

The question is on Motion No. 1. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 2.

● (1530)

(The House divided on Motion No. 1, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 122*)

YEAS

Members

Aboultiaf	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Benzen	Bergen
Berthold	Bezan
Block	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Calkins	Caputo
Carrie	Chambers
Chong	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho
Davidson	Deltell
d'Entremont	Doherty
Dreeshen	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Ellis	Epp
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)
Ferreri	Findlay
Gallant	Généreux
Genuis	Gladu
Godin	Goodridge
Gourde	Gray
Hallan	Hoback
Kelly	Kmiec
Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Kurek	Kusie
Lake	Lantsman
Lawrence	Lehoux

Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Liepert	Lloyd
Lobb	MacKenzie
Maguire	Martel
Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLean	Melillo
Moore	Morantz
Motz	Muys
Nater	O'Toole
Paul-Hus	Perkins
Poilievre	Rayes
Redekopp	Reid
Rempel Garner	Richards
Roberts	Rood
Ruff	Scheer
Schmale	Seeback
Shields	Shipley
Small	Soroka
Steinley	Stewart
Strahl	Stubbs
Thomas	Tochor
Tolmie	Uppal
Van Popta	Vecchio
Vidal	Vien
Viersen	Vis
Wagantall	Warkentin
Waugh	Webber
Williams	Williamson
Zimmer — 113	

NAYS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anandasangaree
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barron	Barsalou-Duval
Battiste	Beaulieu
Beech	Bendayan
Bennett	Bergeron
Bérubé	Bibeau
Bittle	Blaikie
Blair	Blanchet
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney
Blois	Boissonnault
Boulerice	Bradford
Brière	Brunelle-Duceppe
Carr	Casey
Chabot	Chagger
Chahal	Champagne
Champoux	Chatel
Chen	Chiang
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Damoff
Davies	DeBellefeuille
Desilets	Desjarlais
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Dong
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Dzerowicz
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith	Fergus
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fortin	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Gaheer	Garneau
Garon	Garrison

Points of Order

The hon. member for Perth—Wellington is rising on a point of order.

* * *

[*English*]

POINTS OF ORDER

DECORUM

Mr. John Nater (Perth—Wellington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would draw your attention to paragraph 489 of *Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms*, sixth edition, as well as page 3760 of Debates, February 18, 1970, concerning the unparliamentary language used in this place.

Immediately prior to this vote, the Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations, in reference to the member for Windsor West, on two separate occasions, used unparliamentary language. One is the one referred to at page 3760 of Debates, and the other is the French translation of the word “seal”, which is entirely inappropriate for the House.

It offends the dignity of the House, and the member owes an apology to the House and to the member for Windsor West.

● (1535)

The Speaker: This hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader is rising on the same point of order.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, being somewhat familiar with *Beauchesne's* sixth edition, what is important is that any word used in the House is not necessarily parliamentary or unparliamentary. It depends on the context in which it was stated, and I would suggest to you that at the very—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order.

I will let the hon. parliamentary secretary continue.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, if members want, we can be very much standing on our feet, talking about things that are being heckled back and forth from both sides of the House. I would suggest to the members that one does not throw stones in glass houses.

The Speaker: What we will do is we will go to Hansard and go over it to see what was said and if we can find something.

Does the hon. minister want to rise?

Hon. Marc Miller (Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I did more than want to rise. I did rise.

If I used unparliamentary language, I am glad to apologize. What I did say to the member opposite is that if he wants to call me out in the House of Commons, he can at least have the decency to come see me before that. There are plenty of opportunities.

If we are going to have a debate on the substance of this, Mr. Speaker, I think you should understand the motivations for the words that I did express, but if the member has the intellectual integrity to want support for his bill, he can come up and ask me to support it.

Gaudreau	Gazan
Gerretsen	Gill
Gould	Green
Hajdu	Hanley
Hardie	Hepfner
Holland	Housefather
Hughes	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Idlout	Ien
Jaczek	Johns
Jones	Jowhari
Julian	Kayabaga
Kelloway	Khalid
Khera	Koutrakis
Kusmierczyk	Kwan
Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Larouche
Lattanzio	Lauzon
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Lemire	Lightbound
Long	Longfield
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacDonald (Malpeque)	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney
Martinez Ferrada	Masse
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)
May (Saanic—Gulf Islands)	McDonald (Avalon)
McGuinty	McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod
McPherson	Mendès
Mendicino	Miao
Michaud	Miller
Morrice	Morrissey
Murray	Naqvi
Ng	Noormohamed
Normandin	O’Connell
Oliphant	Pauzé
Perron	Petitpas Taylor
Plamondon	Powlowski
Qualtrough	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rogers
Romanado	Sahota
Sajjan	Saks
Samson	Sarai
Savard-Tremblay	Scarpaleggia
Schieffe	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simard	Singh
Sorbara	Ste-Marie
St-Onge	Sudds
Tassi	Taylor Roy
Thériault	Therrien
Thompson	Trudel
Turnbull	Valdez
Van Bynen	van Koevorden
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vignola	Villemure
Virani	Vuong
Weiler	Wilkinson
Yip	Zahid
Zarrillo	Zuberi— 206

PAIRED

Members

Anand	Dowdall
Fast	Guilbeault
Jeneroux	Joly
O’Regan	Patzer— 8

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 1 defeated.

Government Orders

I told him to get off his ass. If that is unparliamentary, I apologize.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order.

The hon. member for Windsor West is rising, I believe on the same point of order.

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I will make this simple. If that is the conduct of the minister in a situation like this, I do not want an apology.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order.

We will review the Hansard and come back to the House with our findings. In the meantime, I want to remind all members on both sides of the House to be very judicious when they use words. Words can have different meanings and different feelings can come out to different people.

* * *

BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2022, NO. 1

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-19, An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on April 7, 2022 and other measures, as reported (with amendment) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

The Speaker: Please be considerate to each other.

[*Translation*]

The question is on Motion No. 3. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 6 to 43.

[*English*]

A negative vote on Motion No. 3 requires the question to be put on Motion No. 4.

The hon. government whip is rising.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, if you seek it, I believe you will find agreement to apply the results of the previous vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting no.

[*English*]

Mr. Blaine Calkins: Mr. Speaker, Conservatives agree to apply and will be voting yes.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting in favour of the motion.

[*English*]

Ms. Rachel Blaney: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agree to apply and will be voting no.

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, the Greens agree to apply and will be voting no.

Mr. Kevin Vuong: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the results of the previous vote to this vote, voting against.

• (1540)

(The House divided on Motion No. 3, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 123*)

YEAS

Members

Aboutaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Barsalou-Duval	Beaulieu
Benzen	Bergen
Bergeron	Berthold
Bérubé	Bezan
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Block	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Brunelle-Duceppe	Calkins
Caputo	Carrie
Chabot	Chambers
Champoux	Chong
Cooper	Dalton
Dancho	Davidson
DeBellefeuille	Deltell
d'Entremont	Desilets
Doherty	Dreeshen
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Ferreri
Findlay	Fortin
Gallant	Garon
Gaudreau	Généreux
Genus	Gill
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gourde
Gray	Hallan
Hoback	Kelly
Kmiec	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Kusie	Lake
Lantsman	Larouche
Lawrence	Lehoux
Lemire	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
MacKenzie	Maguire
Martel	Mazier
McCaughey (Edmonton West)	McLean
Melillo	Michaud
Moore	Morantz
Motz	Muys
Nater	Normandin
O'Toole	Paul-Hus
Pauzé	Perkins
Perron	Plamondon
Poilievre	Rayes
Redekopp	Reid
Rempel Garner	Richards
Roberts	Rood
Ruff	Savard-Tremblay
Scheer	Schmale
Seeback	Shields
Shipley	Simard
Small	Soroka
Steinley	Ste-Marie
Stewart	Strahl
Stubbs	Thériault
Therrien	Thomas
Tochor	Tolmie
Trudel	Uppal

Van Popta
Vidal
Viersen
Villemure
Wagantall
Waugh
Williams
Zimmer— 143

Vecchio
Vien
Vignola
Vis
Warkentin
Webber
Williamson

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Ali
Arseneault
Ashton
Bachrach
Bains
Barron
Beech
Bennett
Bittle
Blair
Blois
Boulerice
Brière
Casey
Chahal
Chatel
Chiang
Collins (Victoria)
Coteau
Damoff
Desjarlais
Dhillon
Dong
Dubourg
Duguid
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Fergus
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser
Gaheer
Garrison
Gerretsen
Green
Hanley
Hepfner
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Ien
Johns
Jowhari
Kayabaga
Khalid
Koutrakis
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lattanzio
LeBlanc
Lightbound
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacGregor
Maloney
Masse
May (Cambridge)
McDonald (Avalon)
McKay

Alghabra
Anandasangaree
Arya
Atwin
Badawey
Baker
Battiste
Bendayan
Bibeau
Blaikie
Blaney
Boissonnault
Bradford
Carr
Chagger
Champagne
Chen
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cormier
Dabrusin
Davies
Dhaliwal
Diab
Drouin
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Garneau
Gazan
Gould
Hajdu
Hardie
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Idlout
Jaczek
Jones
Julian
Kelloway
Khera
Kusmierczyk
Lalonde
Lametti
Lapointe
Lauzon
Lebouthillier
Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Martinez Ferrada
Mathyssen
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)

Government Orders

McLeod
Mendès
Miao
Morrice
Murray
Ng
O'Connell
Petipas Taylor
Qualtrough
Rodriguez
Romanado
Sajjan
Samson
Scarpaleggia
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sorbara
Sudds
Taylor Roy
Turnbull
Van Bynen
Vandal
Virani
Weiler
Yip
Zarrillo

McPherson
Mendicino
Miller
Morrissey
Naqvi
Noormohamed
Oliphant
Powlowski
Robillard
Rogers
Sahota
Saks
Sarai
Schiefke
Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Singh
St-Onge
Tassi
Thompson
Valdez
van Koeverden
Vandenbeld
Vuong
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi— 176

PAIRED

Members

Anand
Fast
Jeneroux
O'Regan

Dowdall
Guilbeault
Joly
Patzner— 8

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 3 defeated, and I therefore declare Motions Nos. 6 to 43 defeated.

The question is on Motion No. 4. A negative vote on Motion No. 4 necessitates the question being put on Motion No. 5.

The hon. government whip.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, if you seek it, I believe you will find agreement to apply the results of the previous vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting yes.

[*English*]

Mr. Blaine Calkins: Mr. Speaker, Conservatives agree to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting in favour of the motion.

[*English*]

Ms. Rachel Blaney: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agree to apply and will be voting in favour.

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, the Greens agree to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.

Mr. Kevin Vuong: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the results of the previous vote, voting in favour.

(The House divided on Motion No. 4, which was agreed to on the following division:)

*Government Orders**(Division No. 124)*

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison	Holland	Housefather
Albas	Aldag	Hughes	Hussen
Alghabra	Ali	Hutchings	Iacono
Allison	Anandasangaree	Idlout	Ien
Arnold	Arseneault	Jaczek	Johns
Arya	Ashton	Jones	Jowhari
Atwin	Bachrach	Julian	Kayabaga
Badawey	Bains	Kelloway	Kelly
Baker	Baldinelli	Khalid	Khera
Barlow	Barrett	Kmiec	Koutrakis
Barron	Barsalou-Duval	Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Battiste	Beaulieu	Kurek	Kusie
Beech	Bendayan	Kusmierczyk	Kwan
Bennett	Benzen	Lake	Lalonde
Bergen	Bergeron	Lambropoulos	Lametti
Berthold	Bérubé	Lamoureux	Lantsman
Bezan	Bibeau	Lapointe	Larouche
Bittle	Blaikie	Lattanzio	Lauzon
Blair	Blanchet	Lawrence	LeBlanc
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney	Lebouthillier	Lehoux
Block	Blois	Lemire	Lewis (Essex)
Boissonnault	Boulerice	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Bradford	Bragdon	Lightbound	Lloyd
Brassard	Brière	Lobb	Long
Brock	Brunelle-Duceppe	Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
Calkins	Caputo	MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)
Carr	Carrie	MacGregor	MacKenzie
Casey	Chabot	MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maguire
Chagger	Chahal	Maloney	Martel
Chambers	Champagne	Martinez Ferrada	Masse
Champoux	Chatel	Mathysen	May (Cambridge)
Chen	Chiang	May (Saamich—Gulf Islands)	Mazier
Chong	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	McCauley (Edmonton West)	McDonald (Avalon)
Collins (Victoria)	Cooper	McGuinty	McKay
Cormier	Coteau	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLean
Dabrusin	Dalton	McLeod	McPherson
Damoff	Dancho	Melillo	Mendès
Davidson	Davies	Mencicino	Miao
DeBellefeuille	Deltell	Michaud	Miller
d'Entremont	Desilets	Moore	Morantz
Desjarlais	Dhaliwal	Morrice	Morrissey
Dhillon	Diab	Motz	Murray
Doherty	Dong	Muys	Naqvi
Dreeshen	Drouin	Nater	Ng
Dubourg	Duclos	Noormohamed	Normandin
Duguid	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	O'Connell	Oliphant
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Dzerowicz	O'Toole	Paul-Hus
Ehsassi	El-Khoury	Pauzé	Perkins
Ellis	Epp	Perron	Petitpas Taylor
Erskine-Smith	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Plamondon	Poilievre
Falk (Provencher)	Fergus	Powlowski	Qualtrough
Ferreri	Fillmore	Rayes	Redekopp
Findlay	Fisher	Reid	Rempel Garner
Fonseca	Fortier	Richards	Roberts
Fortin	Fragiskatos	Robillard	Rodriguez
Fraser	Freeland	Rogers	Romanado
Gaheer	Gallant	Rood	Ruff
Garneau	Garon	Sahota	Sajjan
Garrison	Gaudreau	Saks	Samson
Gazan	Généreux	Sarai	Savard-Tremblay
Genuis	Gerretsen	Scarpaleggia	Scheer
Gill	Gladu	Schiefke	Schmale
Godin	Goodridge	Seeback	Sgro
Gould	Gourde	Shanahan	Sheehan
Gray	Green	Shields	Shipley
Hajdu	Hallan	Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Hanley	Hardie	Simard	Singh
Hepfner	Hoback	Small	Sorbara
		Soroka	Steinley
		Ste-Marie	Stewart
		St-Onge	Strahl
		Stubbs	Sudds
		Tassi	Taylor Roy

Thériault
Thomas
Tochor
Trudel
Uppal
Van Bynen
Van Popta
Vandenbeld
Vidal
Viersen
Villemure
Vis
Wagantall
Waugh
Weiler
Williams
Yip
Zarrillo
Zuberi— 319

Therrien
Thompson
Tolmie
Turnbull
Valdez
van Koeverden
Vandal
Vecchio
Vien
Vignola
Virani
Vuong
Warkentin
Webber
Wilkinson
Williamson
Zahid
Zimmer

NAYS

Nil

PAIRED

Members

Anand
Fast
Jeneroux
O'Regan

Dowdall
Guilbeault
Joly
Patzner— 8

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 4 carried.

[*Translation*]

The question is on Motion No. 44. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 45 to 63.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, if you seek it, I believe that you will find agreement to apply the results of the previous vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting yes.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: I apologize, Mr. Speaker. I meant to say that the Liberals will be voting against.

The Speaker: I think we can record that as a “no”.

[*English*]

Mr. Blaine Calkins: Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives will agree to apply and will be voting in favour.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting against.

• (1545)

[*English*]

Ms. Rachel Blaney: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agree to apply and will be voting no.

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, the Greens agree to apply and will be voting no.

Mr. Kevin Vuong: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the results of the previous vote, voting against.

(The House divided on Motion No. 44, which was negated on the following division:)

Government Orders

(Division No. 125)

YEAS

Members

Aboultiaf
Albas
Arnold
Barlow
Benzen
Berthold
Block
Brassard
Calkins
Carrie
Chong
Dalton
Davidson
d'Entremont
Dreeshen
Ellis
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Ferrerri
Gallant
Genius
Godin
Gourde
Hallan
Kelly
Kram
Kurek
Lake
Lawrence
Lewis (Essex)
Liepert
Lobb
Maguire
Mazier
McLean
Moore
Motz
Nater
Paul-Hus
Poilievre
Redekopp
Rempel Garner
Roberts
Ruff
Schmale
Shields
Small
Steinley
Strahl
Thomas
Tolmie
Van Popta
Vidal
Viersen
Wagantall
Waugh
Williams
Zimmer— 113

Aitchison
Allison
Baldinelli
Barrett
Bergen
Bezan
Bragdon
Brock
Caputo
Chambers
Cooper
Dancho
Deltell
Doherty
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Epp
Falk (Provencher)
Findlay
Généreux
Gladu
Goodridge
Gray
Hoback
Kniec
Kramp-Neuman
Kusie
Lantsman
Lehoux
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lloyd
MacKenzie
Martel
McCaulley (Edmonton West)
Melillo
Morantz
Muys
O'Toole
Perkins
Raves
Reid
Richards
Rood
Scheer
Seeback
Shiple
Soroka
Stewart
Stubbs
Tochor
Uppal
Vecchio
Vien
Vis
Warkentin
Webber
Williamson

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Ali
Arseneault
Ashton
Bachrach
Bains
Barron

Alghabra
Anandasangaree
Arya
Atwin
Badawey
Baker
Barsalou-Duval

Government Orders

Battiste
Beech
Bennett
Bérubé
Bittle
Blair
Blanchette-Joncas
Blois
Boulerice
Brière
Carr
Chabot
Chahal
Champoux
Chen
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cormier
Dabrusin
Davies
Desilets
Dhaliwal
Diab
Drouin
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser
Gaheer
Garon
Gaudreau
Gerretsen
Gould
Hajdu
Hardie
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Idlout
Jaczek
Jones
Julian
Kelloway
Khera
Kusmierczyk
Lalonde
Lametti
Lapointe
Lattanzio
LeBlanc
Lemire
Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Martinez Ferrada
Mathysen
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McPherson
Mendicino
Michaud
Morrisse
Murray
Ng
Normandin
Oliphant
Perron
Plamondon

Beaulieu
Bendayan
Bergeron
Bibeau
Blaikie
Blanchet
Blaney
Boissonnault
Bradford
Brunelle-Duceppe
Casey
Chagger
Champagne
Chatel
Chiang
Collins (Victoria)
Coteau
Damoff
DeBellefeuille
Desjarlais
Dhillon
Dong
Dubourg
Duguid
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Fergus
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Garneau
Garrison
Gazan
Gill
Green
Hanley
Hepfner
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Ien
Johns
Jowhari
Kayabaga
Khalid
Koutrakis
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Larouche
Lauzon
Lebouthillier
Lightbound
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacGregor
Maloney
Masse
May (Cambridge)
McDonald (Avalon)
McKay
McLeod
Mendès
Miao
Miller
Morrissey
Naqvi
Noormohamed
O'Connell
Pauzé
Petitpas Taylor
Powlowski

Qualtrough
Rodriguez
Romanado
Sajjan
Samson
Savard-Tremblay
Schiefke
Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Sorbara
St-Onge
Tassi
Thériault
Thompson
Turnbull
Van Bynen
Vandal
Vignola
Virani
Weiler
Yip
Zarrillo

Robillard
Rogers
Sahota
Saks
Sarai
Scarpaleggia
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Singh
Ste-Marie
Sudds
Taylor Roy
Therrien
Trudel
Valdez
van Koeverden
Vandenbeld
Villemure
Vuong
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi— 206

PAIRED

Members

Anand
Fast
Jeneroux
O'Regan
Dowdall
Guilbeault
Joly
Patzner— 8

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 44 defeated.

[*Translation*]

I declare Motions Nos. 45 to 63 defeated.

[*English*]

Hon. Jonathan Wilkinson (for the Minister of Finance) moved that the bill be concurred in.

The Speaker: 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 Kingston and the Islands.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, I ask for a recorded vote.

● (1555)

[*Translation*]

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

(*Division No. 126*)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Ali
Arseneault
Ashton
Bachrach
Bains
Barron
Battiste
Beech
Bennett
Bérubé
Bittle
Alghabra
Anandasangaree
Arya
Atwin
Badawey
Baker
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bendayan
Bergeron
Bibeau
Blaikie

Government Orders

Blair
Blanchette-Joncas
Blois
Boulerice
Brière
Carr
Chabot
Chahal
Champoux
Chen
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cormier
Dabrusin
DeBellefeuille
Desjarlais
Dhillon
Dong
Dubourg
Duguid
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Fergus
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Garneau
Garrison
Gazan
Gill
Green
Hanley
Hepfner
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Ien
Johns
Jowhari
Kayabaga
Khalid
Koutrakis
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Larouche
Lauzon
Lebouthillier
Lightbound
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacGregor
Maloney
Masse
May (Cambridge)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McPherson
Mendicino
Michaud
Morrissey
Naqvi
Noormohamed
O'Connell
Pauzé
Petitpas Taylor
Powlowski
Robillard
Rogers
Sahota
Saks
Sarai
Scarpaleggia

Blanchet
Blaney
Boissonnault
Bradford
Brunelle-Duceppe
Casey
Chagger
Champagne
Chatel
Chiang
Collins (Victoria)
Coteau
Damoff
Desilets
Dhaliwal
Diab
Drouin
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser
Gaheer
Garon
Gaudreau
Gerretsen
Gould
Hajdu
Hardie
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Idlout
Jaczek
Jones
Julian
Kelloway
Khera
Kusmierczyk
Lalonde
Lametti
Lapointe
Lattanzio
LeBlanc
Lemire
Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Martinez Ferrada
Mathysen
McDonald (Avalon)
McKay
McLeod
Mendès
Miao
Miller
Murray
Ng
Normandin
Oliphant
Perron
Plamondon
Qualtrough
Rodriguez
Romanado
Sajjan
Samson
Savard-Tremblay
Schieffe

Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Singh
Ste-Marie
Sudds
Taylor Roy
Therrien
Trudel
Valdez
van Koeverden
Vandenbeld
Villemure
Vuong
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi — 203

Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Sorbara
St-Onge
Tassi
Thériault
Thompson
Turnbull
Van Bynen
Vandal
Vignola
Virani
Weiler
Yip
Zarrillo

NAYS*Members*

Aboultaif
Albas
Arnold
Barlow
Benzen
Berthold
Block
Brassard
Calkins
Carrie
Chong
Dalton
Davidson
d'Entremont
Dreeshen
Ellis
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Ferrerri
Gallant
Genuis
Godin
Gourde
Hallan
Kelly
Kmiec
Kramp-Neuman
Kusie
Lantsman
Lehoux
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lloyd
MacKenzie
Martel
Mazier
McLean
Moore
Morrice
Muys
O'Toole
Perkins
Rayes
Reid
Richards
Rood
Scheer
Seeback
Shiple
Soroka
Stewart
Stubbs
Tochor
Uppal

Aitchison
Allison
Baldinelli
Barrett
Bergen
Bezan
Bragdon
Brock
Caputo
Chambers
Cooper
Dancho
Deltell
Doherty
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Epp
Falk (Provencher)
Findlay
Généreux
Gladu
Goodridge
Gray
Hoback
Kitchen
Kram
Kurek
Lake
Lawrence
Lewis (Essex)
Liepert
Lobb
Maguire
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Melillo
Morantz
Motz
Nater
Paul-Hus
Poilievre
Redekopp
Rempel Garner
Roberts
Ruff
Schmale
Shields
Small
Steinley
Strahl
Thomas
Tolmie
Van Popta

Business of Supply

Vecchio	Vidal
Vien	Viersen
Vis	Wagantall
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Williams
Williamson	Zimmer— 116

PAIRED

Members

Anand	Dowdall
Fast	Guilbeault
Jeneroux	Joly
O'Regan	Patzer— 8

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

[*English*]

When shall the bill be read a third time?

[*Translation*]

At the next sitting of the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

● (1600)

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—MEASURES FOR IMMEDIATE FINANCIAL RELIEF

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Mr. Francis Drouin (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today we are debating an opposition motion that is supposed to offer solutions to address the impact of inflation. I want to point out to my hon. colleagues that what they are asking for is that the House call on the government to provide immediate assistance. They therefore believe that providing immediate assistance to address the housing problem is to immediately launch a national public inquiry into money laundering. How is that going to provide immediate assistance to Canadians looking for housing?

I do not understand how a national public inquiry into money laundering is going to provide immediate assistance to Canadians. It does not make sense. I cannot believe that anyone even took the time to write this motion. I see no reason whatsoever to support this motion. I will not be able to support it because it makes no sense.

Today we are talking about inflation, and I know that two Conservative members have switched sides.

[*English*]

Two Conservative MPs, on the day the Conservatives presented a motion to come to solutions to fight inflation, decided to jump camp to a specific member of Parliament running for the highest office. His solution to fight inflation is to fire the Governor of the Bank of Canada. I do not see how that is going to help, but that was the big policy idea that this particular member of Parliament came up with. He also suggested that we opt out of inflation by joining the big cryptocurrency movement.

I am not sure if my hon. colleagues on the other side of the House actually watch cryptocurrencies. Let us take Terra Luna, for instance. In April, it was worth \$135.

The Speaker: I will interrupt for a moment. We are trying to hear the parliamentary secretary, and while it is nice to hear everybody getting along and talking, maybe members can keep the tone down a bit so that those who want to hear what the parliamentary secretary has to say will have that option. Those members who want to hear each other can maybe just whisper to each other.

The hon. parliamentary secretary can continue.

Mr. Francis Drouin: Mr. Speaker, just to make sure my colleagues heard me properly, I note that on the day the Conservatives are proposing a motion to fight inflation, with solutions that have no immediate impact on Canadians, two members of Parliament have decided to jump ship to support the member for Carleton, who came up with two policy ideas. Those two grandiose ideas are to fire the Governor of the Bank of Canada and opt out of inflation by investing in cryptocurrency.

With respect to cryptocurrency, I am sure the Conservatives have been following the trajectory of Terra Luna. Terra Luna, about a month and a half ago, was worth \$135 on the market. Today it is worth barely a penny. It is worth \$0.0003. I have not checked out the latest number, but it is not even worth a Canadian penny, and we do not even have pennies.

I do not see how this motion would help Canadians fight inflation. We have put some solutions forward. Obviously, the Canada child benefit is helping families. It is geared toward the cost of inflation, so that is a potential solution.

I represent a big farming community. We have talked about how we can help farmers lower their costs, and fertilizer is certainly in debate. I do not necessarily support simply giving a direct exemption to companies that have decided to continue to do deals with Russia and Belarus, because other companies have changed their supply chains and have made the decision not to continue doing business with them. If I were advocating for a potential solution, it would be to provide aid to farmers directly, as opposed to giving it to companies that continue to do deals with Russian and Belarusian companies.

● (1605)

[*Translation*]

Many companies signed contracts with farmers last summer, telling them they would pay a certain price. Some of those companies are now telling them that even though they signed a contract, they are going to charge them extra fees. When an individual and a company sign a contract in Canada, they are creating a bond of trust.

[*English*]

It is a binding contract. I am fortunate that in my riding this is not happening, but I have heard many, many stories like this in other parts of the country. Companies are not honouring the contracts, and I would hope that they continue honouring them. It is a binding agreement they have signed with farmers and they owe it to our farmers to honour those contracts.

Business of Supply

[Translation]

I do not support this motion because it does not include any solutions that will help Canadians immediately.

[English]

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, CPC): Madam Speaker, the finance minister did not even know that Canada depends on Russia for its fertilizer when the tariffs were decreed. Food has become scarce and more expensive. Carbon taxes on fuel and phasing out the oil sands, our source of fuel, have driven up food prices even higher.

Why is the government intentionally driving up the cost of food? Is it just incompetent?

Mr. Francis Drouin: Madam Speaker, the government is not intentionally increasing the price of food. Everyone is concerned with the price of food around the world. I would invite the hon. member to come to the agriculture committee on Thursday and hear from the agriculture minister from Ukraine, who will explain what the issue is. When Russia is bombing grain terminals, the Government of Canada is not intentionally raising the price of food.

Ukraine is a major contributor on wheat, corn and canola. Canada can play a major role on canola because we have amazing growers out west who grow canola. We can increase the role—

An hon. member: It is not “can play”. We do play.

Mr. Francis Drouin: Yes, we do, Madam Speaker. We export 40% of our canola, and we will continue to do so. We have always supported our farmers in Canada.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I just want to remind members that when somebody has the floor, others should not be trying to have conversations or yelling out other things.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam.

Ms. Bonita Zarrillo (Port Moody—Coquitlam, NDP): Madam Speaker, if the Liberal and Conservative governments would have had courage in the past, and if taxation was fair in this country, we would not be in the mess we are in right now. We would already have pharmacare, affordable child care and affordable housing in this country.

Will the Liberals tax the outsized profits from big box and grocery retail?

Mr. Francis Drouin: Madam Speaker, if we want to create government programs we need to generate revenues. That is a simple fact. Government does not own any dollars. It needs to generate revenues. One way to generate revenues is to unleash the power of entrepreneurship, which is a great idea, and we have great entrepreneurs. Farmers are playing a huge role in this country.

However, we simply cannot create money. Money does not grow on trees. We need to generate wealth, and to do so, we need to ensure our entrepreneurs and private sector are healthy. I believe the economy has been growing. Obviously, we are concerned about inflation, but the solutions provided by the current opposition is not

something that is realistic and will not provide any immediate relief.

Mr. Damien Kurek (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC): Madam Speaker, the member is right that money does not grow on trees. In Canada, we do not even use paper. We use a polymer that based off oil, so there is a very fitting analogy there that oil does produce prosperity in this country.

The member keeps talking about how somehow giving Canadians a break at the pumps will not actually help. We have a very clear and present example, and economists agree, of how definitively the tax cut offered by the Province of Alberta has led to two things. One, it has led to savings for Canadians at the pumps, and two, it has reduced inflation in the province of Alberta by a significant amount.

When a proposal is brought forward that would actually help, and there is proof of it, why will they not support it?

• (1610)

Mr. Francis Drouin: Madam Speaker, as my good Liberal friends Lowell Green and Rob Snow have reminded me, there is always one taxpayer in this country, and he knows the gas tax helps municipalities pay for the costs of operations. I would argue we should be using those dollars to help municipalities pay off some of the operational costs that gas pressures are creating on their own budgets. If they do not have that help, they will need to increase their taxes in return. He knows, because he was part of that government, that they were transferring that gas tax to help municipalities. We have continued that program and we believe in it, but cutting the GST will not help consumers at the pump.

Hon. John McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I find the motion actually pretty easy to vote against. Whoever wrote the motion has been quite brilliant at describing the issue, but not nearly so brilliant at describing the solution.

You might be interested in knowing, Madam Speaker, that I do all the family shopping. I also do the gas purchases and I buy materials for the house. I remember buying two-by-fours during COVID and I had to go to three stores to try to just get one two-by-four and the cost was 100% more than I paid in years previous. I agree with the description of high inflation for everyone, that gas is more expensive and that the cost of food is up. I have experienced that personally.

Business of Supply

What the hon. members from the Conservative Party do not seem to realize is that the supply chains were pretty badly messed up during COVID. Some were out because the countries were locked down. Some were not able to produce the products they had previously. Take for instance, microchips. We could not get any microchips for anything, including a car. Again, within my experience we live in a neighbourhood where we bought a couple of cars and for a considerable period of time there were no cars on the car lot. In fact, we could buy a used car for what we paid a year or two previously for a new car. Just a simple thing like microchips has in and of itself driven up the cost of living quite dramatically.

Add to that the great resignation. People simply do not want to do the jobs that they were doing pre-COVID and that in turn has driven up the cost of labour. I took note in the Report on Business Magazine last weekend that the Royal Bank of Canada has just given a 3% increase across the board to all of its staff because it knows it has difficulty recruiting and retaining staff. We have had representations from Irving, which is building our warships. Its biggest challenge is, again, recruiting and retaining staff, even with substantive increases in salary.

Add to that the Putin war, which took supply chains that were really badly messed up by COVID and only made them more difficult. Sanctions do mean something. They mean that certain products that we are used to purchasing simply cannot be purchased any longer from the Russian-based sources. Add to that the fact that Canada is about 2% of the world's economy. We are in effect inflation takers as opposed to inflation makers. Even for products that we have in substantive quantities such as oil and gas, wheat and various other mineral products, we do not actually get to set the prices. The prices get set by places other than Canada. As I say, we are price-takers, not price makers. We are inflation takers. We are not inflation makers.

On a point of information, as much as the Conservative Party would wish to pin the inflation upon the Prime Minister, I would suggest respectfully that it is a bridge too far even for them.

What is the Conservative solution? The Conservative solution is a reduced consumption tax, and if we do that on the GST and the tax on carbon, everything will be resolved. That is possibly the worst idea ever. Any economist in Canada will say, with the notable exception of Stephen Harper, that if we want to generate government revenues we should be taxing consumption and we should be reducing the tax on labour.

Income tax is a tax on labour. Consumption tax is a tax on consumption. In effect, it is taxing the person who works hard and reducing the taxes on the person who plays hard. If we reduce the consumption tax, it is practically a guarantee that large oil and gas companies and other companies as well will backfill with price increases, and I would expect that our Conservative friends would have recognized that before drafting this motion. The consumer gets no relief. The government revenues are drained. Rich companies get richer, and the working person gets increased income tax. Hardly what one would describe as a brilliant solution.

• (1615)

Finally, there is carbon pricing. The most effective way to reduce carbon consumption, short of turning down the thermostat or reduc-

ing unnecessary travel, is to apply a tax to it. If, in fact, the tax is collected and applied as it should be, then, in the end, the lower-income families will actually receive rebates in the mail. In Ontario, that means \$745, and in Alberta, it means something in the order of just over a thousand bucks.

There are those who say they cannot adjust. For some that is actually true. For others it is simply a lifestyle choice. However, if we are going to be serious about carbon reduction, then we have to apply this sort of tax, which has repeatedly demonstrated to be the most effective way to reduce carbon consumption.

Given that inflation is real, given that we are just 2% of the world's economy, given that we are a trading nation and highly dependent upon external trade, given that the Putin war will not end any time soon and given that inflation is well beyond the Bank of Canada target, what is a relatively small but prosperous economy to do?

We will start with some of our strengths. We have a relatively low debt-to-GDP ratio, possibly the best in the G7. It is the same thing with jobs, as we have had 115% job recovery in the post-COVID era. We have a number of products that the rest of the world wants. There are, frankly, more jobs available here than there are people to fill them. Something about over a million positions are begging for people. Again, we have heard that from various employers who are looking for people to fill positions and simply cannot find them, so we are in a relatively strong position.

Then there are some direct relief measures. The Canada child benefit in my riding is worth over \$100 million per year. That is a significant relief to those constituents of mine who have children. The \$10-a-day child care plan, which is just being rolled out in Ontario, will help a lot of people and it will make a significant difference in terms of the choices that those who wish to take advantage of the program have. In some instances, particularly during the earlier part of this government, we were able to reduce the tax margin for those with lower incomes and apply relief to those who actually needed it the most.

However, we should recognize that the Bank of Canada is the main player here. It has control over monetary policy. The Bank of Canada's monetary policy is independent from government, as it should be. It is possibly the worst idea in the world to have the government control monetary policy because government interests and central bank interests are not always lined up. As an example of that, I might point to Turkey, where the government of the day has taken over monetary policy. That has led to something in the order of 70% inflation. The central bank has renewed its 2% target. We need to recognize that interest rates are going to rise and possibly even dramatically rise.

Our strong monetary policy is our most effective weapon. We have a relatively decent fiscal position. We do not need to yield to the siren song of reduced consumption taxes.

• (1620)

Mr. Adam Chambers (Simcoe North, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is a great honour to ask my hon. colleague a question. He has given so many years to this place in the service of his community.

In the United States, the President as well as the Secretary of the Treasury, Ms. Yellen, have actually taken responsibility for underestimating inflation. Why is it that no one in the government, cabinet or the executive branch, has acknowledged that they underestimated inflation and they were behind the curve? Can they not just say that it is a lot higher than they thought and there are some immediate things that they can do to fix it?

Hon. John McKay: Madam Speaker, I appreciate that question from the hon. member, because in a speech I made about a year ago, or sometime around then, I flagged that particular issue. In fact, from my own grocery shopping, I recognized that inflation was here. I actually sat down with the PBO at one point and said, “I don’t understand why we are not more alarmed about inflation.” People from the Office of the PBO had an explanation that I frankly could not understand, but that said, they were still very helpful in trying to explain it to me.

The Bank of Canada had described inflation at that time as “transitory”. I think it recognized that it was on its way but did not recognize that it was possibly going to be more long-standing than it had previously anticipated, and if there is an issue to be had there, I think that is a legitimate point.

[Translation]

Mr. Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ): Madam Speaker, I listened carefully to my colleague across the way. Basically, he is saying what we are also thinking, which is that the opposition motion is a bogus solution for real problems. I understood that he was objecting to one aspect of the motion, which would be to temporarily stop charging the GST on gas and fuel, since it is unclear whether that money would go to consumers.

However, would my colleague agree that the surplus the government is currently reaping from higher gas prices could be used to provide relief to those hit hardest by inflation? These include low-income earners, seniors, agricultural workers, taxi drivers, truck drivers, and so on. Support programs could be put in place for these people.

[English]

Hon. John McKay: Madam Speaker, in saying “a false solution to a real problem”, the hon. member described it better than I did, and I think he is right.

With respect to the revenues, yes, inflation has that effect of giving the revenues a temporary boost, but it is a temporary boost, because once we get the revenues in, the bills start arriving as well, so the costs of running a government are actually going to be much greater because there is necessarily going to be wage inflation, which is essentially what government is.

Business of Supply

As to spending the revenues that are coming in, I would not go for that kind of an idea immediately. There have been various relief elements, particularly for seniors, that have been distributed over the last couple of years.

• (1625)

Ms. Bonita Zarrillo (Port Moody—Coquitlam, NDP): Madam Speaker, I can tell the hon. member that seniors, single moms and persons with disabilities do not need a lecture from this government on inflation. What they need is food on the table for their families this summer.

My question is this: Will the Liberal government finally start taxing outsized profits so that we can share some of this prosperity with the community?

Hon. John McKay: Madam Speaker, I am shocked.

The federal government is already taxing those who are making excess profits. There is an excess profits tax built right into the system, so I am not quite sure what the hon. member is driving at, but those companies that are making extraordinary incomes will receive an excess profits tax allocation when they file their returns.

[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, Natural Resources; the hon. member for Vancouver East, Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship; the hon. member for Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound, Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship.

[English]

Ms. Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC): Madam Speaker, I will be splitting my time today with the hon. member for Beauce.

I rise today on behalf of so many in the great community of Thornhill to speak in favour of this motion, and I will add my voice to the chorus of those calling on the government to finally tackle the cost-of-living crisis in this country.

Canadians like those in my own family and in my community chose to make Canada home, the best country in the world, because it was the land of opportunity where anybody, no matter where they came from or who they were, could get ahead. Like millions of others who came here, they worked hard, saved their money, contributed to their communities and shared in the uniquely Canadian ideal that their children would be able to inherit a life greater and more prosperous than the one they led or, in some cases, more prosperous than the one they fled.

That dream is in jeopardy, and we have the government to thank for that.

Business of Supply

It is not an overnight phenomenon; it is a consistent erosion of the way of life. It is most certainly not just a product of a global phenomenon, as Liberals continue to claim; it is unique to Canada in many ways. A recent survey stated that 30% of young Canadian immigrants are likely to leave this country. What is the reason? Three-quarters of them said that the rising cost of living is pushing them away to more affordable places. It is most certainly not talking down this country, as we have heard claimed on the other side. In fact, we are the only ones saying they should stay.

New immigrant families are no longer living the Canadian dream. For the first time in our history, parents are not really sure if their children will have better lives than the one that they have. They are leaving our country. They are going to pursue the American dream or the British dream or the Australian dream. That is not a joke; it is the truth. The failure of the government to tackle the inflation crisis is driving valuable talent elsewhere, and the loss of good, hard-working, university-educated individuals, tradespeople and everyone in between will pose major economic problems for us in the future.

It is not only young immigrants who are being squeezed by the inflation crisis; it is also Canadians from coast to coast to coast. It is everyone. How does the government expect families everywhere to get by when the average cost of living goes up by 6.8%? That is now. That is what we are facing. It is the real pressure that few on the other side seem to recognize.

How does the government expect commuters to drive to their jobs when the cost of gas has gone up 60% in a year? How does the government expect seniors to be able to heat their homes when the cost of natural gas increased 22% last year? How does the government expect millennials to be able to afford a new home when the cost of housing went up 7.4% last year, and more than 10% in my own neck of the woods? People cannot afford to live where they grew up, and telling them to move elsewhere is frankly offensive. Telling them to buy an electric car is void of common sense and of an understanding of the reality of most people.

The government is not concerned with economic development. I will ask this: Has it built any pipelines lately? The answer is no. It bought some. It is not increasing wages, because real wages shrank in this country by 2.6% last year, and we know that it is not lowering taxes on hard-working Canadians because it does not do that. In fact, the government has had no solutions and no plan to help families get by at this critical juncture. It has completely lost the plot.

I have been part of budgets before, and this big budget is devoid of vision. That is one thing, but imagine a document that has no vision and no actual relief. It is not even astute politically. It is just a book of words. The response to the record high gas prices was a higher-than-ever carbon tax and no GST holiday, with not a care in the world. That is because higher prices are the plan, and we would be better off if the Liberals just admitted it.

Their response to worker shortages that not only cause confusion and delay but also make almost everything more expensive is doubling down on the vindictive and ineffective vaccine mandate that pushes more and more skilled workers to the side when we need as many people as possible on the job. There are a million job vacan-

cies in this country. The government can act, and it absolutely knows it.

What is the government's response to the housing crisis, with million-dollar homes in the GTA and families that need over \$250,000 a year to be able to afford a down payment on an average house? Its solution is enacting a housing credit for a meagre \$500.

● (1630)

I have said before that this is not a typo. It is a real number. It is laughable, but it is real. If people cannot afford a house, which is not surprising, they cannot even afford rent. There has been a 4.5% increase in rental rates in the last month. We know that the Liberals have promised to build more affordable housing. They have promised projects financed with the Infrastructure Bank that have gone absolutely nowhere, because it is not a bank and it does not build infrastructure. Despite the government's promise on the pressing issues, it most certainly cannot be accused of putting more housing supply out there, of building more houses.

The government has failed in its commitment to help the middle class. That is what it was elected to do. I remember it very well. In 2015, it was about the middle class and those working hard to join it. The Liberals have shrunk the middle class, and Canadians will not forget it. How could they, frankly, when gas is \$2.15 a litre? How could they, when they will be paying off student loans for 30 years? How could they, when their mortgage payments in the GTA on a bungalow are 50% of the average salary? How could they, when they have to choose between heating their homes and eating nutritious food?

There is a reason the Prime Minister thinks things are going so well in this country and there is a reason he has no plan: He does not have to pump his own gas and he has no idea how much it costs. He does not have to go to the grocery store every week. He does not have a mortgage payment on a house. He does not have student loans to pay back.

It is time for some serious policy to get this country back on track. The Liberals could do it.

Here is where we could start: We could scrap the GST on gasoline and diesel to help struggling families fill up, to help the floundering transportation sector, to help resolve the supply chain issues causing chaos across our country and to help the consumer who is paying for all of it.

Business of Supply

Let us suspend the carbon tax. Let us make good nutritious food more affordable for hard-working families. Let us make it cheaper to get on a plane, train or a bus. Let us do that for everybody. Let us scrap those vindictive mandates that are not only keeping Canadians separated but are also causing major labour shortages, the one that they lean on in every single answer in this country.

The Liberals are hurting small businesses, hurting tourism and hurting the pocketbooks of every single Canadian across this country. Let us scrap the other restrictions too, the ones that our allies did away with months ago, to promote the free flow of goods across our borders to make sure that Canada remains competitive as a place for international investment and those who want to bring it here.

Let us make housing more affordable and more attainable for every single Canadian by launching a national public inquiry into money laundering and curbing rampant speculation in our markets, and oh, let us get some housing built. Let us get some actual housing built, faster.

At a time when 53% of Canadians are \$1,000 away from bankruptcy and when seven out of 10 say that money is a major issue for them, we need to consider every idea possible. I am not sure what is going on on the other side of the House. I am not sure if they do not go back to their constituencies or they do not hear about this at the gas station, grocery store or anywhere they go.

Let us make life more affordable for hard-working families everywhere in this country. Canadians are hurting, and they are looking for the government to take action. If Liberal members spent even one moment talking to one constituent in their riding, they would hear that too. Canadians are counting on us.

This is about more than the motion. It is about more than a debate about the numbers and the rates and the percentages. We know that Canadians are hurting, and it is about Canadians. It is about the fact that they are hurting and nobody is listening. Let us pass this motion and get this country back on track, even if it is just for a short amount of time before the Liberals ruin everything again.

Let us pass this motion and get us back on track. Let us reignite the Canadian dream. Let us make this nation a place where Canadians can truly prosper. It starts today, and we are not going to give up until it happens for every single citizen in this country.

I might ask the same questions every single day, but we are not going to give up until something changes. We cannot wait. The alarm bells are sounding, and for some reason, members in the government are just not listening.

• (1635)

Mr. Kody Blois (Kings—Hants, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the member talked about hearing from constituents in the riding.

When I look at the text of the motion, I see a series of different principles that the Conservatives have put forward. One relates to the GST on fuel. As a member of Parliament who makes almost \$200,000 a year in terms of my work, and the member opposite would probably be somewhere in the same range, why would she think that eliminating GST on all gas is a targeted measure?

I agree with the principle that perhaps the government should look at the GST and make this measure specific to individuals who have lower incomes, but the way the Conservatives are proposing it, everyone across the board, including millionaires, would receive this benefit. Would the member not agree that MPs should not be eligible for that type of benefit?

Ms. Melissa Lantsman: Madam Speaker, I do not think there is a single tax cut that they would support on gasoline. This is a party that wants to see gas prices get higher. It would be better if the member opposite just told us that. The Liberals want to see the price of gas be over \$2. That is part of the plan. Cutting the GST, which is a tax upon the tax, will give real relief at the pumps for constituents in his riding, who, I understand, need to drive a car really far to see him and tell him.

Mr. Taylor Bachrach (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Madam Speaker, I want to speak directly to the issue of travel-related public health measures. I think it is fair to say that it is premature to lift every single federal public health measure related to travel, but I share the member's frustration that the government has refused to provide the basic information necessary to explain to Canadians why unvaccinated people still cannot fly within the country.

People simply want to see the evidence. They want an explanation. It is frustrating that those of us who support public health and support vaccination are unable to explain to people why this measure still exists when experts are calling it into question almost every week now.

Can my colleague talk about why she thinks the government is so reluctant to provide that information to the House and to Canadians?

Ms. Melissa Lantsman: Madam Speaker, I enjoy the work that my hon. colleague and I do on the transport committee, where we have heard expert after expert tell us that these mandates no longer make sense. We have asked the government, for months and months, to provide the specific scientific data. They have not, and they will not, and that is because it is vindictive and punitive to people who do not agree with their world view.

We are still testing 4,000 people upon arrival in airports. We have lineups out the door. I have a flight on Friday out of Pearson, and I want to know from the government if I should go today and line up, because that is what is happening in our economic centre, in Toronto's Pearson airport. It is not just people who are waiting in line who are affected. It is people who are not allowed to fly. There are about five million Canadians that the government has othered and continues to other, because it is punitive.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Sylvie Bérubé (Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou, BQ): Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for her speech.

Business of Supply

I think you often double down on previous motions that were already defeated in the House, such as eliminating consumer taxes, immediately ending health measures and abolishing the carbon tax.

Clearly these proposals do not really help people cope with the global issue of inflation that is affecting a number of essential products and services, nor do they do anything beyond addressing prices of individual products.

Inflation is here and it is real. What real solutions are you proposing to help those hard hit by inflation?

● (1640)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I would like to remind the hon. member to direct her questions through the Chair in the future and not directly to other members.

The hon. member for Thornhill.

[*English*]

Ms. Melissa Lantsman: Madam Speaker, I will be brief. Just because we ask the government or tell the government that we think the carbon tax should be eliminated, or just because we want a GST cut, or just because we have proposed solutions a number of times, it does not mean they are wrong. They are absolutely right, and we are going to continue standing up for Canadians in the House every single day until it gets done.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Richard Lehoux (Beauce, CPC): Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak to our Conservative motion and, most importantly, to advocate for the interests of my constituents and all Canadians.

This country is on the brink of disaster, yet the Prime Minister and his government continue to make decisions that are hurting Canadian families. The Prime Minister is quick to blame COVID-19 and the war in Ukraine, but does he ever look in the mirror? Does he wonder how many of his decisions have made life harder for Canadians? Most of the problems we are dealing with today are problems that were made worse by the Prime Minister.

I want to start by talking about the carbon tax and about how it punishes hard-working Canadians.

The Prime Minister keeps blaming Mr. Putin and his war machine for the rising cost of gas. In reality, the taxes imposed by this government are the main cause behind the rising prices. The cost of gas in my riding is above \$2.23 a litre today. That is unacceptable.

This Prime Minister has a trust fund and has probably never gone to a gas station. I am therefore not surprised that he does not understand the impact this can have on the wallets of ordinary Canadians. He and his ministers have drivers who pick them up and drop them off everywhere. He also has a private jet that can take him wherever he wants, whenever he wants, all at taxpayers' expense.

Beauce is in a rural part of Quebec. The men and women in my riding work very hard and do not have the luxury of being driven by professional drivers. They do not even have access to public transit because our towns are far apart from one another. These men and women have to get up every morning, pull on their boots and then work very hard to pay their bills, but the government continues to reach deeper and deeper into their pockets. People now have to

choose between paying their mortgages to avoid losing their homes and skipping a meal, because they cannot afford to do both.

Our party tried to get similar motions adopted over the past few months, but the new love story between the NDP and the Liberals has put the brakes on every attempt we have made to make life more affordable for all Canadians. I have to say it is shameful.

Last week, in the House, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Tourism and Associate Minister of Finance and member for Outremont suggested that the Conservatives just wanted to give Canadians a tax break and that would not help them in the long run. Does the government not understand that Canadian families are having serious problems right now?

Families need a break from these inflated prices, and they need it now. My office continues to be inundated with calls from new parents, seniors and persons with disabilities who are unable to put food on the table because of this government's punitive taxes and its refusal to work with the opposition. Our party understands that inflation is currently a global phenomenon, but does the government not see that by adding self-inflicted policies, it has placed an added burden on the country?

Food inflation alone is at 9.7%. Economists agree that this number is the result of several factors, many of which could be addressed right here on our doorstep. There is no question that the carbon tax is having the greatest effect on pricing across the country. Companies are trying to offset their extra costs by passing them on to the consumer. Have Canadians not suffered enough during this pandemic? Then there is the fact that we are the only country in the world to impose the infamous 35% tariff on fertilizer from Russia.

● (1645)

Many questions have been asked here in the House and elsewhere about why the government is still imposing this tariff on our hard-working farm families. The only thing the minister has to say is that farmers can borrow more.

Business of Supply

Let us think about this logically for a minute. These tariffs have a minimal impact on Russia. They have a much greater negative impact on hard-working Canadian farmers. We see the impact every time we walk into a grocery store. The price of food has gone up because of the carbon tax, and now the same thing is happening because of these draconian fertilizer tariffs. Farmers can borrow money to pay sky-high prices for fertilizer, but, once again, they have to pass that cost on to consumers sooner or later to hit the break-even point.

I would like to talk about our tourism sector and federal public employees. The government is refusing to say when it will change federal COVID-19 requirements both at the border and in government offices. All we want is a plan. Canada's tourism sector is wasting away. This summer should have been the perfect time to visit the whole country and help our economy prosper. Instead, many other nations consider our country to be a joke. Pearson airport and many other international airports are in such disarray that nobody wants to visit our great country. Many people are deciding to take their money elsewhere. As a proud Canadian, I find that very upsetting.

Our federal public servants, who just want to get back to work, are not being allowed to do so because of vaccination and masking policies that are dividing Canadians. With the backlogs we are seeing at Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada and the passport offices, would it not be a good idea to have all public servants back at work, in order to get our country back on track?

In closing, I can only hope that my speech today will encourage this government to reconsider its positions, because Canadians deserve better than what they are currently getting from their government. We are all here to serve our constituents, and it pains me to see the repercussions this is having in my riding.

We feel a bit powerless when a minority government can push whatever it wants through Parliament, without being held accountable. The NDP is largely responsible for this, so I hope that party will finally see the light and stop supporting this Liberal government on everything.

I urge all my colleagues to support this motion. We must help Canadians now, before it is too late. The Prime Minister will have to live with the legacy of this deliberate failure for the rest of his life.

I will be happy to respond to my colleagues' questions and comments.

• (1650)

Mr. Kody Blois (Kings—Hants, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my hon. colleague for his speech. Yesterday, he asked Ukrainian MP Yulia Klymenko if she supported the 35% tariff on fertilizer. She very clearly stated that we should do everything in our power to avoid supporting Russia.

For the past few weeks, the Conservatives have been saying we should support Ukraine, so why are they asking for rebates instead of calling for the tariff to be maintained to deter imports from Russia?

Mr. Richard Lehoux (Beauce, CPC): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question.

Yes, I did ask the representative of the Ukrainian government that question yesterday. Perhaps I did not specify the consequences of the 35% surcharge on anything ordered and paid for before March 2.

Everyone agrees that we should support Ukraine. It is important to understand that the conflict began on March 2. Everything purchased after March 2 will have repercussions for Russia. In terms of fertilizer ordered in the fall of 2021, I think that we should be supporting our farmers instead, because they are the ones bearing the brunt of this right now.

Mr. Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ): Madam Speaker, my colleague obviously has good intentions.

There might be a little problem with the approach, however. Would my colleague agree that a program should be created with the surplus to help workers whose livelihoods are at risk because of the rising cost of diesel and gas? I am talking about farmers, truckers, taxi drivers and everyone who is struggling to make ends meet right now. Does he think the surplus could go directly to the workers who need help?

If not, could he explain how he would ensure that removing the GST from diesel and gas would truly benefit consumers?

Mr. Richard Lehoux: Madam Speaker, the member should take time to read through the motion we have moved. We are proposing to suspend the GST and the carbon tax to provide immediate relief.

There may be something worthwhile in what the member is proposing, but today we are debating a motion, not a budget. I want to make that clear.

Suspending the GST for the next few weeks is a concrete action we could put in place tomorrow morning. All Canadians would benefit from this, not just the farmers who need it. This would generate economic spinoffs across the country.

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his speech.

The leader of the NDP has made some interesting proposals. Banks, insurance companies and oil companies are making record profits, while people are struggling to pay their bills.

Why not impose a temporary tax on excessive profits so that we can take that money and redistribute it to people through the Canada child benefit and by doubling the GST tax credit? That is far more practical and fair.

Mr. Richard Lehoux: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question.

I am not saying that his suggestion is not worthwhile. However, if we want to quickly take real action, I think that what we are proposing in this motion would have a far greater and more immediate impact on the ground.

Business of Supply

• (1655)

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am wondering if the member could provide his thoughts in regard to the Canada Infrastructure Bank. His colleague was very critical of Canada Infrastructure Bank, yet it has invested hundreds of millions of dollars in many areas in the country, and in particular in Brampton, for example, where it is actually responsible for ensuring that they get electric buses.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Richard Lehoux: Madam Speaker, I myself have not seen much in the way of positive outcomes from Infrastructure Bank of Canada projects. On the contrary, I think there are good reasons to get rid of it.

Mr. Kody Blois (Kings—Hants, Lib.): Madam Speaker, let me start by saying I will share my time this afternoon with my hon. colleague from Kingston and the Islands.

I think questions about affordability are good questions. I think most MPs here understand the reality of this problem in Canada and around the world. I am delighted to have the opportunity to engage in a debate about policies that can help Canadians. I will talk about this problem in general terms while also addressing the specific points in the opposition motion.

First, I think it is important to recognize that there are several reasons for the inflation we are seeing in Canada and around the world, because inflation is a global problem. According to Statistics Canada, the country's inflation rate was 6.8% in April. I just want to point out that many other countries are in the same situation as us or even worse off. For example, in Germany, inflation is at 7.9%. In the eurozone in general, it is 8.1%. In the United States, it is 8.3%. In Spain, it is 8.7%. In the United Kingdom, it is 9%.

I absolutely understand that inflation is a problem in Canada. My point is not to minimize its impact on Canadians, since all Canadians and all parliamentarians understand that it is a problem for everyone in the world. What is causing this phenomenon? There is no single reason for the situation we are in right now. There are several causes.

The primary reason for inflation is of course the supply chain. That is a fact. During the pandemic, there were a lot of problems with the workforce and with the supply chain because of obstacles created by the health restrictions put in place to protect our collective health.

Another reason for inflation is the labour shortage. According to Statistics Canada, during the last quarter of 2021, there were roughly one million job vacancies. This is a reality in every western country because of the demographic situation resulting from the current or imminent retirement of baby boomers.

A third reason is the war in Ukraine, about which I asked my hon. colleague from Beauce a question just before my speech. The situation on the ground is terrible. The Russians are targeting infrastructure that is crucial for both the Ukrainians and the world. Yesterday we listened to testimony from Yulia Klymenko, a Ukrainian member of parliament, on how Russian soldiers are tar-

geting bridges, factories and grain storage facilities. This is also part of the problem.

I objectively recognize that another partial reason for inflation is of course the money spent by governments around the world at the height of the pandemic, along with certain restrictions imposed for the sake of protecting our collective health.

• (1700)

[*English*]

I could go on at great length about the initiatives that this government has taken on since 2015 in relation to affordability. I am proud of that record. I am happy to quickly highlight some of them, but I do want to get to the text of the motion so that we can debate what is before us today.

The first thing this government did, I was not a part of. My honourable predecessor Scott Brison was in the House when the first thing the government did was lower income taxes for lower- and middle-income Canadians and raise them for higher-income Canadians.

On child care, we were the government that has and will continue to deliver national child care. This is something that has been talked about at great length. We have already seen a 25% reduction, on average, of fees in my home province of Nova Scotia. Those are concrete measures that we have taken forward.

I am a rural member of Parliament. We know the importance of supporting seniors. That is exactly why our government brought the old age security age for when someone will be eligible down from 67, to which the Conservatives proposed to raise it. We brought it back down to 65. We have also increased old age security by 10% for those who are 75 and older, and we have strengthened the guaranteed income supplement. The results have been telling. Nearly a million seniors were lifted out of poverty. That is under our watch, and they are affordability measures that matter.

We have heard a lot about the Canada child benefit. We reformed a program that had previously targeted higher-income earners. I have heard, on the doorsteps, the difference that makes in the lives of vulnerable families and single mothers, and I think it is something that should be celebrated.

I want to highlight a couple solutions I think would be important as a member of Parliament. I know the government is seized with the question, as many governments around the world are, on inflation.

I want to talk about the GST on gasoline and diesel. I asked the member for Thornhill about this. I do not mind the measure. I just do not think it is targeted enough. When I go to fill up at the pumps, I am noticing it. It is up over \$100 right now. That is largely tied to the global market, but I am very privileged and fortunate. Every member of Parliament has a basic indemnity here that is higher than the average Canadian salary. I personally do not think that those types of measures, which could help support affordability, should be targeted to high-income Canadians.

I think we also have to be mindful of the fiscal framework. I love to see some of my Conservative colleagues talk about the government having to do something and that it has to be there to support vulnerable Canadians, but we cannot throw the fiscal framework out with the bath water. That is something I believe in and we have to be measured and responsible in terms of how we use public funds in the days ahead, not just give benefits to Canadians who really do not need them, objectively.

Looking at considering removing or expanding the programs that exist right now that reduce or eliminate GST on home heating fuels for low-income Canadians is also a really good idea. At the end of the day, as a rural member of Parliament, I can say that rural Canadians are more vulnerable to some of the costs around home heating. Many rural Canadians have not been able to make the same transition to the types of home heating systems where fossil fuel is not used. As an example, in Nova Scotia, nearly 50% of residents still use home heating oil. That is going to be a challenge as we head back to the winter of 2023, and I think something targeted in this domain would be beneficial.

Last would be the grocery code of conduct. This is something that is extremely beneficial to be looking at for food affordability.

I have already touched on (a) of the Conservative motion.

On carbon pricing, this is in place to try to help incentivize to reduce emissions. It is inherently a Conservative principle. I have chatted with some of my Conservative colleagues about why they do not like a market-based system that actually allows consumers to be able to make choices. I take notice that in certain provinces, because they have not stepped up with their own program, the federal backstop is sometimes clunky, but I do think this is something that needs to stay.

On fertilizer, I asked my hon. colleague from Beauce about this. I think the tariff should stay. The government should be looking at ways to indemnify farmers and certainly that tariff has to stay to dissuade the importation of Russian fertilizer.

● (1705)

On the mandates, I think, certainly, in a domestic sense, the government should continue to be looking at making adjustments for domestic travel.

I will finish on that and take questions.

Mrs. Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the member one very specific question. The Liberal government has been talking today about employment stats and 3.5 million jobs created. He is talking about a lack of people to employ in jobs that are available.

Business of Supply

I am concerned that the government is overlooking a significant part of our population, and I would like to ask him if they are included in the statistics in regard to those who are unemployed. There are hundreds of thousands of Canadians who were fired by the government or whose ability to earn an income for their family was impacted by the government's COVID policies. As well, they are denied the EI that they have paid into.

I wonder if he is aware of the statistics in regard to how many Canadians do not have work and are not able to get a job.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I want to remind members that whether someone is speaking in the House or virtually, if it is not time for them to raise their voice in the House, they should not be doing it.

The hon. member for Kings—Hants.

Mr. Kody Blois: Madam Speaker, my understanding is that about 1% of federal civil servants have not been vaccinated. I think this policy was justified at the height of the pandemic. I think that as long as we continue to work ourselves out of the pandemic, from a legal perspective the government will have to look at adjusting the policies.

She mentioned hundreds of thousands of people who have not been vaccinated. There are not those same principles in all workplaces, so I reject the premise that individuals cannot find employment in the country on the basis of their vaccination status.

As it relates to federal jurisdiction, as I mentioned, the government will have to be mindful of whether there is a legal requirement to accommodate in the days ahead, particularly as we move forward and get beyond the height of the pandemic.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Marie-Hélène Gaudreau (Laurentides—Labelle, BQ): Madam Speaker, clearly there are good things in the motion in question. We need to examine it more closely. There is a great deal of emphasis on the carbon tax, and therefore I am going to focus on something that the Bloc Québécois already criticized several weeks ago, namely the infamous 35% tax on everything purchased in fall 2021 or before March 2.

The people of Laurentides—Labelle called my riding office to tell me that it is unfair and unjust, and it has a direct effect on inflation, which arrived quickly and will not be resolved. Given that even the official opposition mentioned this several times, what action will be taken to restore fairness to this situation?

Mr. Kody Blois: Madam Speaker, I will state a few facts before answering the question. The Conservatives' current position is that the 35% tariff on fertilizer imported from Russia should be eliminated.

Business of Supply

In the case of farmers who purchased their fertilizer before the start of the war, that is the right thing to do, and I hope that the government will consider giving them a rebate.

However, they must change their supply chain and look for other markets. I believe that buying fertilizer that costs less is a fair solution. I am of the opinion that after the war, however, we will have to keep the tariff and find other solutions for affordable imports.

• (1710)

[*English*]

Mr. Taylor Bachrach (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Madam Speaker, Canadians are going to the grocery store and to the gas pump, and they are seeing these eye-wateringly increased prices on the basic necessities. At the same time, the companies that sell those necessities are not simply passing along higher costs. They are also making dramatic profits.

I am wondering if my colleague across the way could tell the House why his government has refused to consider a windfall profits tax on companies that are making dramatic profits, similar to the tax that the U.K. has put in place on oil and gas companies that are gouging consumers.

Mr. Kody Blois: Madam Speaker, our government, in the budget of 2022, has introduced a higher rate for banking interests. We are looking at the grocery code of conduct. At the end of the day, there are a number of initiatives that the government is trying to take to create a balanced playing field. It may not be exactly what the member opposite is calling for, but the government is looking at a variety of options to try to make sure that those who have the propensity to pay are paying a more equitable share to support the programs that we all consider really important.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons (Senate), Lib.): Madam Speaker, I will start by saying, “Wow.” As if it were not enough that all of these items have already been dealt with in the House through various different opposition day motions over the last few months, the Conservatives have suddenly decided that it would be in their best interests to bring forward what the Conservative opposition leader referred to this morning as an omnibus motion. It is as though they do not actually think there is a chance that this would ever pass, yet they still bring it forward to the House in an attempt to do, I do not know what, because there are so many issues in here that anybody can literally get up and speak to. There is no ability to be concise and try to improve one policy or another. It is literally an airing of grievances, and it is so unfortunate to see the Conservative Party use its opposition day to do this.

Having said that, I have been listening to the debate for the last several hours, and at the heart of the debate is affordability, which is a really good discussion and debate to have, so I will focus my comments primarily on the affordability issues right now and what I see as the difference between the government's position and the opposition's position in terms of how to deal with that.

For starters it is very important to put on the record, and I know that several of my colleagues have done this today already, that the inflation problem we are seeing is not unique to Canada. As a matter of fact, Canada, among the developed countries, is toward the bottom in terms of the level of inflation. I am not suggesting for a

second that it is acceptable in any way or that it is not creating a lot of hardships, because indeed it is, but it is important to address the problems in their totality.

This brings me to a comment that was made earlier today by the member for Simcoe North. In response to my question about affordability and about inflation being a global problem, his response was basically that just because other countries have an inflation problem, the reason they are experiencing those problems is that they had the same monetary and fiscal policies throughout the pandemic that Canada had, which I found very fascinating. The member is basically telling the House that he disagrees with the position that developed countries throughout the world took in fighting against the economic hardships that were endured during the pandemic. It is what he basically said. It makes me reflect on where Conservatives would have preferred to see not just this government and Canada go, but indeed developed countries throughout the world during the pandemic.

It is pretty clear through the member for Simcoe North's comments and what I have been hearing today, and for that matter over the last two years, that Conservatives would have preferred an approach that just left everybody to themselves to deal with their own individual hardships throughout the pandemic. Luckily, the Canadian government and governments throughout the developed world disagreed with the member and the Conservative Party when they decided it was in the better interests of Canadians and the western world to make sure that we invested in people to get through this pandemic.

Did that lead to some issues with respect to supply chains and inflation? I think everyone can agree that to some degree those policies played a role. Now is the time for government, and we are seeing this throughout the western world, in developed countries and in Canada as well, to start developing and implementing new monetary policy to help deal with some of that inflation.

I also found it very interesting when the member for Thornhill stood and somehow tried to suggest that when it comes to affordability, young Canadians are, in her words, fleeing Canada for “the British dream” and “the American dream”.

• (1715)

Is the member for Thornhill not aware that the inflation rates in the U.S. and Britain are actually much higher? In fact, compared to Canada, which is at 6.8%, the inflation rate in the United States is at 8.3%, and in Britain it is 9%. This hyped-up rhetoric by the Conservatives to somehow try to suggest that this is a problem just within Canada and that only people living in Canada are experiencing it just is not the reality of the situation. That is quite obvious in the comments that have been made by the member for Thornhill and indeed other Conservatives.

I also just cannot wrap my head around the fact that a member of Parliament would come in here and suggest it is the government's plan to make prices higher, that it is intentionally trying to make it more difficult for Canadians in terms of affordability. The member for Thornhill was asked a great question by the member for Kings—Hants and of course completely sidestepped it and did not address the question.

Business of Supply

The question she was asked by the member for Kings—Hants was why she thinks the GST should be eliminated for everybody. Would it not make more sense to ensure that any kind of reduction in taxes or rebates, however one would model it, was targeted at those who needed it the most?

Indeed, the member for Kings—Hants was absolutely correct. I do not think any member of Parliament, knowing what our salaries are, really needs to have the GST eliminated from their purchases. I think the member for Thornhill would agree with that. Why she was unable to provide an answer to that question really hits at the heart of what the Conservative agenda is here. The agenda is to provide tax breaks for the wealthy. This is what Conservatives have always done.

I hear the member for Regina—Lewvan laughing right now. I would encourage him to get up when it is question time and explain to the House and to me why it is that he, the member for Thornhill, and Conservatives generally speaking, are so much in favour of the idea of ensuring that he and I get GST tax cuts. That is exactly what they are asking for in this, so I would like the member from Regina, when the time comes, to explain to me why he thinks he and I should get a tax cut. I do not think we should. I do not think we need the GST eliminated from our purchases right now.

I can definitely see the need for a good policy discussion on the many Canadians out there who are struggling, the ones who Conservatives get up on a daily basis and talk about. They refer to them by name quite often in the House and talk about how they are struggling with the increased prices at grocery stores. Those are the people who would benefit from the policy objectives the Conservatives are suggesting through the GST cut. It is not the member for Regina—Lewvan, the member for Thornhill, the member for Simcoe North or me, yet they continue to promote that idea.

I can respect the NDP's desire and passion to push forward the agenda when it comes to taxing businesses more that have made excess and huge profits during the pandemic. I respect that and agree with it, but I do not understand why they will not just accept the answer.

The member for Scarborough—Guildwood stood up and answered the question from an NDP member directly, who then just stood up and asked it to another Liberal. We are already doing that. We have already increased the excess profits tax on companies that have made a windfall during the last two years. I know it is not enough, because the NDP's job is always to ask for more. It would not matter what was given; its members would want more. I get it. It is part of their job and I respect it, and I am sure they will continue to do that.

I obviously will not be voting in favour of this. There is absolutely no way any Conservative is expecting any member in this House other than themselves to vote in favour of it. This brings me back to the beginning of my speech, which is to ask why they are bringing forward this motion they know will actually help nobody.

• (1720)

Ms. Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am not surprised at all that the member opposite is so out of touch with Canadians. Is he unaware, for example, that his own

Prime Minister said that higher gas prices are exactly what they want? Is he unaware that his government has put a carbon tax on that is 25% of that higher gas price, and that there is a tax on that? Is he unaware that when it comes to housing unaffordability in this country, supply and demand in housing are under his government's responsibility? It has been there for seven years and has not done a thing. Is he unaware?

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, the member is suggesting that I am out of touch. That member and her party want a GST cut for everybody, including her, including me and including the people who are making ridiculous amounts of money right now as a result of going through the pandemic and the people who have experienced a lot of windfall from that. The reality of the situation is that we do not need a GST tax cut. I do not need it, and I will go out on a limb and suggest that she does not need it. However, there are people out there who do need supports, and that is where the government is focused. It is focused on providing support to the people who need it.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I know this is a very passionate debate, but, again, unless I have recognized members, they should not be speaking in the House.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Montcalm.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ): Madam Speaker, while our public finances have posted huge deficits and SMEs have been forced out of business because of the pandemic, we have seen oil companies, multinationals and corporations making massive profits and, unfortunately, doing very little to pay their fair share of taxes.

Since targeted measures will eventually have to be put in place to help people with affordability, does my colleague not find it shameful that oil companies heavily financed by the state and big Canadian banks are not paying their fair share because the government is not fighting tax havens and is therefore complicit in their use?

[*English*]

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, for starters, about two weeks ago, I voted in favour of the NDP motion to eliminate the oil subsidies. I am not sure if this particular member did.

I would totally agree with him. I do not disagree with him. There are other companies out there that have seen windfalls and huge profits during the last two years and that, quite frankly, through the proper policy, should be contributing more, in particular to assist those who are on the other end of the spectrum.

We have to remember that what the pandemic has really done to our society and the fabric of our society is that it has driven the wedge between the haves and the have-nots further. I think we need to work on addressing that, instead of working on addressing how we get a GST cut for members of Parliament and everybody out there, in particular those who do not need it.

Business of Supply

• (1725)

Mr. Taylor Bachrach (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Madam Speaker, the U.K. has just announced a 25% windfall profits tax on the oil and gas sector. Suggesting that the current government is doing anything close to that is patently absurd. However, that is not my question.

I have constituents, as I know the parliamentary secretary does, who have chosen not to get vaccinated. It is a choice I disagree with, but it is a choice they have made and I feel that I have a responsibility to answer their question. Here is the question they asked me: “How does preventing me from flying within Canada contribute to combatting the spread of COVID-19?” Could the parliamentary secretary explain it to them?

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: No, I cannot explain that, Madam Speaker, because I am not a medical expert. I know that this particular member from the NDP has been playing this game lately of skating very close to that line of what his constituents and indeed his supporters would deem to be acceptable or not acceptable, but I would suggest to the member that it is in his best interest to listen to the advice of the experts. If we do not believe the experts and if we have lost faith in the institutions, as the Conservatives continually do, time and again, in questioning the institutions, which is extremely problematic for the democracy that we have, that is when we are going to run into a problem. I would encourage the member to be very careful about what he is doing.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Again, I see there are additional voices rising during the responses. I hope the hon. members will ensure that the next speaker will have the attention of the House that she deserves.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Hastings—Lennox and Addington.

Mrs. Shelby Kramp-Neuman (Hastings—Lennox and Addington, CPC): Madam Speaker, today I will be splitting my time with the wonderful member for Sarnia—Lambton.

Once again, I find myself standing in this place, along with my Conservative colleagues, to speak on behalf of my constituents of Hastings—Lennox and Addington and on behalf of struggling Canadians who are concerned about the cost of living.

Just this week in particular, one of my constituents posted this on her social media: “As per our weekend routine, today I went to fill up my car and buy groceries for our family. This routine normally costs around \$300. Today it was \$500. Seriously, how are people surviving right now? I don't normally get so shaken up about things like this, but we've been in a constant state of transition for three-plus years now, always pivoting, always trying to figure out a new plan for the way we do things. I know there were parents out there struggling before inflation, and I can't even imagine what is keeping you up at night now.”

While the current government often hand-waves its role in inflation domestically, there is one area where it could make things better: lowering prices at the pumps for Canadians. They cannot wait until carbon tax rebate season for money to buy groceries and the medication they need today. Then again, I suppose the point of the

tax is to make it prohibitively expensive to drive. Of course, this completely ignores the plight of rural Canadians, who literally depend on a vehicle in order to survive. The carbon tax is only driving up fuel prices and is disabling business owners in my riding. That is why the Conservatives tried to put a halt to the bleeding by introducing an opposition day motion to reduce prices by 5%. Sadly, it was not supported.

In March of this year, while speaking to that motion, I urged the members of this place to consider the official opposition's realistic, tangible and direct solutions for Canadians suffering from high prices. I noted that, up until that date, this legislature's reaction to those gas price increases was completely inadequate. Two and a half months later, nothing has changed, except that the price of gas continues to rise.

In a few short weeks, this House will adjourn for summer recess while we go home to our respective ridings to work locally. As a legislature, we will have no capacity to provide relief for single parents, low-income families, seniors or small businesses. They will face continuing increases on groceries, gas and the basic necessities of life. In my humble opinion, this country is spinning in a downward spiral and we need leadership. We need to provide something to Canadians so they do not feel abandoned for the next two and a half months. Today, in our motion, we are offering a chance to put politics aside and deliver the relief that Canadians need.

Every single day, I speak to constituents in my riding. They are worried. They are having trouble sleeping. People just do not feel like they can get ahead. Young families are being busted apart because of financial stress. Too many seniors are feeling helpless and ignored, and their quality of life is failing. On top of that, food insecurity is staring people in the face.

On this side of the House, we have been trying in vain to provide some sort of relief, to no avail. I know my hon. colleagues have already pointed this out, but I feel it necessary to reiterate. As previously stated, when gas prices continued to increase, we asked that the government suspend the GST on fuel to give Canadians a break. We asked again for relief for Canadians by suspending the carbon tax increase on April 1, and we also asked that the tariff on fertilizer bought before March 2 be removed in order to help our agricultural producers.

• (1730)

I recognize that it can be difficult for some people to accept a good idea when it comes from somebody else. Perhaps that is why the government stubbornly refused to follow through with the previous government's decision to purchase the F-35s, despite everyone, apart from the lobbyists working for competitors, knowing it was the right decision. Barb aside, I implore the government and this House to take substantive, meaningful and timely action to help Canadians out, because they cannot afford to wait.

Business of Supply

I know that I am not the only one seeing regular, everyday Canadians struggle with the cost of living. We in this chamber have a tremendous responsibility. It is enormous, but we must also never forget the people who sent us here. Canadians are suffering with the high cost of fuel, food and housing. The taxpayers who put the confidence in us to be in this place do not get a housing allowance. They do not have travel points and they cannot claim any meal allowance. It is no wonder that many Canadians are losing faith in their elected officials.

They turn on the news and see the highlights of question period, which often is little more than theatre. I suppose this is the natural result of a legislature that puts more focus on communication and sound bites instead of good policy. A very wise man, if at times a very difficult man, saw this trend starting in the 1980s. The late member for Yukon and deputy prime minister, Erik Nielsen, lamented this shift to focus on commentary, interviews and opinion papers. The sound bite was the goal, not the substance of the discussion. Nuance was dying in front of his eyes, and in his autobiography, he tried to warn us.

In a similar vein, the individual who gave the inaugural televised speech in the U.K. House of Commons, Ian Gow, said in November 1989:

I have always voted against the televising of the proceedings of this House, and I expect that I always will. The brief intervention earlier of the hon. Member for Bradford, South (Mr. Cryer) did nothing to alter my view. Despite my strongly held opinions, a letter that I received—three weeks ago—I believe that a copy was sent to each of us and possibly even to you, Mr. Speaker—made the following preposterous assertion: “The impression you make on television depends mainly on your image (55 per cent) with your voice and body language accounting for 38 per cent of your impact. Only 7 per cent depends on what you are actually saying.”

This is sad. While Ian Gow and, indeed, the entirety of the Parliament at the time thought those claims preposterous, there is no denying that the quality of debate and the level of co-operation have declined and been largely replaced with imagery, with theatre. A cursory reading of the historical Hansards will show this. The fact that the NDP felt it necessary to surrender its money-scrutinizing authority to the Liberal government in order for a promise shows this.

Every single person in this room, including my good friends on our side of the House, needs to do the job we were sent here to do: to work with other parties and fight for the best interests of all Canadians. I ask my colleagues across the aisle to please exercise a minimal amount of humility. Adopting this Conservative opposition day motion would do just that.

• (1735)

Mr. Lloyd Longfield (Guelph, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, at the end of every recession, we see a very similar pattern where we have a shortage of material and a shortage of labour and supply chains are disrupted, yet what we are debating today is looking at some very piecemeal measures to try to get Canadians back on their feet, including cutting GST on gasoline purchases. We saw Prime Minister Harper, at the time, cut the GST and that did nothing for economic growth.

Could the hon. member talk about solving complex problems with simple answers versus solving complex problems with complex answers?

Mrs. Shelby Kramp-Neuman: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I may remind the hon. member of a quote from Bill Morneau, the former finance minister, who said, “I’m much more worried about our economic prospects today, in 2022, than I was seven years ago”. Seven years ago, we had a Conservative Harper government.

Ms. Bonita Zarrillo (Port Moody—Coquitlam, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my thanks to the member for pointing out today some of the realities found in social science research about who gets listened to and who does not. It is based on their presentation and their voice, their intonation. We know that women are not respected as much, based on those realistic factors and even their competency is judged this way. It is just on the tone of their voice or the way they look. I really appreciate those insights today in the House.

I wanted to talk about trickle-down theory. What I think I am hearing from the Conservatives is this idea of trickle-down. There is a lot of research that says trickle-down does not work because of the sponges at the top.

What makes the Conservatives think that, if the GST was taken away from gas purchases, it would actually trickle down to the consumer?

Mrs. Shelby Kramp-Neuman: Mr. Speaker, this motion today is about how we can get money back into the pockets of Canadians now. Often all members are speaking with constituents in their ridings. Every single day I am hearing from constituents, and they are in trouble. They need help, and they need the government to step up.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Conservative motion calls for action to tackle money laundering and yet, at the same time, the Conservatives also want more investments in cryptoassets, which facilitate money laundering. I am talking about Bill C-249. I am also thinking of one of the leadership candidates who is very much in favour of cryptocurrency.

How does the member reconcile that?

• (1740)

[*English*]

Mrs. Shelby Kramp-Neuman: Mr. Speaker, we are focusing today on the opposition day motion. With that opposition day motion, we are looking at suspending the carbon tax, eliminating tariffs on fertilizer, enabling the free flow of goods across the Canadian border and curbing speculation in the housing market by immediately launching a national public inquiry into money laundering. That is what I understand the member was asking about.

Business of Supply

Mr. Mike Morrice (Kitchener Centre, GP): Mr. Speaker, I share the member for Hastings—Lennox and Addington's concerns about affordability. The carbon tax increase she mentions, though, is a total of 2.2¢ per litre, and it is supported by most economists as the most effective way to address the climate crisis. Meanwhile, CBC recently reported that wholesale margins, profits for oil and gas companies, have increased 18¢ a litre, while oil and gas companies are also posting record profits.

Can the hon. member share why a tax on these windfall profits is not part of the Conservative motion to help get money back in the pockets of Canadians?

Mrs. Shelby Kramp-Neuman: Mr. Speaker, taxes are rising and there is nothing left in the pockets of Canadians. I would agree to disagree with the member. We have to recall that when companies are paying dividends, where do the dividends come from? Perhaps I would pose that question back for consideration for the member to think about.

Ms. Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise and speak to our opposition day motion because the cost of living is the number one issue in this country.

It is unbelievable to me to think that a year ago 60% of Canadians were within \$200 of not being able to pay their bills every month. Let us think about the increased costs that have happened during the pandemic and the multiple carbon tax increases from the government in the middle of a pandemic when people were losing their jobs, not to mention the exacerbation of everything under all of these COVID mandates, which are driving the cost of supply chain activities up across the country. All of these things are fundamental to the increased cost of living.

I am hearing from constituents in Sarnia—Lambton who are calling me, and it is heartbreaking. I have John, who is 73 years old. He is retired and has had to go back to taking two jobs to make ends meet. His wife is suicidal, thinking about the fact that they cannot afford to live. That is one story, but there are many others I could go into. This is all for what?

If we look at what is in the motion today, there is a lot to unpack. I am only going to focus on a few things. Let us start with the carbon tax. I heard the member of the Green Party talk, and his facts were not on point. Eleven cents a litre is the increase that we have had to date, and it is going to get worse. We know from the Parliamentary Budget Officer, the tax on gas is 25% of the issue. The government has the power to do something about this today. France and Japan have eliminated taxes on gasoline, recognizing there is a shortage in the world and the price is high. This is something that could be done today.

However, the government continues to not just increase the carbon tax but to have a tax on that tax. There is huge revenue for its coffers, but the average Canadian is suffering. What did we really achieve for climate change out of this? We have achieved nothing, absolutely nothing. The Liberals have never met a climate change target. B.C. has had a carbon tax for 12 years, and its emissions have not gone down. Quebec has had a program for 12 years, and its emissions have not gone down. The government's emissions have not gone down, but it is punishing Canadians by continuing to raise the price on carbon tax, which is driving up not only the cost

of gasoline but also of everything that has to be transported using gasoline.

We hear disinformation and misinformation on a daily basis in the House. The Liberals stand up and say that 80% of Canadians are better off, but that is not what the Parliamentary Budget Officer said. He said that 60% of Canadians are worse off with the carbon tax, and by 2024, 80% of Canadians will be worse off. We need to be honest with Canadians as they can see, when they are filling up their tanks and when they are paying their bills, that the costs are going up.

On the topic of the vaccine mandates, I very much appreciate the importance of vaccines to prevent COVID-19. I appreciated, in the heart of the pandemic, the many measures that were put in place. However, 55 countries around the world have dropped the mandates. The World Health Organization has said this is no longer effective for fighting Omicron or any of the current variants, yet the Liberal government continues to have these mandates in place. That is causing a shortage of all kinds of employees across the country. Truck drivers are just some of many. They were already short 14,000, and then with the mandates that increased.

I had women from the Canadian Federation of Truckers explain to me that one truckload of butter used to be \$7,000 when they picked it up in the U.S. That is now \$14,000, and that cost gets passed right on to the consumer. That is the reason why, when people go to the grocery store, single moms, seniors on a fixed income, and all of the people who are living below the poverty line, they do not have the ability to absorb it. I know the Prime Minister does not care. He has his trust fund. He does not have to worry about his bills. He is not concerned about the money.

The Prime Minister is punishing Canadians with these failed policies. It is not just individual Canadians. Let us talk about tourism. We visited today with the duty-free folks. They saw a 95% drop in the revenue of their businesses due to the border mandates. Instead of lifting the mandates, like all the other countries are doing, the Liberal government has doubled down and extended them into the heart of the tourism season. It is totally unacceptable, and it is accomplishing absolutely nothing.

• (1745)

Most of the people in the House have had all their vaccines, and all of them have had COVID one or two times. I am double vaccinated, and I have had COVID three times. It is not an effective technique, and these restrictions are causing problems at the airport and problems at the land border. It is impacting tourism and costing Canada economic activity.

Business of Supply

Those are things the government could change with the stroke of a pen. With the stroke of a pen, it could help the tourism industry and drop those mandates. They are accomplishing nothing. We see the hypocrisy, when the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health stands up on the issue of ferries and says that, as long as someone's journey is less than 24 hours, they can be unvaccinated. The member for Cumberland—Colchester asked how many flights in Canada are less than 24 hours. The answer is all of them, so I ask why the mandates are not being dropped. This is killing economic activity, and it is hurting Canadians. This is something the government could do immediately.

That is the kind of solution that is in this motion. We are saying to put politics aside. This is the last chance before we rise for the summer. Let us get it right. Let us work together, and let us drop the mandates to get back to good economic activity.

I must not leave without talking about the farmers and the government's punishment of farmers. I understand the war of Russian against Ukraine. Everybody in the House has stood in solidarity to say we need to help Ukraine and we need to put sanctions against Russia, but it was clearly pointed out to the Minister of Agriculture that fertilizer was already purchased by Canadian farmers, and they have already paid the money to the Russians. The Russians already have the money, and now Canadian farmers are getting a 35% tariff. That is hundreds of thousands of dollars they are having to pay, and we have asked the Minister of Agriculture to exempt them back to March 2, but the government has refused.

Do the Liberals not understand where food comes from? There is already a concern globally about food security. Ukraine is one of the major suppliers of wheat in the world. The whole supply chain of food is at risk, and when Canadian farmers could be increasing their production, what is the government doing? It is punishing them, not just with prices of fertilizer and the tariffs on that, but also with the carbon tax on heating their barns for their animals and running their equipment. There is no relief in sight. It is totally unacceptable.

I would say that, when it comes to other things the government could do, it tries to pretend that, even though inflation is at an all-time high in the last 30 years, it is somebody else's fault. I have just pointed out things it could do about the carbon tax and the tax on the tax, and things they could do for farmers.

What about affordable housing? It is simple. It is all about supply and demand, so we have to increase supply. The government has had seven years to address housing affordability, and what did it accomplish? It doubled house prices. That is utter failure. Young people cannot ever have a dream of owning a house right now, and while there are solutions that our party has put forward, which the government could take advantage of, it has instead chosen to create a savings account that is tax free.

Do Liberals not understand that young people do not have any money to save? This is a totally fruitless exercise. It is not going to change anything. Some of the housing minister's programs that were put in place were taken advantage of by 9%, or perhaps nine individuals. I cannot remember. That is a failed plan. There are thousands of young people across the country who want to revisit

the dream of owning a house, but the government has let them down.

My hope is that Liberals are going to look at this motion and look at the specific things they can do today to cut costs for Canadians because they are at the breaking point. It is my plea that Liberals will vote with us on this motion and that they will take these actions, because we need to be there for Canadians. Everybody in the House was elected to stand up and serve Canadians, and I want to see action from the Liberal government.

● (1750)

Mr. Kody Blois (Kings—Hants, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am the proud chair of the agriculture committee, and yesterday we had the member for Beauce ask a question of Yulia Klymenko, who is a member of parliament from Ukraine. The question was asked of whether she was in support of the 35% tariff that has been placed on Russian and Belarusian products. She was absolutely clear this is an important policy because we do not want to support Russia at all. In fact, many of the Conservatives have called for that policy, and they have said that the government should be working to try to help support Ukraine.

I asked the member for Beauce earlier what his position was. He said that the government should be indemnifying farmers who made the purchase before March 2. I actually agree with that, and I will continue to work with the government to see if there is something that can be done, but why would the policy be changing? The motion says right here that the Conservatives want to get rid the tariff altogether.

What is the Conservative position?

Ms. Marilyn Gladu: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member opposite for agreeing that the right thing to do is give an exemption. I am not sure why his government has refused to do that. In fact, the Minister of Agriculture stood in the House and refused to answer that question.

The Conservative position has been clear. We stood up and called for the exemption prior to March 2. We all realize that after that, when people purchase things, the money going to Russia is going to fuel the war. We need to do more.

There has been a lot of talk. I, personally, in Sarnia—Lambton, am helping to bring 100 families from Ukraine to Sarnia and provide relief. Where are the planes the government has promised for that?

Ms. Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, one of the issues the member raised is affordability and the cost of living for Canadians. Many Canadians are, in fact, struggling and are trying to recover from the COVID pandemic.

Business of Supply

The reality is that big banks are making billions of dollars. In fact, Scotiabank netted \$10.1 billion in profit and gave out billions of dollars in dividends to its shareholders. For BMO, it is the same thing. Other big, wealthy corporations are also netting huge profits, and Loblaws is one of them. In fact, it even refused to increase wages by a whole two dollars for its workers.

My question for the member is this. Will she support the NDP's proposal for the government to increase the GST rebate, along with increasing the Canada child benefit by \$500?

Ms. Marilyn Gladu: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for her advocacy for those who are struggling.

Listen, this is not a one-shot solution. There are multiple solutions that we need to bring to bear to address affordability. However, there is inequity, and one thing that I found really inequitable I heard today. The government paid out \$20 million for businesses in the downtown core of Ottawa that suffered during the convoy, but do members know what it did not do? It did not give \$20 million, which is the total ask, to all the border crossing duty-free shops in the country, which have lost 95% of their revenue. That is inequity. That needs to be addressed.

[Translation]

Mr. Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I have already asked one of her colleagues this question, but perhaps this member could answer it.

I have previously spoken with several economists, including Bernard Landry, who was one of my mentors. We have already been in situations where we would have liked to eliminate the gas tax. As he explained, the problem with this approach is that there is no way of ensuring that what is being removed would not go into the pockets of the oil companies. We have no way of ensuring that that money would get to consumers.

Could the member explain how she would make sure this happened, or what she would do to guarantee that the consumer was not the one left to pay again?

• (1755)

Ms. Marilyn Gladu: Mr. Speaker, there are many things we can do. For example, we can eliminate the tax on oil and give the money back to the people. This is very important. It may not be that important to some, but right now there are many Canadians who cannot pay their debts. I think that is the kind of solution we need to put in place.

[English]

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, CPC): Mr. Speaker, if we control the food supply, we control the people. We have seen the Liberals increase the carbon taxes on fuel and have seen them increase the excise taxes. All those increases on fuel will increase the cost of food. If we got rid of the excise taxes and the carbon taxes, it would be a temporary fix. In the long term, we need to increase supply.

Can my colleague tell us what kind of incentives could be put in place to increase the supply of fuel, as opposed to what is going on now and what is about to come with the fuel standards, with even further restrictions and higher fuel prices?

Ms. Marilyn Gladu: Mr. Speaker, these are failed policies of the Liberal government for oil and gas. Canada should be independent. We have the most environmentally sustainable oil and gas products in the world, yet we prefer to buy from Saudi Arabia for \$15 billion and send the jobs there, instead of building pipelines here, instead of supporting our oil and gas and instead of returning that economic growth here for Canadians to prosper. That is what we ought to do. That is what the Conservatives recommend.

[Translation]

Ms. Kristina Michaud (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia, BQ): Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I want to say that I will be sharing my time with the member for Abitibi—Témiscamingue.

I am very pleased to speak to this motion, and I thank the Conservative Party for bringing it forward. The rising cost of living is affecting everyone, including people back home in the Lower St. Lawrence and the Gaspé. Gas, groceries, housing and necessities have all gone up in price. People need housing, they need food and they need to travel to get to work, but they are increasingly struggling to afford all those things. I think it is our job, as parliamentarians, to find solutions to this problem.

What bothers me a little about this motion, though, is that the Conservatives have again found a way to bring up lifting the health restrictions. They talk about inflation, but they put a spin on it so that they can revive an issue that we have already discussed many times in the House. Each time, we have argued and defeated these motions calling for the health restrictions to be lifted immediately. I think it is ridiculous to drag up the issue again with this very long motion. We have debated this issue extensively and concluded that it should not be a political choice, but a scientific one. It is a bit unfortunate to see the Conservatives putting forward a motion like this again and trying to link it to the rising cost of living affecting all of our constituents.

As a solution to help people, the Conservatives are suggesting in this motion that consumption taxes be suspended, that the health restrictions immediately be lifted once and for all, and that the carbon tax be eliminated. That is their solution to help people deal with the rising cost of living: eliminate a measure brought in to fight climate change, politicize an issue that should not be politicized and reduce government revenues.

My colleagues have already shared the Bloc Québécois's position on these measures. Since our position has not changed, allow me to reiterate them. I think that inflation and the rising cost of living are the result of a complex structural problem that will not be fixed by one-time half measures that have little impact. As I was saying, these measures could immediately reduce the government's revenues, and I think that we could find stronger, more sensible solutions that would deliver quick, concrete results.

Business of Supply

I am not the best at math, but I can do basic calculations. If a measure reduces the government's revenues, then the government will not be able to fund reliable public services and programs that provide direct assistance to individuals. I do not know whether my colleagues are experiencing the same thing, but I am getting a lot of calls for help in my riding. Constituents are calling on their member of Parliament to help them deal with the rising cost of living.

I think that we need resources to achieve our ambitions in this case. It would be unrealistic to think that implementing one-time measures on the cost of goods will truly help Quebeckers and Canadians deal with global inflation, which is affecting a variety of products and services and which will require long-lasting measures.

In reading between the lines of the motion, I came to a simple realization. These proposals will not really help people deal with the rising cost of living. What I understand, and I hope I am wrong, is that this measure to abolish the carbon tax will only help the oil and gas companies. I will say this again and again, as often as I have to: The oil and gas companies do not need federal help right now.

• (1800)

Take the energy company Suncor, for example. Last year, in the first quarter, it had net profits of \$821 million. This year, in the first quarter, it made almost \$3 billion in profits. I honestly do not believe that this company needs to be exempted from paying tax. I do not think that abolishing this tax is really going to directly improve the lives of citizens or households. Furthermore, some provinces already have their own systems that work well. For example, Quebec's carbon market is effective, and it is good for the environment.

As I said, getting rid of these kinds of measures will not put more money in our constituents' pockets. Inflation is real, we know it, and it is putting households in Quebec and across the country in a real jam.

Real solutions go deeper. To get there, we have to think about how to create wealth while respecting the environment and, most importantly, how to share that wealth. This situation is not going to fix itself. I do not think band-aid solutions will get us there, certainly not when voter confidence in elected representatives in general is lukewarm. I do not think putting these inadequate solutions forward helps anyone. It just fuels voter cynicism. It is our job to bring a little more wisdom and rigour to the proposals we put to the government.

I heard my colleague from Mégantic—L'Érable say yesterday that Quebeckers are suffering from the rising cost of living, and he is absolutely right.

The Comité des citoyennes et citoyens Mitis organized a march that was held last Friday in my riding. The participants were essentially asking for appropriate measures. About 20 people who often live in precarious conditions braved the rain to ask for help, to ask us to take action and to ask the federal government for a little assistance. As they marched, they chanted a slogan: "I found a place to live, but I can't afford to eat." We need to take a moment to reflect on the fact that my constituents were basically telling us that they have to choose between food and shelter. That is what people living on low incomes are worried about right now.

Supporting this motion would mean abolishing the carbon tax. That is the solution this motion proposes to these individuals, and it makes no sense. Have we lost sight of how serious this is? Maybe.

Let us talk instead about meaningful solutions that can be applied quickly to truly help our constituents. If we wanted to seriously address inflation, we could consider taxing the wealthiest members of society. This is not a new idea. During the last election, the Bloc Québécois proposed creating a special temporary tax on the wealthy to have them contribute to the economic recovery and, to some extent, pay down the pandemic-related deficits.

We are not the only ones who think this is a good idea. Last year, the Parliamentary Budget Officer estimated that a tax on excess profits earned by big firms in 2020 would have generated \$7.9 billion for the federal treasury. That \$7.9 billion is something to think about. I think it is a good start.

The President of United States has also proposed some good ideas, including a tax on the super-rich to finance his postpandemic investment plan. This tax on unrealized capital gains would apply to roughly 700 taxpayers and would raise hundreds of billions of dollars, ensuring that the wealthiest Americans contribute their fair share of the historic funding needed for a strong recovery.

Last winter, some Quebec business people even proposed another special temporary tax, one that would apply to businesses that kept operating or made a profit during the pandemic, in order to help those that were severely affected.

There are plenty of good ideas out there, so we could set aside the idea of eliminating carbon tax. As I was saying, I do not believe that that is the type of solution that will improve people's lives, because the carbon tax was created to fight climate change.

There are many other subjects I wanted to address, such as the fact that higher gas prices are affecting people back home, such as taxi drivers, truckers and farmers. I have mentioned that my father was a trucker. He recently told me that he thought he might stop driving his trucks because gas is too expensive. It is terrible to see entrepreneurs give up on their dreams while oil companies get richer.

• (1805)

The Deputy Speaker: Before we continue, someone here in the House has turned the volume on their headset up so high that I can hear it from here. I encourage members to look around and turn the volume on their headset down if necessary.

The hon. member for Kings—Hants.

Business of Supply

Mr. Kody Blois (Kings—Hants, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, like me, the member represents a rural riding, and she described the reality of her constituents and the citizens of Quebec by talking about the distances they travel for recreation, leisure and work.

I agree with the principle of the proposed measure in paragraph (a) of the motion, “temporarily suspending the Goods and Services Tax (GST) collected on gasoline and diesel”, but my concern is that it is not targeted. For example, members of the House would benefit from this measure, but it would be a better idea if it targeted low-income Canadians. What does my hon. colleague think?

Ms. Kristina Michaud: Mr. Speaker, I was going to cover that in my speech, but I underestimated how much time I had. I do think it would be good to start by helping people with low incomes, especially seniors.

This summer, the federal government is going to increase old age security, but only for people 75 and up. For those between the ages of 65 and 74 this summer, the government recognizes that the population is aging and that people are living longer, healthier lives, but it is telling them to figure things out for themselves until their pension kicks in at 75.

In addition, there is a labour shortage. We need more people in the labour market, but when seniors return to work, they are penalized financially.

I think financial measures for seniors and people with low incomes, along with investment in social housing, are some ways to help people deal with the rising cost of living. Those are the types of measures I would focus on if I were in government.

• (1810)

Mr. Alain Rayes (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Mr. Speaker, does my colleague believe that our society has a tax that we could eliminate to help Canadians?

She spoke about the carbon tax, which is one of many, but I have rarely heard members of the Bloc Québécois say that they were in favour of cutting taxes to take some of the pressure off Canadians.

Can she think of a tax, just one tax, other than the carbon tax, that could be eliminated and thus give a little breathing room and relief to Canadians right away and not in one, two or five years?

Ms. Kristina Michaud: Mr. Speaker, that is a very good question, and I thank my colleague for asking it. I am perhaps one of those people who believe that citizens pay taxes for a reason, and that they pay them to the federal government in exchange for services.

I would like to remind members just how long it currently takes to get a passport. If an individual is a victim of EI fraud and their file is blocked, it takes a long time to get services and the money they are owed. It takes a long time for the federal government to transfer the money it owes to the provinces and to Quebec, especially for health care.

Instead of eliminating or suspending a tax, because I believe they have a purpose, I would perhaps propose an exchange whereby the federal government would provide the service that Quebecers and the people who pay this tax are entitled to. I believe that the gov-

ernment could be more proactive in the way it provides these services.

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I very much like the idea of a temporary tax on excess profits. My colleague says that the Bloc Québécois is not the only party to propose that idea. Indeed, the NDP is also proposing it.

What does my colleague think of the idea of taking that money and increasing the GST tax credit and the Canada child benefit, which would actually help the most disadvantaged families and the middle class, who are struggling right now?

Ms. Kristina Michaud: Mr. Speaker, that is not a bad idea, and I am pleased that we are having these debates to put forward these kinds of proposals.

I think that people in our ridings are at their wits' end. Recently, someone who saw me asking for more for seniors called me out saying that there was nothing for families. It is not because I am asking for more for seniors that I am not asking for more for families too.

The average family, or the average household, is struggling to pay for essentials right now. An increase in the family allowance would certainly be welcome.

Mr. Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to apologize for my hair. It is raining outside. If members want to see a member of Parliament who is willing to get wet to speak up for their constituents, that is what I am offering.

I feel privileged to speak to the opposition motion, which gives us yet another opportunity to debate solutions to help our constituents go about their daily lives despite rising costs.

I had a meeting with a seniors' subcommittee. I created it to help the seniors of Abitibi—Témiscamingue find solutions, and I would like to commend those who are participating. We are looking at solutions for income, taxation, local services, federal jurisdictions that affect seniors. We are able to collect data and consider potential solutions. I thank those involved and I am sorry I cannot be there with them.

It is time to think about better financial conditions for seniors. There needs to be an increase to the amounts they receive, and the tax system must be reviewed so as not to penalize those who still go to work and want to work.

Business of Supply

I would like us to take a moment to think hard about the kind of future we are building for seniors. I am thinking of the Bloc Québécois petition sponsored by my colleague from Shefford. We circulated it to take the pulse of the population. I myself sent out a bulk mailing, and I will get back to the House with the results, but what I can say is that there are already thousands of signatures. Meanwhile, the Conservatives thought they found solutions for seniors. Unfortunately, the motion before us leaves something to be desired.

This motion focuses on the impact of agricultural input costs. I can assure all members that I am painfully aware of this issue. Just last Sunday, I was at the Témiscamingue agricultural fair in Saint-Bruno-de-Guigues, where I had the opportunity to talk to farmers and take the pulse of the community.

People understand that this situation is global and that we need to take action. Some potential solutions deserve our consideration, but the idea is to ensure sustainable progress over time. We do not know how long this economic disruption will last, which is yet another reason to think hard about how we get through this and achieve our goals.

My constituency office conducted a study on the agriculture situation in Abitibi—Témiscamingue, at all stages of the production chain, and there are serious shortages everywhere.

A few weeks ago, I released the results of the study on local agricultural infrastructure in my region. Agricultural development is obviously about more than just buying fertilizer or the price of gas. It relies on the availability of every link in the supply chain. Transporting a calf 800 kilometres to an abattoir is obviously not profitable with current gas prices, and this illustrates why we need to have abattoirs in the regions, so we can create local distribution channels and ensure our food sovereignty. This type of solution can help develop local agriculture, but other links in the supply chain are missing in order to be able to set up a structure that would ensure local production, which would help combat inflation in the agri-food sector.

Climate change is also having an impact on agriculture. As we have seen, droughts in western Canada and the southern United States have caused prices to soar. Meanwhile, the Liberal government wants to plant trees on fallow lands in our region. That would be a big mistake.

The current situation fully warrants creating an assistance program for the agricultural sector, and my colleagues have conveyed the demands of the Union des producteurs agricoles to the House. The Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food has in hand the demands concerning farmers and agriculture-related businesses. When will there be action on this file?

I will name them because I think it is important. I had an exchange with the people from the UPA back home. There was talk of the excise tax, at 4¢ a litre in Quebec. I propose a compromise. Could we abolish it in the agriculture sector? This is a solution that would affect the fuel tax but would apply to the agriculture sector, which may have an impact on the price of food. We know that when it comes to profits and things being more expensive, it is not the farmers who are making more money. There is a need for spe-

cial assistance, a bit like the Canada emergency business account that was created during the pandemic. Can we help our farmers in the current context with this idea?

The funds would be provided in the form of cash that could be disbursed quickly and would be repayable. Anything that is not repayable would help ensure that our farmers remain profitable, because that is important. There is also the current 35% tariff on inputs from Russia. Canada may be one of the only countries in the world that is still applying that surtax. We need to give that some serious thought.

Everything is going up. There is talk of 50% inflation in the agriculture sector in Quebec. Fuel, lime, fertilizer and foodstuffs are their own sort of pandemic. This is having a serious impact on the profitability of cattle farming.

● (1815)

When we hear that there is unused money sitting idle in AgriInvest accounts, I can guarantee that that is not the case in Abitibi—Témiscamingue. There are few opportunities to pass the cost on to consumers. Prices are going up for producers, but no more money is going into their pockets. Think about that.

Lastly, there are advance payment programs. Cash flow is a very serious concern, so we need to keep in mind that if that amount could be increased to \$200,000 per business, this might give farmers a little more breathing room. I encourage my colleagues to think about that as a concrete solution.

I want to talk about how we can better work together. That is my entrepreneurial instinct at work here. I think it is appalling that we cannot get people to work, that we are letting our businesses think about relocating their operations and that we are preventing people from working because the government cannot provide them with a work permit or even permanent residency. We are missing out on business opportunities and having to turn our backs on all the golden nuggets we worked so hard to get during the pandemic.

The challenge right now is about cutting red tape and removing the obstacles that are undermining our businesses' productivity. The Standing Committee on Industry and Technology is currently studying this issue. The big problem facing farmers is their debt levels. What can be done with their loans? Could emergency assistance for the agricultural sector be reconsidered?

These are all important questions, as are the questions about temporary foreign workers and workers who want to come for the long term.

I want to talk about some other concerns. Critical and strategic minerals have immense potential. We could try something else as we search for a solution, instead of fighting over whether to hike the price of gas and increase oil company profits. We could focus on electric vehicles. We conducted a study on critical and strategic minerals. Some proposals were made, and our regions are bursting with potential. I look forward to having this study released because it contains some worthwhile proposals.

Business of Supply

The Bloc Québécois is proposing, among other things, to work with SMEs and find the weaknesses in their supply chains, put them in touch with Canadian suppliers, and propose new ways of managing their inventories that will make them less vulnerable.

The Bloc Québécois is proposing to work with its North American partners to rebuild, on the continent, critical links in the supply chain, such as semiconductors, the processing of strategic minerals and essential goods, particularly for health care and food.

The Bloc Québécois suggested a number of measures that would provide relief to businesses hit hard by inflation. We will continue to put forward our ideas and to pressure the government to implement assistance measures that have also been suggested to help producers face the increase in the price of inputs.

For some time now, I have felt that we are again having to address important issues, but I deplore how some ideas are being discarded. It seems to me that we are straying from our values, from what brings people together. I find it hard to imagine that the government is still trying to hand out gifts to banks and oil companies.

The Bloc Québécois has that concern, and I believe that the response to the points set out in the preamble to the motion moved by the Conservatives could be quite different from the solutions they list. They are using pretexts in an attempt to convince us they are not trying to find a way to help the oil companies and banks again escape the energy shift. The Conservatives are trying to impose their priorities and play politics on the backs of hard-working citizens.

This runaway inflation is real and pervasive on every front, from gasoline and housing to food and cars. We need measures that are far more comprehensive than today's populist proposals. Do they realize how upsetting it is to work so hard and watch the banks walk away with huge profits yet again? Paying these prices for gas is not much better.

It all seems so unfair. The Canadian Federation of Independent Business, the CFIB, seems to agree. It issued very specific demands about exorbitant credit card fees and bank fees.

I will not shed a tear for oil companies that are pocketing billion-dollar profits and still finding ways to collect subsidies from the Liberals with the Conservatives' blessing. As for banks, whose profits jumped during the global pandemic, I like them even less.

I could go on and on about this, but I will just wrap things up here.

The Bloc Québécois has put forward a series of balanced approaches. On the one hand, it is important to target aid programs at individuals and businesses that need it without driving prices even higher. On the other hand, it is important to identify the factors driving inflation so we can tackle it sustainably and prevent it from becoming structural and permanent.

• (1820)

[English]

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons (Senate), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I heard the member speak towards the end of his

speech, as one of his examples, about the way that the government was approaching banks in terms of the excess profits that they have been making over the last couple of years. He would seem to suggest that there are supports that are being given out to banks as we speak.

However, the reality of this situation is that there is an excess profit tax that is specifically being applied to banks and other businesses that saw windfall profits during the pandemic. Can the member at least accept the fact that the government has introduced that measure to make sure that banks in particular are paying their fair share as it relates to dealing with the problems that we had during the pandemic and the supports that had to be distributed during the pandemic?

[Translation]

Mr. Sébastien Lemire: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to give my colleague a lesson on economics, but, considering the net profit the banks are making right now, I think we can agree that they are benefiting greatly from inflation.

The increase in interest rates may provide some relief, but we are a long way from any solutions. My money is invested through Mouvement Desjardins, a co-operative, because I believe that is the best way to reinvest money in a society.

There are financial solutions. I would like to see the government actually tackle tax havens. There is money in tax havens and money in the oil companies' profits. Why not institute a minimum global tax?

The G7 finance ministers met in London in June 2021 and announced an unprecedented agreement on a 15% global tax rate. This would allow for better distribution of tax revenues from multinational corporations, including the big, often American, tech companies that pay a pittance in taxes, despite making massive profits, by having their headquarters in countries with very low or no corporate tax rates.

These are the Bloc Québécois's ideas.

• (1825)

[English]

Ms. Bonita Zarrillo (Port Moody—Coquitlam, NDP): Mr. Speaker, what a refreshing speech today. It is so nice to hear in the House some innovative thinking. Unfortunately, we are dealing with a system that is antiquated and both the government and the official opposition do not have the same kind of thinking, which is why we end up with the type of motion we are dealing with today.

The motion is quick to cut taxes for large corporations while offering nothing in terms of consumer protection from the big corporations that will just go ahead and raise prices above and beyond inflation. Can the member comment on whether he thinks cutting taxes at the pump will stop big oil and gas from simply raising prices, and if this motion is innovative thinking?

Business of Supply

[Translation]

Mr. Sébastien Lemire: Mr. Speaker, I think the short answer to that question is no. However, since it is not like me to provide a simple answer to a simple question, I am going to take the time to point out that there are innovative solutions.

I myself came to work today in an electric car. I can say that I am not affected by the higher gas prices right now. Sure, I am making some sacrifices: I had to stop a little more often along the way.

I am looking forward to seeing new charging stations installed. That is definitely part of the solution, because pollution comes at a cost. We pay for it through our health care system. The Conservatives do not talk about it, but there is a cost to polluting.

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate that the Bloc has recognized the motion is not worthy of voting for and for a number of different reasons. I want to highlight the need for us to recognize that the price on pollution is something that, in my home province for example, if we look at the 2021 tax year, provided a net benefit to virtually 80% of my constituents. Where the federal government is providing the price on pollution credit, our citizens are actually benefiting from it. It is having an impact. We are encouraging people to think electric, and so forth.

Could the member provide his thoughts on the importance of the whole idea of that transition?

[Translation]

Mr. Sébastien Lemire: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Winnipeg North. I will answer his question the same way I answered his colleague's.

I believe we need to review the taxation of big banks in Quebec. We need to ensure that we stop investing in the oil and gas sector. The consequences are huge. Why not review equalization and make it greener?

The pollution we generate in the system needs to be offset by higher equalization payments. I think it is a win-win. The greenest provinces would get more. Now that is a solution.

[English]

The Deputy Speaker: Resuming debate for a very short two minutes, the hon. member for Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry.

Mr. Eric Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will be brief in my two minutes of what was hopefully going to be a 10-minute speech to reiterate something I have been hearing from farmers and businesses in my riding pertaining to fertilizer.

I want to go on the record in the House and thank Duncan Ferguson, the president of the Glengarry Federation of Agriculture; Doug MacPherson, the general manager and president of Munro Agromart; and Jackie Kelly-Pemberton of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture for raising awareness of the unfairness happening to

our Canadian farmers when it comes to the 35% tariff imposed on fertilizer.

Our House and our country are united and pushing back against the evil and illegal acts of Russia, but the actions taken by the government of imposing a 35% tariff on fertilizer pre-March 2 only hurts Canadian farmers and consumers. The opposition day motion we are voting on tonight is very clear. It calls for an exemption of those tariffs pre-March 2. Our farmers and local businesses ordered fertilizer last fall, before we knew these actions were going to take place. We are putting on the record that we are standing up for farmers and those local voices to say this is a tangible way can provide relief to help with the high cost of living facing our country and the global community today.

• (1830)

The Deputy Speaker: It being 6:30 p.m. and this being the final supply day in the period ending June 23, 2022, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the opposition motion.

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 would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

[English]

The hon. member for Regina—Wascana.

Mr. Michael Kram: Mr. Speaker, I would like to request a recorded division.

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 81(18), the division stands deferred until later this day.

* * *

MAIN ESTIMATES, 2022-23

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Hon. Mona Fortier (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of \$274,137,786, under Department of Justice — Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2023, be concurred in.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to rise and speak about where the government has come from, where we are today and where we are moving forward to. I would like to try to amplify a couple of points that I think are really important.

Over the last number of years, what we have witnessed coming from the Conservative Party in particular is a different type of tactic.

Business of Supply

I reflect on the speech that the interim leader gave in the House this morning. When she talked about the issue of focus and how the Conservative Party wants to see all of these actions taken and she talked about ideas, what struck me as rather odd was that with regard to what she was talking about, I would not have thought she was the interim leader of the Conservative Party, in terms of wanting to be perceived as being more productive in opposition.

What she was talking about was not reflective of what I have been witnessing in the House over the last number of months, in particular, but even well before that. For the Conservative opposition, their focus has been more about playing a destructive role inside the House of Commons to the degree that they do not want to pass anything. As they put up all sorts of dilatory motions and different types of actions, one gets the opinion that they do not want to see anything pass out of the House.

I have often referred to it as a destructive force inside the chamber, where, on the one hand, they do not want anything to get through and then, on the other hand, they will be critical of the government for not being able to get anything through.

That seems to be one of their areas of focus. The other area has been that of attacking the personalities within the government. They have spent a great deal of time and resources, whether it is, no doubt, financial resources or just resources inside the House, being critical of personalities, particularly those within the cabinet—

• (1835)

Mrs. Karen Vecchio: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I just want to clarify that we are actually speaking about the main estimates today and that we are going to be talking about what is coming out of some committees. I just want to be sure we are on the right topic.

The Deputy Speaker: I just want to remind everyone that we are speaking to certain specifics here.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, we are, as the member's interim leader talked about, focused on what we are spending and where we are getting our revenues. It is one thing for the interim leader to be saying that, but it is another thing to just watch the behaviour of the Conservative Party in opposition. It is very different.

If we take a look at the types of behaviours we have witnessed virtually from the beginning back in late 2015 and going into 2016, we see that the Prime Minister in particular has been very much concentrating on the real issues of the day that Canadians have to face. We have been doing that from the very beginning.

When the interim leader talked about how the government needs to be focused and talked about the motion they were moving earlier in regard to the finances of the government, I believe there has only been one party, the party fortunately that is in government, that has been focused in its attention.

If someone listened to some of the speeches delivered today, were they a true reflection of the important issues that Canadians are facing? In good part, yes, for a lot of the debate. We concur with a number of the issues being debated that are in fact important to Canadians. It was kind of encouraging in that sense, that the

Conservatives have chosen their last opposition day to raise a number of issues, some of which should be discussed and debated. However, that is something that is not a part of the normal routine.

I suggest that the Prime Minister, caucus and cabinet have been consistently focused on the issues that are important. We have seen real, tangible results. As an example, over the last number of months, we have seen the Conservatives stand up, I do not know how many times inside the House. As we talked about a budget presentation, what were the Conservative Party talking about? It was mandates and criticizing the Government of Canada for not lifting mandates. When people were outside protesting, the Conservatives were criticizing our having mandates. I can recall seeing one picture on social media of the interim leader out at a dinner where she was talking with some of the organizers of the “freedom convoy”.

Mrs. Karen Vecchio: Mr. Speaker, I will make this quick. This is the business of supply on the main estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2023, and the member is talking about other things. I am just wondering if we can maybe talk about the estimates and the spending of the government, instead of the stuff that he was talking about for the last five minutes.

Let us talk about money and the spending of money, as we are supposed to be doing today.

The Deputy Speaker: I will remind all members of the House that we do try to stick to the topic at hand.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, if the member opposite is having a difficult time following the logic here, I would suggest that she leave the chamber or not listen, as opposed to interrupting.

This is in fact very relevant. We have the opposition focusing their attention on an issue, but the government of the day is focused on the issues that are facing Canadians. Whether it is today or during the budget debate or debate on Bill C-19, we have been consistent on these types of issues. It is the official opposition that has not been consistent. The opposition has not been focused on these important budgetary measures because it has been focused on other issues to try to stir the pot.

I am using the issue of the mandates as a tangible example. The wannabe leader of the Conservative Party was out saying, “Let us end the mandates”, and the minions within the chamber who are supporting that leader are espousing the same policy. To say that this issue is not relevant is ridiculous, because those are the types of issues they were talking about during the budget debate. Even when the Province of Quebec still had a curfew in place, the Conservatives were focused on ending mandates.

Business of Supply

The member for Carleton made reference to the Bank of Canada and its governor. It was very discouraging. When we talk about issues of inflation and what is happening in our economy today and the person who is likely the new leader of the Conservative Party is going around diminishing the value and the importance of the Bank of Canada and its governor, we should all be concerned. That person has not won yet, and maybe he will not win, but he is definitely supported by a majority of the members opposite in the Conservative Party, and these are important budgetary-type issues, because the Bank of Canada does play an important role. It is supposed to be arm's length.

The Conservatives are more interested in playing political games than in dealing with the issues. We have indicated very clearly that we are going to deal with the real issues that Canadians are facing day in and day out. When Conservatives talk about inflation, they try to give the impression that the sky is falling and that Canada is going straight downhill. They put their collective heads in the sand, not recognizing what is happening in the world.

Conservatives talk about inflation. The Prime Minister and every member of the Liberal caucus are all concerned about inflation, and we all understand the reality of what is happening in our environment that goes beyond our borders. It is affecting our inflation rate. If we could stop the war in Europe, we would do that. We do not have that kind of influence. We do have a great deal of influence in working with our allied countries. However, to deny the impact of what is taking place in Europe in the illegal Russian war that is happening to Ukraine is highly irresponsible. That war is having an impact on inflation.

To try to click our heels and think that mandates and the coronavirus would be gone and we would have nothing more to worry about would again be irresponsible. We just have to take a look at what is happening internationally.

● (1840)

Even today some members will say that someone can be on a boat for 24 hours but that cannot be done on a plane. Have members ever been a boat, compared to a plane? There is a big difference between being in a fuselage, where there are 220 people or whatever number of people, and being on a ferry between, let us say, Vancouver Island and the city of Vancouver.

We within the government benches continue to review and look at the situation, listen to what science is telling us and work with health experts. That is what is dictating our policies. Remember, the Conservatives have been saying to end mandates for months now.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: One member is saying "Hear, hear!"

Even when the Province of Quebec had a curfew, Conservatives were still advocating getting rid of mandates or mandatory masks. The Province of Quebec just got rid of mandatory masks. Are those health experts also wrong?

This is the type of focus we see from the Conservatives. Maybe it is because of the leadership convention that there seems to be a vacuum within the Conservative caucus today. There is no consistency.

When we take a look at the policies being brought forward from this government, whether they are legislative initiatives or budgetary initiatives, we see that they are having an impact for Canada from coast to coast to coast. Look at some of the numbers.

Conservatives will criticize us. It is truly amazing. The Conservatives will say that we are spending too much money, but in the last federal election they committed to spending more money than what we committed. They criticize us on the deficit, yet the Conservatives were projecting more, and that was only a number of months ago.

What is the actual reality? When looking at the reality, one needs to do a comparison and take a look at it. As we continue to receive and spend tax dollars, how is Canada actually managing? Canada has the lowest debt-to-GDP ratio in the G7, and the G7 includes some pretty important countries, including the U.S.A.

We have actually recovered 115% of the jobs that were lost as a direct result of the pandemic. Again we are doing much better than the U.S.A. We have been able to do this because we worked with Canadians and stakeholders when going through the pandemic and in planning the budgetary expenditures that formulated our estimates so that we would be there to support them in real and tangible ways.

I have given many speeches in the House giving examples of that support. Is there any wonder that we have been able to recover 115% of the jobs lost when we actually supported small businesses? We did this by providing rent subsidies, wage loss subsidies and better access to loans.

I would ultimately argue that because of the actions of the government in working with the different stakeholders, we prevented many companies from going bankrupt. We allowed for small businesses, which are the backbone of the Canadian economy, to be in a better position to hire back when the opportunity came.

A lot of the expenditures for which the Conservatives will criticize us were there to support people in having disposable income, whether it was supporting the poorest seniors in the country through the GIS or individual seniors 65 and older through the OAS, not to mention the literally tens if not hundreds of millions that were allocated to non-profit organizations that support our seniors.

● (1845)

We can also take a look at students and the doubling of summer jobs for young people and a continuation of that program within this budget. I remember the Conservative days when they cut back on that expenditure.

These are the types of initiatives that the government worked on, from the Prime Minister to the cabinet to the individual members of the Liberal caucus. We did that because we believe it is important to take the ideas and thoughts from our constituencies and bring them to Ottawa to ensure that the budget reflects what Canadians want to see in a national budget.

Business of Supply

We have been successful by listening. We are concerned about inflation, as my constituents and all Canadians are. Canada's inflation rate is at 6.8% and yes, we are concerned about it. Whether it is the GIS, the OAS or the Canada child benefit, the benefits programs are all indexed to inflation. If people are 75 and older, they are getting a 10% increase in the OAS.

We are concerned about the 6.8%, even though it is actually less than the United States' inflation rate, which is 8.3%, or the U.K. inflation rate, which is 9%, or Germany's, which is 8.7%, or the OECD's, which has an average of 8.8%. Just because our rate is lower than all of those countries does not mean we are giving it any less attention. We understand that it is hurting pocketbooks, and that is why we see a number of budgetary measures that are going to help provide some relief.

We constantly see Conservative members vote against all of those measures. On the one hand, they talk about cutting taxes, and cutting more taxes, and looking at ways to cut tax. As a side point, when we provided them with a chance to do that by cutting taxes for Canada's middle class, they voted against it, but they sure like to talk about it. At the end of the day, they can be all over the map on a wide variety of things and have their focus on two issues in particular that I mentioned, but we will continue day in and day out to focus on the issues that Canadians are facing.

• (1850)

Mr. Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I listened to the member's speech carefully, and one of the things he said is that the CPP and the OAS were increased based on inflation. Is that an accurate statement? I know the OAS had a 10% increase for individuals who were 75 years of age and older, but does he really believe that seniors between the age of 60 and 75 did not have the same increase in costs as someone over the age of 75?

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, as the member would know and as I would hope all members would know, from my understanding of it there is a formula that is put into place that enables the cost of living increases for the GIS, the OAS and the Canada child benefit. That is my understanding, and if that is not the case, I would be more than happy to apologize. I am sure there will be some people who will be very quick to find out and ask me to apologize if in fact that is not the case.

• (1855)

Ms. Laurel Collins (Victoria, NDP): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, President Biden made a bold move and announced that he will be using the U.S. Defense Production Act to accelerate the manufacturing of solar panels, grid infrastructure, heat pumps and building insulation. I am curious as to whether this government is also looking at Canada's Defence Production Act to ensure that we are accelerating these clean energy industries as well.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I do not know the specifics of that. The member might want to raise this with the minister responsible.

I can say, though, that we have seen an incredible amount of money and dedication, whether it is coming from the minister responsible for the environment or the Minister of Finance, who are ultimately being led by the Prime Minister, to ensure that we are seeing greener jobs, technology and so forth being developed and

encouraged. This is not just from direct government expenditures but also from working with the private sector.

The Conservatives have been very critical of the Infrastructure Bank, but it has been hugely successful on environmental projects. All one needs to do is take a look at what is happening in Brampton today, with the conversion of buses from diesel fuel to electric. This is an excellent example, and I think there are virtually endless examples. If I were provided the time and maybe allowed to do a little more research, I could provide all sorts of good details on that front.

Mr. Mike Morrice (Kitchener Centre, GP): Mr. Speaker, one of my concerns with the main estimates we are discussing this evening is with respect to the number of Canadians with disabilities, both in my community and across the country, who are living in poverty. We do not have here any emergency funds for these folks, nor do we have anything with respect to the Canada disability benefit.

I wonder if the hon. member can speak to what he could be doing to advocate in this place to ensure that we get funding to a group of folks across the country who need it most, Canadians living with disabilities.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, the minister responsible for disability inclusion actually made an incredible effort a couple of years ago in terms of bringing in some legislation and ultimately having it passed. I thought she gave a brilliant speech in terms of why we need to focus more attention and build the proper database in order to support people with disabilities. She went on to ensure that during the pandemic there would be a payment going out to people with disabilities.

Also, it is really encouraging that, just recently, the minister has once again brought forward disability legislation. This has been a high priority for this particular minister specifically, but I know that the government as a whole has been very supportive of the minister, recognizing how important it is to support people with disabilities.

Mr. Lloyd Longfield (Guelph, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his intervention and for repeating the concerns we all have around inflation. I also thank him for pointing out the comparison of Canada to other countries and the complexity of the problem we are dealing with in trying to get support to the Canadians who really need it, rather than just everybody getting some kind of a handout.

Could the hon. member talk about the expenditures that we are putting forward to target the people who need help the most?

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I will take this opportunity to talk about something that I know the member is very proud of, as am I, which is the national child care program.

The national child care program is now going to make day care affordable for hundreds of thousands of people from coast to coast. It is going to enable people to enter into the workforce, and it will have a profound impact.

Business of Supply

I am very proud of the fact that this administration and the minister responsible were able to get the provinces and territories onside. We have, for the very first time, a very progressive, national program in regard to child care. If members want to get a sense of just how well it is going to work into the future, they can look at the positive impact it had when it was brought in by the Province of Quebec.

Mrs. Anna Roberts (King—Vaughan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the member for Winnipeg North if he could explain to seniors in my community who are living below the poverty line, who have had to take a line of credit on their property in order to stay in their home, why they were, in effect, told by the previous minister of seniors, “Why do you not just sell your house and move on?”

What kind of a response is that to someone who has lived in their home, raised their children, paid their taxes and taken care of a dying husband, who had no choice but to leave, and who at 72 years old does not get the \$500 and has to go and get another job?

● (1900)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I know the member was not here when Stephen Harper was the Prime Minister, but I was, and if she wants to talk about dishing out zip for our seniors, we can take a look at what Stephen Harper did not do for our seniors. I would love to compare how we have been there in a very real and tangible way for our seniors. Any day of the week, I would debate the member in any type of forum in regard to what we have done in comparison to what Stephen Harper did, and we have been in for only six or seven years, whereas Stephen Harper was there for 10 years.

I can talk, right from the very beginning, of lifting hundreds of thousands of seniors out of poverty with the immediate increase that was made to GIS back in 2016; I can talk about the grants that were given via direct payments to seniors, both OAS and GIS, during the pandemic; I can talk about the 10% increase for seniors over 75; and I can talk about the hundreds of millions of dollars invested into non-profit organizations to support seniors.

It is an endless list. The member cannot try to tell me that Stephen Harper was sympathetic to seniors. This is a government that is not only sympathetic but has taken action after action to support the seniors of Canada, because they deserve that support.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague from Winnipeg North mentioned the Infrastructure Bank, and I have to say that some of the early spending by the Infrastructure Bank was very encouraging, but I am devastated that budget 2022 does not promote the continued building of interties to connect our electricity grid so that we can have a functional, robust electricity grid working east-west and north-south to move renewable energy from one province to another. As the member will know, I am very disappointed in his government's climate plans, but I do not understand why it is ignoring the urgent need to build a strong electricity grid to meet our needs to decarbonize energy.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I suspect that if we take a look at the voting record, we will probably find that the former leader of the Green Party voted against having a Canada Infrastructure Bank. Now, if we take a look, anyone can google the Canada

Infrastructure Bank and take a look at the projects that are there. Many of those projects are green projects.

I made reference to what is happening in Brampton: the conversion of fuel buses into electric buses. We are talking about hundreds of millions of dollars. That is happening, in good part, because we created, a number of years ago, the Canada Infrastructure Bank, something that many members of this House did not support and that many other members continue to criticize today. They need to check out the website, at the very least, and take a look at what the Canada Infrastructure Bank has been doing. That is without even mentioning the many other initiatives the Government of Canada has taken by working with partners, whether they are provincial or other stakeholders in the private sector and so forth.

Hon. Rob Moore (Fundy Royal, CPC): Mr. Speaker, tonight I will be splitting my time with the member for Elgin—Middlesex—London, who is a great MP and doing a great job for her constituents.

On Friday, May 27 of this year, the Supreme Court of Canada struck down the punishment of life without parole in cases concerning mass murderers. There had been a change in the law that allowed consecutive periods of parole ineligibility, which meant that mass murderers would not receive a discount for the extra lives they had taken.

The case at the core of this ruling is with regard to the 2017 killing of worshippers at a Quebec City mosque. Shortly after 8 p.m. on January 29, 2017, an armed 27-year-old man entered the mosque and began to shoot at the people inside. Six people were killed and at least five others were wounded. He was charged with six counts of murder, convicted, and sentenced to 40 years without the possibility of parole.

Following this ruling by the Supreme Court, this killer will now be eligible to apply for full parole after only 25 years. It is now the case in Canada that, regardless of whether mass murderers kill three people or 20, they will be eligible to apply for parole after 25 years. The message that this decision sends to Canadians is that every life does not in fact matter. I do not agree with that sentiment, and I know that most Canadians would not agree with it either.

Just yesterday, MPs from all parties stood in this House in a moment of silence to remember the victims of the hate-motivated killing of a Muslim family in London, Ontario, on June 6, 2021. Every single member of that family who was killed in that attack mattered, but right now, sentencing law in Canada will not reflect that fact. The killer responsible for the attack in London, Ontario, was 20 years old at the time. As a result of the Supreme Court decision, he will not even be 50 years old when he is eligible to apply for full parole.

Business of Supply

The Canadian justice system must be fair and balanced, but it is becoming increasingly imbalanced, with the scales too often tipped toward the perpetrators of violent crime and away from the victims, who are left to pick up the pieces of their lives. In the court ruling on life sentences for mass murderers, the provision struck down by the court was originally introduced in 2011 under the previous Conservative government. The bill was entitled “Protecting Canadians by Ending Sentence Discounts for Multiple Murders Act”. It is worth noting that this bill was passed with the support of all parties in the House.

The bill made sure that an offender was held responsible for each and every life taken when these horrific mass murders occur, and they do, unfortunately, occur. It ensured that the length of offenders' sentences reflected the severity of their crimes.

This decision of the Supreme Court effectively repealed this act. To provide some background, the Protecting Canadians by Ending Sentence Discounts for Multiple Murders Act addressed two specific concerns that victims of crime raised again and again. These concerns were, one, the need for accountability for each life taken and, two, the mental and emotional turmoil that victims face when an offender is granted a parole hearing and family members have to relive the worst day of their lives every two years at repeat parole hearings for the rest of their lives.

The act actually expanded judicial discretion by allowing judges, if they deemed it appropriate, to impose consecutive periods of parole ineligibility. In the years after this legislation was passed, that is exactly what many judges across the country did. They used their discretion to impose consecutive periods of parole ineligibility when they thought it was appropriate. Specifically, since 2011, when this act was introduced, the law has been used in at least 18 cases. These were the worst of the worst, cases that many Canadians would be familiar with as the news of these horrific crimes shocked communities right across our country.

The law was used to sentence the killer who ended the lives of three RCMP officers in Moncton, New Brunswick, and wounded two others in 2014. He was handed a 75-year sentence without parole. The law was used to sentence the notorious killer who took the lives of Tim Bosma, Laura Babcock and Wayne Millard. He was handed a 75-year sentence without parole. The law was used to sentence the killer of two grandparents and their five-year-old grandson in Calgary. He was handed a 75-year sentence without parole. These murderers, all of them relatively young, will now be able to seek full parole 25 years after they were first sentenced.

• (1905)

When the president of the organization Victims of Violence, Sharon Rosenfeldt, testified at the justice committee, she made an important point that I would like to share, as I believe it is just as relevant to the discussions we are having today as it was then. She stated:

We understand, in following the discussion on other bills, that there has been concern expressed by some members of Parliament over mandatory minimum sentences because they reduce judicial discretion. As you know, murder already has a mandatory minimum sentence of life imprisonment, although, with parole eligibility, the “life” part of the sentence does not necessarily mean being imprisoned. [This bill] would actually give judges more discretion at sentencing, so hopefully those MPs who have taken the position opposing a reduction in judicial discretion will support this bill, because it actually increases it.

Susan O'Sullivan was the federal ombudsman for victims of crime at the time, and she also appeared at the justice committee study on the bill. She stated:

Providing judges with the discretion to apply consecutive, rather than concurrent parole ineligibility will help ensure accountability for each life lost, and, where appropriate, will delay and in some cases prevent the trauma and devastation victims experience when faced with [repeated] parole hearings.

The former victims ombudsman makes a really important point here regarding the retraumatization inflicted on families throughout the parole process.

When confronted with the impact of the Supreme Court's recent ruling, the Liberals are determined to stick to their talking points, telling Parliament and concerned Canadians that we should not worry about mass killers actually receiving parole because that possible outcome is, in their words, extremely rare.

• (1910)

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the member for Elgin—Middlesex—London made a really good point earlier on when she said that the discussion happening in the House really did not have anything to do with the main estimates. I am wondering if the member will bring his speech back to the estimates or if he is going to continue with justice policy and legislation.

The Deputy Speaker: As I suggested during those last interactions, we should try to stick to the motion at hand, even though I did not correct or change the course of the previous speaker.

I see another point of order, from the hon. member for Tobique—Mactaquac.

Mr. Richard Bragdon: Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt the member is in proper order by giving these remarks and he should be allowed to continue. This is very much on point and very much a priority. It needs to be discussed in the House, so I do not quite get what the point of order was for in the first place.

The Deputy Speaker: As I said previously, I will always ask members to stick to the motion or bill we are debating at hand. Again, I remind everyone that we are on the main estimates, so there is a pretty wide scope of information we can debate in the House.

The hon. member for Fundy Royal.

Hon. Rob Moore: Mr. Speaker, we are on the main estimates, and the justice estimates are within those main estimates. This relates to the justice system in Canada and we need more justice in this country. That is precisely why I am speaking about these main estimate-related issues.

Business of Supply

When confronted by the impact of the Supreme Court's ruling, the Liberals are saying we do not have to worry about parole hearings. What that actually means is that the government is comfortable with putting these families through revictimizing and re-traumatizing parole processes, even though at the end of the day, it is essentially all for show because, in the government's words, the killer will not receive parole anyway. This process does not benefit anyone involved but is particularly devastating to the families of victims.

I recently spoke to a mother who suffered the loss of a child due to the actions of a drunk driver. I spoke to her about the parole process she had to endure. She said the process was traumatizing and that as soon as some time had passed and she was able to take a step forward in the grieving process, the offender involved applied for parole or appealed the Parole Board decision and she was snapped back to the worst day of her life.

This is a cycle that repeats itself over and over. That is the real life sentence. Like the mom I spoke with, the families impacted by the Supreme Court's decision on reducing life sentences for mass murderers will spend the rest of their lives grieving the loss of their loved ones.

I have read the Supreme Court ruling, and we are speaking about the estimates and the justice estimates within them. The Minister of Justice speaks about a charter dialogue, a dialogue that happens between the courts when they make charter decisions and Parliament as we enact laws, including laws within our Criminal Code. The ball is now in our court in this Parliament. The ball is in the government's court to respond to the court decision. We know from the ruling that the door has been left wide open for Parliament to respond. For the sake of victims, for the sake of our communities, for the sake of ensuring that families do not have to go through repeat parole hearings and for the sake of the life of every victim, we need to make sure that we, as a Parliament, respond.

The Conservatives call on the government to respond to this particular decision of the Supreme Court with legislation that ensures every life in Canada counts and that families are not revictimized over and over again. They have already suffered far too much.

I thank members for listening this evening. Let us take up the challenge that has been put before us and enact strong legislation that keeps our communities safe and protects victims and their loved ones.

● (1915)

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I think my hon. colleague and I may agree on one thing, and I want to reassure Canadians. In his speech, the member referenced that criminals doing the most heinous of crimes will be eligible for parole. It is important to emphasize that eligibility for parole does not mean they get parole. There is a lot of literature on this and we have the statistics to know that certainly the most dangerous of criminals are not going to be getting parole.

I am concerned, and I think he can agree with me on this point, that we have not adequately dealt with the rights of victims of crime. He mentioned Sue O'Sullivan, our former ombudsman for

victims of crime. She was not satisfied with the legislation we got in 2014.

I wonder if my hon. colleague would agree that we need to do much more for victims of crime.

Hon. Rob Moore: Mr. Speaker, I absolutely agree with the member. We have to do more. In fact, she mentioned a former ombudsman in her question. We do not even have an ombudsman for victims of crime and that is truly outrageous. The position has been vacant for some time.

What we are trying to do is eliminate the revictimization of families for the case in Moncton where three RCMP officers were shot and killed. That individual is going to be up for parole at 47 years old. That means a lifetime of attending parole hearings for the families, whether the offender ever gets out or not, and that is not fair to those families.

Mr. Lloyd Longfield (Guelph, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, looking at the justice file is something we were talking about during the member's intervention, which I thank him for. These are the programs we opened up in January: sexual harassment in the workplace, the access to justice in both official languages fund, family violence in the justice partnership and innovation program, the justice partnership and innovation program in general, victims fund for child advocacy centres, victims fund for project funding, victims fund for provincial and territorial program funding, the youth justice fund, and consultation, co-operation and engagement on UNDRIP.

Could the member comment on the variety of justice programs that we are funding through these estimates and how they are making Canada a stronger place?

Hon. Rob Moore: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has listed some things, so I will note that we have a vacant position for a victims ombudsman. When the offenders ombudsman position was vacant, it was filled the next day. For the victims ombudsman position, it has been months since it should have been filled.

In a very short period of time, we have had a Supreme Court decision that says if someone drinks enough, they might be found not guilty of a serious offence. We have had the striking down of a law that valued every life for consecutive periods of parole ineligibility. We have also had Bill C-5, which says that for serious gun crimes and serious offences against other individuals, a person can serve their sentence from the comfort of their own home. That is just in the last month that we have been dealing with these things.

It is time for the government to reverse course, drop Bill C-5 and respond to these Supreme Court decisions.

Business of Supply

Mr. Richard Bragdon (Tobique—Mactaquac, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important that Canadians come to understand the fact that there seems to be a lot of misplaced priorities by the current government. There seems to be, in what it has been presenting as it relates to justice, a disproportionate emphasis on getting soft in the sentencing of people who have committed offences and crimes through the illegal use of firearms, and a disproportionate response to law-abiding firearms owners, who have kept to the law and been faithful in abiding by the law.

Can the member comment on that? I would be interested in his thoughts on the rights of law-abiding firearms owners and going after the true perpetrators of crimes with firearms.

Hon. Rob Moore: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member hit the nail on the head. What we have is a situation where law-abiding firearms owners are not the problem. However, once again, as we have seen over the past couple of decades, law-abiding firearms owners are the target of the Liberal government. Meanwhile, with Bill C-5, jail time is being eliminated by the government for robbery with a firearm, extortion with a firearm, weapons trafficking, importing or exporting knowing it is unauthorized and discharging a firearm with intent, all of which are offences that used to carry with them mandatory jail time.

• (1920)

Mrs. Karen Vecchio (Elgin—Middlesex—London, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is truly an honour to stand here as we discuss the business of supply and the main estimates for 2023. I would like to begin by thanking a lot of people who have been talking to me over the last three weeks about the Supreme Court ruling that was made on May 13. I would like to thank the member who just spoke earlier, the hon. member representing New Brunswick. I would like to thank people from the London Abused Women's Centre, especially Jennifer Dunn and Megan Walker, and all those who have connected with me to ask if this is really the truth, if this is really happening.

I want to go to what happened on May 13 and the discussions that started following a Supreme Court ruling. On May 13, the Supreme Court of Canada issued a major decision indicating that criminal defence in cases involving assault, including sexual assault, would be able to use a defence known as self-induced extreme intoxication.

It is really hard for me to look at this. I am not a lawyer. I am just a normal human being who has children, who has family and who loves her community. I want to ensure that things like this do not exist in a court of law. I have reached out to some of these lawyers, to some Crown attorneys, and we have amazing support here from the member for Brantford—Brant and the member for Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, just the work they have done to share with me what is going on here. These are the things we need to talk about. I am not going to blither anymore. I am going to talk about what has actually happened.

On that date, there was a ruling saying that extreme intoxication could be used, because otherwise it goes against the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, sections 7 and 11. I started looking at this, what it actually means and how it happened, and I went back to the history of why section 33.1 exists in the Criminal Code in the first

place. This had to do with the fact that someone had been charged and there was a problem because at the end of the day, they were allowed to use this type of defence, the fact that this person was totally intoxicated and yet sexually assaulted someone.

I started looking at some of the different cases and asking why this is such an important thing to Canada and how we can ensure that this would never happen again. How can we ensure that someone would never be able to use extreme intoxication, especially when it is an offence on another individual, especially when it has to do with sexual assault, bodily harm, or any type of violence against a person? This is why I am so concerned with this.

When this Supreme Court ruling came out, I asked my colleagues about three key issues: What needs to be addressed in the Criminal Code? What are the specific loopholes? What can we do to address this issue immediately? The first thing we did as a group, and there were four of us who signed on, was to send a letter to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada explaining that we wanted to talk about this and that we knew there was an issue. We indicated that these decisions imperil the safety of sexual assault victims by permitting the dubious defence of non-insane automatism due to self-induced intoxication. Sexual offences disproportionately affect women and vulnerable people. The Attorney General has had sufficient time to study this ruling. The ruling clearly implores the government to act. The government has not. We have only heard silence from the government.

That is why I am here today. This judgment was made on May 13. Today is June 7. We already know that when it comes to victims of sexual abuse and exploitation, the chances of people coming forward are already very slim, going into the criminal justice system. We just finished Bill C-233 last week, where we talked about judges' training and we talked about the fact that there is such a disconnect there. Understanding domestic violence, understanding criminal law, understanding what it is like to be a victim is so important. That is why I will continue to ask and continue to advocate for judges having training on domestic abuse, on sexual exploitation, on rape, all of these things, and how important it is. Although Bill C-233 is expected to pass through the Senate, we still need to make sure that judges are taking this.

That is why, when we look at this decision, we say, oh my gosh, the victim is lost throughout the entire discussion. That is why I have so many issues with this. We sent this letter over two weeks ago, and we are still waiting for a response. I recognize that the minister has spoken to us in question period, but we are waiting for action, and that is what I am calling for today. We want action.

We have people like Jennifer Dunn, the executive director of the London Abused Women's Centre, who said, "Women are already disproportionately affected when it comes to assault and sexual assault so this will affect them tenfold.... To be able to use that as an excuse and potentially not be convicted for their crimes is absolutely absurd."

• (1925)

That is why I want to continue to have this discussion. We are talking about a person and the fact that if people are violated, there is a fear of coming forward after everything. Whether it is the judge's training, or whatever it may be, the fact is that someone could even use extreme intoxication as a defence. I am sorry, but if it were my daughter who was raped and someone used extreme intoxication, as a mother watching my child, I would ask, how could anyone let that happen? I ask every person out there to reflect on this: If this was a member of their family or a member of their community, how would they feel if they knew that they did nothing?

It has been three weeks now. Let us get this done. I am just going to ask the minister to get this done. We know that section 33.1 is unconstitutional, based on the nine Supreme Court judges saying it is unconstitutional, and they have come back to the government and indicated, even in their decision, that the government could do something, so I am asking where the government is on this. Why have the Liberals not done anything?

I know that on an issue just a month ago, they had an immediate response. At that moment they were talking about oil and gas. That day, they talked about the fact that they were going to appeal that decision. We are talking three weeks later, and we still have not heard from the government what it is planning on doing.

I want to go back and talk about why section 33.1 was put there in the first place, so that members have an idea of what can happen and why this is so important. I am looking through these notes, and there were two cases that involved men who were high on drugs when they killed and injured family members. The extreme intoxication was used to acquit one man and order a new trial for the other. Right there, we have people high on drugs who killed and injured family members.

With the case that just came up here recently, I know there has been lots of discussion on that one. It is not up to me as a parliamentarian to judge what is right and wrong, but it is to fill in those holes. We sit here and ask if this is fair. This is where the rights of the victims are lost and the rights of the criminals are talked about as being charter rights under sections 7 and 11.

I ask members, what if they were the ones violated and every single right was gone because the violator took those rights away from them? What if their rights were taken away and all we were worrying about were the criminal's rights? I sit here and think that the criminal's rights are outweighing the victim's rights. Something is absolutely wrong there.

The case that brought this all up, and the reason we are having this discussion, was the May 13 decision. It was about a case that involved a man who had consumed alcohol and magic mushrooms. He broke into the home of a female victim and violently assaulted her with a broom handle, leaving permanent injuries. He was de-

clared by the courts to have been in a psychotic state and to have had no will to control his actions.

I sit here and wonder how we define extreme intoxication. How many times have people gone to somebody's Facebook and seen that somebody had written "I was extremely intoxicated"? I have spoken to friends and different people who will talk about not remembering what happened that night. What we are doing here is actually saying that if people are not able to make that choice, although they voluntarily consumed the alcohol or the drugs, they are involuntarily doing the thing, because they do not have the state of mind to make the right judgment.

I go back to point one: They had the choice to drink, and they had the choice to take drugs. There are some cases where awful things have happened when people have been given drugs. We understand that this happens as well, so we have to look at that, but when people are voluntarily doing something and then the next time they are actually victimizing somebody else, why are we sitting back and allowing that to be the case? Why are we sitting there and saying extreme intoxication can be used? We know that it is very minute, because we know that there is a threshold, but my problem is that one is too many. That could be somebody's daughter. That could be anything like this. We have to look at the victims first. We have to look at the violators first, and that is what we are not doing.

I think the decision made by the Supreme Court, whether it is right or wrong, gave direction to the government to do something, and I am asking the government where it is at making this decision.

We know that, as I said, people are not going to come forward if they think this can be used, so I am very concerned as we are moving forward. There is a lot of work we need to do here. When it comes to intimate partner violence, when it comes to violence and when it comes to offences on other victims, I believe we can all agree that the victims matter and that they should come first, so I urge the government to do something now, not three weeks from now, but now.

• (1930)

Ms. Laurel Collins (Victoria, NDP): Madam Speaker, I want to thank the member for raising this really important issue.

She mentioned that this happened three weeks ago, but the Ontario court actually ruled on this two years ago. Two years ago this week, my New Democrat colleague, the member for London—Fanshawe, called on the government to explore changes to the law to ensure that extreme intoxication could not be used as a defence. It has been two years, and we have been calling for the government to explore those changes.

I wonder if the member can comment on how unacceptable it is that the government keeps delaying and that victims are paying the price.

Mrs. Karen Vecchio: Madam Speaker, I think the member wrapped it up perfectly. The government is late to the game. Victims need to come first. We have seen this when we talk about the victims bill of rights and the victims ombudsman. Where are they?

Business of Supply

I appreciate the fact that the member for London—Fanshawe works on issues dealing with women all the time, and I will stand beside her as she is working on those issues, because I think that when we see that women are being violated, we do stand together on these issues. Let us work together to get the government to do something.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, to pursue the point the hon. member for Elgin—Middlesex—London put forward, I was very troubled by the Supreme Court of Canada's decision when it came down. The more I read the decision, the more I see that the court carefully differentiated mere drunkenness from this very specific extreme intoxication defence. That does not mean I am satisfied to leave the law as it is. We obviously cannot appeal this decision. It is a Supreme Court of Canada decision, but I agree with the member for Victoria and the member for Elgin—Middlesex—London.

I would suggest that we all work together across party lines, recognizing that the Supreme Court of Canada itself has invited Parliament to legislate in this area in ways that would not offend the charter, to make sure that even in cases of extreme intoxication there is no loophole for violent crimes.

Mrs. Karen Vecchio: Madam Speaker, I understand where the member is coming from, because there is a line between where drunkenness ends and where extreme intoxications starts. That is the line we have to figure out. Right now there is no true definition. We know that there would need to be psychologists, psychiatrists and a variety of different people, so the threshold is high, but there needs to be something more defined. At this time, the Supreme Court of Canada has come back and said that legislators and members of Parliament need to fix this. That is our job, so we should be having those discussions and fixing that.

Mrs. Tracy Gray (Kelowna—Lake Country, CPC): Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for her strong ongoing advocacy for victims.

I wonder if she can comment on the government's overarching theme of being soft on crime. We see it in a number of ways, in different legislation that it brings forth and in how it approaches many different issues. I wonder if you can comment on how the government is not really standing up for victims of crime, but really having this soft-on-crime approach.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Just as a reminder, it is the hon. member who is going to comment, not me.

The hon. member for Elgin—Middlesex—London.

Mrs. Karen Vecchio: Madam Speaker, to that point, being soft on crime is exactly how I see this. We talk about the revolving door that we see in the courts. We talk about that all the time, and we continue to see it because there is loophole after loophole. That is where the government comes in. When it comes to criminal law and laws like this, we need to look at them and ask where the victim fits in.

I have watched different court sessions. I recognize that, at the end of the day, the government wants to get rid of mandatory minimum sentences and so forth. I want to know how many victims' organizations are sitting at the table when the government is talking

about that. I have sat with people who have gone to Parole Board hearings and who have been revictimized after the loss of a sister. I have spoken with these people. I ask the government to stand in their shoes for one day and imagine what it is like to lose a loved one, and then imagine having to withstand a government that is soft on crime.

• (1935)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Monique Pauzé (Repentigny, BQ): Madam Speaker, I want to inform you that I will be sharing my time with my colleague from Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères.

I just got back from a short trip to Stockholm last week to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the first Earth Summit in 1972. These summits on global environmental challenges are always very informative, but over the years they sometimes take on another tone. I have to say that the data is becoming quite worrisome. This year, in 2022, the call for urgent action was clearer than ever.

The statistics and the evidence should be stirring us into action and motivating us to implement bold public policy that provides hope for the future. People say there is always someone who is worse off than we are, but based on what I saw in Sweden, I would venture that Canada might not even be able to say that. That is how badly off we are.

In its most recent report, the IPCC highlighted the important, in its most critical, role that municipalities play in combatting climate change. I would say that Stockholm recognized that well before—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Order. I can hear a phone sounding an alarm and I would ask that it be turned off.

The hon. member may continue.

Ms. Monique Pauzé: Madam Speaker, the city of Stockholm is at the forefront. I will not talk about the many praiseworthy elements of its urban planning, but, in short, it is a model city. Obviously, some will say that Sweden is a small country that does not face the same challenges as Canada. That is true. However, the real difference is that Sweden has the political will and courage to do things differently, with the common objective of meeting the collective imperatives.

What are the current collective imperatives? The climate crisis and even the survival of humans. We must acknowledge this and take action to counter the declining biodiversity and the material threats represented by all climate events, such as violent winds, forest fires and the destruction of infrastructure. These events are reported every day in the newspapers.

Business of Supply

I have not forgotten about health. The World Health Organization just issued a new policy brief on the measures that countries must implement to address health issues related to climate change. This brief was released as Stockholm+50 ended. The WHO urges us to view health not just from the historical perspective of pollution and its links to cancer, but by also factoring in psychosocial well-being, anxiety, depression, persistent grief and suicidal behaviour.

It is David versus Goliath. David is the millions of citizens who are worried about their future and their children's future. David also represents the organizations that are trying to knock some sense into politicians. Goliath is big oil, which is dominated by foreign interests and whose ambitions are being legitimized by the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers, an influential third party, which is really worrisome.

In December 2021, the Council of Canadians released a report analyzing the system that is in place. It revealed an industry sector that is holding the government hostage and keeping it captive through intensive lobbying. This is the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers. The author of the study is an economist, author and university professor. He uncovered a significant issue: CAPP was allowed to register as a third-party advertiser in the 2019 federal election, letting it run ads and advocate on key issues. Third parties are allowed to spend up to \$1 million in the pre-writ period and up to \$500,000 during the election campaign. One would think we were in the United States.

The Canada Elections Act prohibits a person or entity from making or publishing false statements during an election to affect election results. However, during the 2019 election, CAPP made two false statements on the Vote Energy platform website.

In its first statement, it wrote that "Canada's only credible path to meeting its Paris commitments is through increased exports of Canadian natural gas". It was implying that fossil fuels were actually going to help us. In the second statement, it called for Canada to "acknowledge that Canada's oil and natural gas sector is not subsidized". As false statements go, I do not think it gets any worse than this second statement.

We understand better now why the government cannot resolve the issue of fossil fuel subsidies. Obviously, hundreds of meetings in 12 months with ministers and other elected government officials produce results. How can we expect to make a real transition? We are even at the point where the Canada Elections Act would have to be amended in order to close another loophole. It seems to me that we have enough on our plates already. Let us not add to it, for goodness' sake.

We learned recently, after the supplementary estimates (A) were released, that Canada's six largest banks have quietly provided \$10 billion in financing for Trans Mountain. Canada's Department of Finance had repeatedly refused to reveal who was behind the huge loan for the controversial oil sands pipeline. Bloomberg, the largest supplier of financial data, has confirmed that all the Canadian banks are listed as lenders. With the guaranteed returns on a loan this big, the banks are getting a good deal.

Everyone needs to understand something. Even if Trans Mountain does not pay back the full amount, the federal government's

commitment means that the banks involved are in no danger of losing money. We will see why.

When was that promise made? The deal with the banks was signed on April 29, the same day that the federal loan guarantee was approved by the Prime Minister's Office, as first reported by the news website Politico.

● (1940)

The exact amount loaned by each bank is not disclosed, but if I divide the \$10 billion by the number of banks, each bank would have loaned roughly \$1.7 billion. Some observers have said that it was a formality. Why say such a thing? A \$10-billion loan coordinated between six banks is a complex agreement that would have taken months to prepare, which once again raises the problem of the lack of transparency. It seems like Export Development Canada's habit of not being transparent is starting to rub off on the Department of Finance.

Trans Mountain is a Crown corporation. It is funded in part by taxpayers' money. It should therefore be a paragon of transparency, not opacity. The government wants to build a pipeline, but it does not have any credible arguments for doing so. The Minister of Finance said in February that no additional public money would be spent on that project and that the necessary funding would be secured through third-party financing, either in the public debt markets or with financial institutions. She failed to mention that the government would guarantee these arrangements. Again, Canada's account administered by Export Development Canada is the account fed by the public treasury, meaning our money.

It is not like the Bloc Québécois has not talked about that account. We have not stopped talking about it. It takes some nerve to tell people stories like that. It is disgusting. It would be irrational not to be concerned about the current state of governance. If this were some kind of amazing, solid project that was a guaranteed money-maker and guaranteed to be safe for the climate while ensuring a future for our children and our health, I would bet anything that the government and Canadian banks would shout it from the rooftops, but no, this is all being done in secret.

This project is an environmental death sentence that violates indigenous rights and compromises the global community's efforts to slow the climate crisis. It is a financial disaster. It is a carbon bomb being built through the mountains. It flies in the face of climate science. Nobody can be proud of this project. It is obvious why they are not exactly advertising it, so it should come as no surprise that the latest developments in this shameful saga are being hushed up.

The arrangement shows how non-Canadian institutions feel about the financial prospects of the tar sands. It also speaks to the undue influence of the oil and gas industry, the loopholes in the Canada Elections Act, and finally, the consequences we will collectively face in the future.

Business of Supply

To attract private lenders such as the big Canadian banks, experts say the federal government is likely to have subordinated its own debt, which means that private sector investors will be paid first if the project is completed and generates revenue. If what the experts say proves to be true, if that really is the case, an investigation will be in order to shed some light on the decision-making process. However, the government is keeping mum.

The Bloc Québécois has been systematically calling for an end to the support for Trans Mountain for a very long time. Are the Bloc members the only ones who are fed up with all the lies and double-talk?

• (1945)

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Repentigny. I am happy she has returned safely from the major conference in Stockholm.

I want to ask a question about our government's target, its major objective of achieving net zero by 2050. The IPCC says that achieving net zero by 2050 would be too late to protect our future. We must act immediately to reduce greenhouse gases before 2025.

What does she think about the idea of achieving net zero by 2050?

Ms. Monique Pauzé: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague and friend from Saanich—Gulf Islands. Indeed, we can see that 2050 is too late.

In my speeches, I have always said that we need to protect the future for our children and grandchildren. We are beyond that point, however. We are in the thick of it now. The problems have already started. Everything that is in the atmosphere will continue to make temperatures rise. We need to act right now, and we need to do it fast.

When I hear people elsewhere in the world who have brilliant ideas about how we can succeed in this mad race against time, I sometimes find myself thinking, “Dear God, if only Canada could get on board, it would have already made progress.”

We need to move more quickly, but the political will does not seem to be there.

I want to add one more thing. In 1972, at the Club of Rome, a predecessor to the IPCC, one Mr. Fuller said that Earth could be a paradise if all the politicians were sent to the moon.

I have a couple of names to suggest for the next shuttle launch.

[*English*]

Ms. Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Madam Speaker, the hon. member is correct in the sense that urgent action is needed to address the climate crisis.

The IPCC, scientists and, more broadly, Canadians already know that. However, what we saw, as the member has mentioned, is the government and, more specifically, the Prime Minister decide to buy a pipeline, one that is actually not economical at that. They are being particularly secretive about the cost implications related to it. On top of that, they are not moving forward and taking real action to stop the subsidies for big oil.

From that perspective, I would like to ask the member what she thinks the top priorities would be for the government to address the climate crisis?

[*Translation*]

Ms. Monique Pauzé: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for her question. I would say that there was a time when we could set priorities. Now, everything is a priority because the crisis is too serious.

I feel that all countries worked together to tackle the health crisis quickly, but they are unable to do the same with this major climate crisis. We are losing living things. What is happening to biodiversity is shocking. The air we breathe is making us sick.

The government is giving money to Trans Mountain and, as I explained in my speech, the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers is such a powerful lobby that it can hide the costs. We have yet to talk about Bay du Nord or the offshore drilling off the coast of Newfoundland.

All the decisions being made seem to be completely contrary to what all international and Canadian experts are telling us.

• (1950)

[*English*]

Mrs. Tracy Gray (Kelowna—Lake Country, CPC): Madam Speaker, we are talking about the main estimates tonight. I am wondering if the hon. member has any specific thoughts on agriculture with regard to the main estimates.

Looking at the agriculture sector, we know there are a lot of pressing issues right now in Canada having to do with production and the supply chain. I am wondering if the member is hearing any comments from her constituents on agriculture and how they might flow through the main estimates.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Monique Pauzé: Madam Speaker, with respect to agriculture, I cannot really speak to anything the people in my riding may have told me because it is not a primarily agricultural riding, even though there is some agriculture.

However, at the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development, we saw that funds were given to help farmers minimize their emissions. That is related to the main estimates. I will stop there.

Mr. Xavier Barsalou-Duval (Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères, BQ): Madam Speaker, we are here this evening to debate the supplementary estimates for the 2022-23 fiscal year. As members know, budgets generally go up to March 31. That is usually how they work.

My question is about the supplementary estimates or the budget. Since we are talking about the 2022-23 budget, I want to talk more specifically about budget 2022, which was presented in March. I think tonight is the perfect opportunity to talk about a subject that is near and dear to me, but that the government does not seem to care much about. This will become clearer in a moment.

There was one short segment in the budget that the government presented not too long ago that might have been overlooked. A federal budget is several hundred pages long, and it is rare for someone to go through it line by line, word by word. It is easy to miss things.

Obviously, as the transportation and infrastructure critic, my staff and I are more interested in those areas, so we dug a little deeper. We found that on page 79 of the budget it says:

Budget 2022 signals the government's intention to accelerate the deadline for provinces to fully commit their remaining funding under the Investing in Canada Infrastructure Program to priority projects to March 31, 2023. As a measure of fiscal prudence, any uncommitted funds after this date will be reallocated to other priorities. The federal government will work closely with provinces to support them in expediting project submissions.

The next line says that the deadline remains unchanged for the territories.

It is important to understand that the deadline was not 2023. It was moved up; it used to be later. In fact, the deadline was 2025. That is the whole problem. It is 2022 and the government is saying that all projects have to be submitted by 2023.

We also have to understand what type of money and what type of projects we are talking about. The investing in Canada infrastructure program is a huge program. It has a \$7.5-billion envelope for the Quebec component alone. How much is left in the program right now? A bit more than \$3.5 billion roughly has been allocated, so there is \$4 billion left. In an election year, where all sorts of things may happen, where we might lose a month and there may be changes in government and ministers, people had 10 months to submit plans instead of the three years they should have had.

Worse yet, it is not just the Government of Quebec submitting plans. The municipalities and towns of Quebec are doing so as well. Who will pay the price for these decisions at the end of the day? It is Quebec's towns.

I mention this today because it has had significant and profound adverse effects, but it is more than that. When a government decides to change its agenda, we might say that is its right. It can do that and we can speak out against the resulting consequences, which is what I am doing right now.

However, it goes further than that. An agreement was signed with the Quebec government in 2018, which essentially said that the end date was going to be 2025. There was a signed agreement in which the parties agreed on the amounts and the dates. When you have a signed agreement, you usually expect your partner on the other end to stick to it. Of course, when it comes to the federal government, it is a bit harder to know for sure whether one can rely on anything it agrees to, since it does have a bad track record in that regard.

Business of Supply

Many will remember, as I do, the famous 1980 referendum in which Trudeau senior said that voting "no" was a vote for change. I was not there in 1980 because I was not born yet, but I remember the images, and they come back to haunt me every time I see things like that happen. The infamous change was the patriation of the Canadian Constitution. This was not a very positive change for Quebec, which never signed it, not even to this day.

Again in 1995, we were promised the world and what we got was the notorious sponsorship scandal and the equally notorious Clarity Act. That is the kind of reliable partner we can do without.

On the subject of infrastructure specifically, I could talk about the national trade corridors fund, which gave us peanuts. I could talk about contracts for the Davie shipyard and how the government laughed in our faces and gave us next to nothing. The federal government seems to enjoy laughing at us and showing us who is boss. That is what we are seeing here.

● (1955)

The problem is not just that the government wants to pretend it is the boss. The problem is that real people in real communities will be passed over. These are programs for green infrastructure, public transit and drinking water systems, which are huge issues for all the cities that need them.

There is \$4 billion up for grabs. Those people over there will say that cities still have a shot at those billions because they still have 10 months to submit something that takes three years to prepare. That means cities will be in a big rush and will put anything down in an effort to save as much as they can, but they are almost guaranteed to lose.

It is sad to see a government acting that way. What is even sadder is that, in reading the agreement in detail, we realized that it contained something specific to Quebec. In Quebec, we do not necessarily like to be yes-men. Infrastructure and municipal affairs are not under federal jurisdiction. A total of 97% of the country's infrastructure belongs either to municipalities, provinces or Quebec. This means that the federal government owns roughly 3% of infrastructure, next to nothing, but it thinks it is the boss. The problem is that this government, which is notorious for thinking it is the boss, does not even uphold the agreements it signs. However, we need this money for our infrastructure.

As I was saying, we took a look at the agreement to see the differences between Quebec and the other provinces, because we know that the federal government does not like it when Quebec does something different—that is practically criminal—because Quebec does not have the right or because it is dangerous. Quebec is not allowed to have its own identity.

Business of Supply

There are two sections in the 2018 agreement with Quebec, sections 3(a) and 3(b), under the heading “Commitments by Canada”, which are not in the other agreements. At the end, there are two short phrases noting that Canada would subsequently add phases to the program. There have indeed been several phases in the investing in Canada plan, but in the first phase, there was \$342 million remaining in the amount allocated to Quebec.

The sections I just mentioned state that the amounts not used in phase I will be able to be used in subsequent phases. This is worthwhile and very positive, because Quebec will not lose money and will be able to use this money to plan other projects.

However, something happened at last Monday's meeting of the Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities. Since we have a reliable partner that always keeps its word and never backs out of agreements, I asked the Minister of Transport what would happen to the money remaining from phase 1 and whether it would be transferred as set out in the agreement. The minister told us no, we would not see or get that money, and that the government would keep it, that it would be recovered by the receiver general of Canada. I was not impressed.

I then asked myself if Canada plays these kinds of games when negotiating with other countries. Take for example an agreement with China, the United States, France, Germany or Japan, or a bilateral agreement with another country. Will the Canadian government renege on this agreement a few weeks later? If so, do members think that the other country would be happy about it? Obviously not, and Quebec is also not happy today.

I am wondering if Canada generally honours its agreements. I am guessing it does, and I am guessing that the only reason it is not honouring this agreement is that Quebec is not a country. It is that simple. We are not a country, and the government knows that ultimately, there will be no consequences. It can do whatever it wants, and it knows that its word is worth absolutely nothing. That is disappointing.

Quebec is set to lose hundreds of millions of dollars because of the arrogance of this government, a government that we cannot trust, that could not care less about Quebec and that only wants to be in charge and impose its own laws. That is completely unacceptable. That is what we are fighting against, and we are really going to ensure that we hold the government to account on that.

I find this so unacceptable that we passed a motion in committee this week to once again summon the minister to explain why Canada is not living up to its bilateral agreements.

The government has not upheld its agreement with Quebec, but the other provinces are also suffering because their bilateral agreements have not been upheld either. Quebec is not the only one being disrespected; all the Canadian provinces are, through the decisions that the government makes.

However, the biggest difference is that it is Quebec that is being punished the most. Quebec believed the government opposite. Perhaps we were naive to believe that we could trust the Liberals and trust the Canadian government.

I am not sure if I any time left, but I think I have said basically everything I wanted to say.

• (2000)

[*English*]

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons (Senate), Lib.): Madam Speaker, I listened to the intervention by the member today and I find it quite fascinating that previous Bloc MPs have risen and said that we are not moving fast enough with various things, in particular in relation to green infrastructure.

The Infrastructure Bank is funding so many of these projects. We just have to go online to see that, but the member is now complaining that municipalities and the provinces are asked to submit their plans and their applications for 10 months from now. I was a mayor of a city and a city councillor and I know very well that if a municipality has a project on the go or is interested, 10 months is more than long enough to get council approval to proceed with an application and put together the basic framework for an application to submit.

I am curious if the member can comment on one or two municipalities that he knows for which 10 months would not be long enough to put together a plan for that application.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Xavier Barsalou-Duval: Madam Speaker, imagine a person has three years left to pay off their mortgage and the bank calls them up one morning to say that they actually have only 10 months. Imagine a person has a three-year contract with their employer, and, one random morning a year later, that person goes to work and their boss says that their contract will end in 10 months. I am not sure anyone would be happy to hear that.

Usually, when people have a contract, they respect it. That is what we expect from the government. The most frustrating part of all this is that the government across the way is not respecting its own signature. It is meaningless. The government seems to think of itself as a supreme being that owes nothing to anyone. It is so frustrating. I hope that Canadians, especially Quebecers, will remember this the next time they go to the polls.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague from Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères for his speech. We sat beside one another in the previous Parliament.

I would like to hear his comments on the fact that budget 2022 completely overlooks the importance of having an intercity transportation service. For example, here in British Columbia, we lost the bus system and the same is true in the Maritimes. I do not think it is as big of a problem in Quebec.

What does he think of the fact that the federal government has ignored the needs of citizens in more remote regions?

Business of Supply

● (2005)

Mr. Xavier Barsalou-Duval: Madam Speaker, I thank the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands for her very relevant question. It gives me a chance to add to what I said earlier.

I talked about the fact that the government basically stole \$342 million from Quebec by deciding not to give it the money it should have received under the agreement. Of that \$342 million, \$293 million was supposed to be spent on public transit, so Quebec has lost out on \$293 million for public transit because of a unilateral decision by the government opposite. There is a lot to be angry about.

[English]

Mr. Daniel Blaikie (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise this evening to speak to the main estimates for 2022-23.

I want to start by talking a bit about climate change and the importance of the government taking a leadership role in charting an economic path from where we are today to where we need to be, both in order to lower emissions and to try to avert the worst of what is coming with climate change in the climate crisis. That continues to be, or must be, the priority. I am not always convinced that it is the priority that it needs to be around here, but it must be a priority.

That economic course is important, not only to mitigate the economic and the very real human effects that climate change will bring, but also because it is about securing a prosperous future for Canadians in an economy that is changing. If we look around the world, we see a lot of countries that are accepting the reality of climate change and trying to transition their economies away from such a heavy reliance on fossil fuels. We have seen the importance of that from a climate change point of view, but recently we have seen the importance of trying to transition away from fossil fuels from a defence and security point of view too. Russia's illegal invasion of Ukraine has shown just how fragile the world economy is in the face of its reliance on fossil fuels. Therefore, we are trying to develop energy alternatives that are closer to home, and we are fortunate in Canada to have many ways that we can do that and many resources that can enable a transition away from such heavy reliance on fossil fuels. There is certainly more than one reason, and I do not even pretend to have captured them all.

With regard to the government's spending plan, what we saw in the budget was a commitment, first of all, of about \$2.6 billion for carbon capture and sequestration. That is a bad bet, not only in terms of the success of the technology at scale, which many experts have called into question, but also in terms of emissions reductions as well. It is just not where we should be spending the lion's share of public funds that are meant to transition the economy away from reliance on carbon. In fact, it is designed to not be transitioning away from reliance on carbon; it is meant to find ways to perpetuate that reliance, which is still a form of climate change denial, and it is going to do a fair bit of harm.

We saw already in the budget that the government has not understood the severity of the crisis. I do not think the government is at a place where it is going to invest in the right options. It was very disappointing to see that, particularly in the context of a govern-

ment that had committed to reduce fossil fuel subsidies and not increase them. That is one area of government spending in respect to climate that is important to highlight, and I want Canadians to know that the government is making a serious mistake in that respect.

With respect to the budget still, the Liberals want to land investment in renewable energy in the Infrastructure Bank, which means they want to capitalize the bank for a lot of renewable energy projects. That is what they say. However, part of the issue is that in so doing, they are handing it off to an organization that has a very bad track record so far on delivering projects. It does not give us a lot of hope to know that the Infrastructure Bank is on the case. It has not delivered a lot of projects.

To the extent that its successful projects list has increased—and I am sure somebody will want to quote some high numbers at me later—it has largely been around bus purchasing. That is great and is an important part of it, but we do not need an Infrastructure Bank and we do not need to pay former Liberals high salaries in order to figure out how to source electric buses. This is something that we already know how to do. It is something municipalities were doing before the Infrastructure Bank, thanks very much, and it is something that they could continue to do without the Infrastructure Bank. As well, perhaps we could do it more effectively if we did not have to go through another layer of administration and pay the salaries of government cronies over at the Infrastructure Bank, if I am being honest about what I think about it.

● (2010)

There is another intentional or unintentional consequence of running that funding through the Infrastructure Bank, although I would impress upon colleagues again that there is not a lot of evidence that it is worth it, because the Infrastructure Bank is not so great at delivering projects on time and on budget. The other consequence is that those projects that may have appeared in an estimate—projects that might have appeared somewhere here on the floor of the House of Commons to give parliamentarians and, through their representatives, Canadians, an opportunity to weigh in on the key nation-building projects that ought to be a part of our response to climate change and drive our transition to a low-carbon economy—will not grace the floor of the House.

Instead, that money will be set aside at some point, perhaps in estimates one time, and then those debates will be happening internally at the Infrastructure Bank. Municipal governments will be talking to the Infrastructure Bank, not our duly elected government—or parliamentarians, for that matter. I think there is a real loss of democratic involvement in the way that the government is projecting the delivery of those funds, and it is a mistake.

Business of Supply

I think of my colleague from Manitoba, who represents the riding of Churchill—Keewatinook Aski and has done some great work and presented a private member's bill to try to change the nature of the Infrastructure Bank, which is a good thing. However, that work is not done. That bill has not passed. The Infrastructure Bank remains largely as it was originally set up by the Liberals and is not doing the job that I think was advertised in the 2015 election when the government initially ran on the idea of having an infrastructure bank.

If we are going to successfully transition the economy to a lower-carbon economy, that is also an opportunity to engage Canadians who are wondering a lot about their future right now, wondering a lot about how they are going to afford a home, how they are going to get the education they need to get a job that is actually out there in the market. We hear a lot from employers right now, who are saying they cannot find qualified people to do the jobs that they need done in order for their businesses to succeed, in order for their customers here in Canada and abroad to get the products and the services that they want.

As we think about serious public investment in the economy to respond to climate change, I think we should also have a process that brings more Canadians into that conversation and helps them get some direction over the kinds of employment that we are going to see and the pathways to that employment as well. Running the lion's share of the funding for new renewable infrastructure projects through the Infrastructure Bank is a real missed opportunity to foster that kind of engagement and participation on the part of Canadians.

There is another major spend by government that is not in the estimates, and that is the recent loan guarantee of \$10 billion for the TMX pipeline, in addition to what had already been committed. I do not think anyone should kid themselves: It is an expenditure. It is a commitment of public funds above and beyond what had already been budgeted, which was around \$15 billion or maybe a little bit more. This is another \$10 billion. We are getting close to the \$30-billion mark, for those who are keeping track, and because that happened through the Canada Account of Export Development Canada, it does not appear on the books here. That is a decision that cabinet got to make off in the corner, as it did when it initially purchased the Trans Mountain pipeline.

When we think about the Mackenzie pipeline debates of the 1950s and what a watershed moment that was for the country and for Parliament, this is a real disappointment. I think that is an understatement. I am feeling very parliamentary at the moment.

It is disappointing that the government chose to fund that project in that way for all sorts of reasons. It is disappointing because it is the wrong project at the wrong time and it does not take us in the right direction in terms of the economy for the future, but it is also disappointing because it circumvented this place.

We do talk a lot about pipelines in this place. I have my own views on that and I have been pretty open about that. People can search the record in terms of what I think about pipelines. I have probably given enough that people can probably read the tea leaves here already.

• (2015)

I know others disagree, and that is fine. Parliament is a place where disagreement comes to live. If we are doing our jobs well, hopefully we can tackle some of those real disagreements and we can find some common ground. On the things that we cannot find common ground, we cannot.

At the very least, something like the federal government buying an existing pipeline and committing close to \$30 billion, certainly \$25 billion, to get the thing built is a major national undertaking, whether I agree with it or not, and whether others like it or not. It would be outrageous for someone to claim that is not a major national expense and that it will not have major national implications down the road.

The government could have tried to fund it through estimates, but it did not. It decided to circumvent Parliament instead and make that decision on its own. I think how it chose to make that decision was wrong, independently of the fact that I think the decision was wrong.

Why was TMX even up for sale? It was not just the existing pipeline, but the projected future pipeline. It was because a large company in the oil and gas sector, which is very good at building pipelines, decided it was a loser. If it thought it was going to make money on that thing, it would have hung onto it.

The company decided it was going to lose a lot of money, so it put the pipeline up for sale. Who came knocking? The federal government. It was the government that ran on getting serious about tackling the climate crisis. A government that has since many times repeated about, but not often actually acted on, reducing fossil fuel subsidies.

Just like everyone else, we are reading in the media about where this project is headed and the massive cost overruns. We know that when the government says it is going to provide loan guarantees, and it is not public funding, then it is a sham because one of two things is going to happen.

The project could be a wild success and it would make a lot of money for the private investors who are kicking in cash, with no risk, because the government has already underwritten those loans. In this case there would not be a public expenditure, but there would be a lot of happy private investors.

However, in the case where it goes wrong, it would be a public expenditure because the government is going to step in and cover the loans. In that case the private investors are going to walk off scot-free without ever having taken a meaningful risk.

To me, that sounds worse than public expenditure. At least if the government had spent the money itself, it would be entitled to the profit and, if it were successful, it would make income off it. However, the government has said the only for sure thing is that it is not going to make a lot of income off that project because, if it is a success, the private investors will walk away with the return. Only if it is a failure, will Canadians have to pay the bill.

It is a completely wrong-headed project, but I am glad to take this opportunity to talk about it in the context of the estimates because it is not there and it really ought to have been a parliamentary conversation. I wish we had a better debate about that before the decision was made. In fact, it was announced as a surprise. I remember reading about it on my phone walking up to the Hill one morning, that the government had decided to do this.

It is quite a disappointment. I say that by way of trying to remind people of the importance and the significance this place can have and sometimes does have. These kinds of circuitous funding routes are ways that government, the executive, minimizes the role of this place and keeps important decision-making and important national conversations away from this place.

We have taken up the question of the TMX pipeline. I do not just mean the NDP. I mean in this place, we have heard about it from all sides of the House in various ways during question period. However, there really ought to have been a time for a better and more focused debate. It should not just be in 35-second snippets during question period that we are trying to make sense of this major decision with import not only for Canada. When we talk about climate change, we have to talk about the global context. That was a decision that actually has import far beyond Canada's own borders.

I wanted to raise that as an example of something that is a government expenditure, but is something not in the estimates that really ought to have been in the estimates.

I want to talk more generally, having addressed some of the features of the estimates, both in terms of its content and absence, about where I believe government spending and government intervention in the economy has to go. We have seen a lot of big numbers announced from the government. Unfortunately, too often this is a government that conflates spending announcements with real action. New Democrats are often accused by others of wanting to spend everybody else's money, and it is always implied that we do this frivolously, which is simply not the case.

● (2020)

We are here to talk about how we could invest in Canadians and how we could invest in the country. I would say that we do not think of a return on investment as being solely a financial question. If we pool our resources as Canadians and we find a more efficient way to pay for prescription drugs, or we pool our resources and we make sure that not just my kids but every kid in the country has access to dental care, to me that is a return on investment. In respect of pharmacare, I think there is a financial return that we could realize as Canadians against what we are already paying for prescription drugs.

We know a number of studies have been out, and the most small-c conservative estimates on how much we could save is in the order of about \$4 billion a year, and this is dated information. We are living in a period of great inflation, and I am sure the numbers have gone up but I bet the differential has not. Back when the PBO reported on pharmacare, he said that Canadians were spending about \$24 billion a year on prescription drugs, and one national prescription drug insurance plan would cost about \$20 billion. That would be a savings of \$4 billion. That would be a very concrete financial return on an investment out of the public purse.

Business of Supply

We could also measure return on investment in other ways. Government spending to build new housing supply so we could house people who are currently living on the street brings return on investment. It brings return on investment, and that is another one where I would say there is actually a financial component. We know that people who are experiencing homelessness have more frequent interactions with the justice system. They are more likely to end up in jail, and we know that jailing people is expensive. We also know people experiencing homelessness are also more likely to end up in the health system, and not through preventative care, like a typical physical at the doctor's office, but in the emergency room where the issues are more acute and the costs are much higher. That is a return on investment.

When we talk about people who are nervous about taking the bus because there are people who have set up their home in the bus shelter, and they do not know what those folks are like, they do not know what state of mind they are in, so they get nervous about taking the bus and say that we need to get these people out of the way. Well, creating a sense of safety in our communities by housing those folks instead of waiting until something goes sideways and the police show up to arrest them is another way we could realize tangible return on investment. That is something we could do together through our governments that no individual could do on their own.

As we think about what was required in the pandemic as a response, and as we think about the ongoing and mounting challenge of climate, we have to revisit the conventional wisdom of the last 30 or 40 years around public involvement in the economy and recognize that, if we are going to get to where we need to be, then we need some bold public investment. It should be happening in a way that allows it to be discussed in this place with public deliberation, instead of at the boardroom table at the Infrastructure Bank or at the cabinet table in secret, spending out of the Canada account, instead of doing it transparently here in the estimates.

Even if we consider the oil and gas industry, an industry that has had its heyday and now we need to figure how to have a lower carbon economy, that industry in Alberta was built with tons of public investment. That economic engine did not actually happen with the private industry on its own. There were years of publicly funded research and publicly funded infrastructure at the provincial and federal levels that led to that economy being what it became. It is going to take that level of seriousness and public investment to build the economy of the future to provide good-paying jobs and prosperity for Canadians again, which is why it is important that this place get it right when it comes to how we evaluate government spending.

● (2025)

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons (Senate), Lib.): Madam Speaker, I want to bring up an issue the member talked about. I have also heard quite a bit about it from the NDP over the last several months, and it is with respect to fossil fuel subsidies. I do not disagree with the NDP. I do not disagree with the member. In my personal opinion, I would love to see fossil fuel subsidies end tomorrow.

Business of Supply

I am on the same page, but I have a problem with their narrative when they start saying that fossil fuel subsidies have increased. This information comes from the federal government deciding to invest money into dealing with abandoned orphan wells during the pandemic. That is what the money went to. These are wells that have been abandoned because either provincial regulations were not there to deal with them or the companies no longer exist. The federal government stepped in and said we will take some of the responsibility of dealing with these wells.

I know it plays the narrative the NDP like to purport in the House of the subsidies going up, but does the member really think that spending money on dealing with abandoned orphan wells, which is incredibly important environmentally, is really a subsidy for the oil sector?

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Madam Speaker, I would say two things in response to that. The first is that the new \$2.6 billion that was just announced in the budget for carbon capture and sequestration, I consider to be a fossil fuel subsidy. That is a major increase in fossil fuel subsidies that has nothing to do with orphan wells.

I do think that it is a good idea to clean up orphan wells. I think that the industry should be made responsible to do it. One of the proposals we have to do that indirectly is to take the surtax on banks and insurance companies, which the government has agreed to in our supply and confidence agreement, and do what we have been calling on the government to do, and it has not agreed to, and apply that surtax to oil and gas companies so they can pay the bill for the orphan well cleanup.

There is more than one way to do this, but for government to just assume that responsibility and have Canadians pay the costs of cleanup that the industry should have been paying all the way along is not right.

Hon. Mike Lake (Edmonton—Wetaskiwin, CPC): Madam Speaker, what we saw there was like a WWE fight. That last exchange was not real because, while the hon. member stands and talks about his disappointment in the government, the reality is that the only reason the government is able to do any of the spending he decries is because his party is supporting the government.

I will ask a very specific question in an area that the government is not spending money on as I am curious to hear his thoughts. The Liberals made a promise during the election campaign to fund Canada mental health transfers for \$250 million last year and \$625 million this year. That was the promise the Liberals made during the election campaign. Since that election campaign, they cut a deal with the NDP. Now, when it comes to the spending of the government, that money is not there.

I am wondering if the hon. member could tell us what the NDP negotiated into the budget in order to get their support and what was traded away against the promised funding for the Canada mental health transfer.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Madam Speaker, I think the member knows full well that we do not have an NDP government. Things would be very different if we did. Things have not gone the way they did because we cut an agreement. The reason that the government is able to spend what it going to spend is because Canadians elected a Par-

liament, like it or not. I do not. I do not even like the voting system that helped them get the most amount of seats.

The member will know I believe the Conservatives actually got more of the popular vote than the Liberals, but the Liberals have more seats because of a system the Conservatives endorse and defend. Canadians elected a Parliament and, unless we are going to be in a perpetual election cycle, some of us have to act like grownups and try to work together here instead of throwing tantrums all the time. That is what happened.

What is in the agreement reflects what we could get the Liberals to agree on in the agreement. The main thing for us was dental care, and it is a shame that they are not living up to their commitment on mental health. The member will hear us continue to press them on those things, as we would have if we were not in a supply and confidence agreement. What we got in the agreement were the things that we could move forward on, and we secured our right to continue to go after them on the things that are not in the agreement.

• (2030)

Mr. Mike Morrice (Kitchener Centre, GP): Madam Speaker, on the topic of carbon capture in the budget, it is actually \$7.1 billion between now and 2030. On the Trans Mountain pipeline, which the member for Elmwood—Transcona also spoke about, \$21.4 billion is the cost that project has doubled to, even before the \$10-billion loan guarantee. He spoke about engaging Canadians. The Council of Canadians, for example, has been doing just that. It has been engaging Canadians across the country about what it would look like to have a prosperous or a just transition that would include retraining and career supports for workers, jobs transfers, income supports and pension bridging.

I wonder if the member for Elmwood—Transcona could elaborate on what this could look like if we could move past the bickering about the fossil fuel subsidies and move on to what we have to do, which is to invest those funds in a prosperous transition for workers.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Madam Speaker, I was really fortunate to do my electrical apprenticeship at a time when the Province of Manitoba, under an NDP government as it happens, was investing a lot in public infrastructure. I never missed a beat between working, going to school to finish my levels, and then coming back out to the job site.

Business of Supply

I never worked on a fossil fuel project. There are a lot of different ways the government can invest in public infrastructure that is going to create jobs and prosperity for Canadians. This dichotomy between investing in fossil fuel and having jobs and not doing that and losing all the jobs is simply a false one, because that is not the real choice. The fact of the matter is that there are a lot of things we can invest in that are going to create good employment for Canadians.

I am from western Canada, and the Canada West Foundation, which is not usually a place New Democrats look to for inspiration, has done a great report on the idea of a western power grid that would connect B.C., Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba and allow the hydro power of B.C. and Manitoba to act effectively as a battery for Alberta and Saskatchewan, which have the most potential for wind and solar power generation in the country by far. However, because that does not give us a baseload, we need another kind of baseload power that can be released into the system when the sun is not shining or the wind is not blowing.

We could create a really effective system of generation, transmission and distribution in western Canada that would help lower our emissions, create tons of employment and have the same nation-building capability as a pipeline. It would actually cross more provinces than a typical pipeline does.

That is the way we can be creating employment and moving our economy in the right direction, not only for here in Canada but developing expertise with Canadian workers and Canadian companies that they can then go and sell globally, as other economies make similar investments in renewable energy. That is how we can develop a plan for prosperity here in Canada that is actually equal to the climate crisis. It is not the vision we are getting out of the government.

Hon. Mike Lake (Edmonton—Wetaskiwin, CPC): Madam Speaker, it was interesting to hear the hon. member's response to my last question. First of all, I like the hon. member. I like the way he carries himself in the House. I take issue with his characterization of my raising mental health as an issue as “a tantrum”.

The hon. member talked about the priorities the NDP negotiated into the spending of the government. It was one of the highest-spending budgets we have ever seen in this country, and if the mental health of Canadians cannot factor into the highest-spending budget in Canadian history, when will it factor into the list of NDP priorities?

• (2035)

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Madam Speaker, I am happy to clarify that I was not labelling the member's previous intervention as a tantrum. I was referring more to the totality of question period interventions we see from his party, with perhaps the odd exception. There is my charitable moment in respect of Conservative performance in question period.

There are a lot of things I would love to have seen in that agreement, sure, but we can get in only what we can agree to move forward on with another party. I share his frustration that the government has not made this a priority. I am happy to criticize the government for that. I would like to replace the government with a majority NDP government that will do those things.

In the meantime, we were able to get agreement on what I think is a very significant step forward, which is providing dental care to Canadians who have a household income of \$90,000 or less, among other things.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons (Senate), Lib.): Madam Speaker, I listened with great interest to the last intervention. I appreciate the fact that the member for Elmwood—Transcona was talking about the estimates and government policies. I respect the fact that he disagrees with some of them, but it certainly was a departure from the previous speeches that we heard from across the way, which literally had nothing to do with the estimates.

I should say that I am splitting my time with the member for Kings—Hants.

I will go back to the answer the member for Elmwood—Transcona provided me when I asked about government intervention in dealing with environmental issues from industry of the past. Although I agree with him that we certainly would not like to see that moving forward, unfortunately that has been the reality of pretty much everything since the Industrial Revolution. My city is still dealing with former tannery sites that are leaching material into the river along Kingston. The reality of the situation is that quite often, unfortunately, we do not know the consequences in advance of the environmental impact the economy is going to have on particular sectors, and it falls on the public to deal with that.

Certainly, I would love to set up a system, and I think we have a lot of stewardship systems in place at various levels of government, to help deal with that sort of thing now. However, we cannot just leave these abandoned oil wells because we think somebody else should have dealt with it; we need to deal with it. That is where a lot of the money is coming from when the NDP refers to the subsidies in the fossil fuel sector.

I respect the fact that the member for Elmwood—Transcona also brought up the fact that some of it had to do with carbon capture. As much as I would like to see us move away from this concept of carbon capture, because I honestly think it looks as though we are now grasping at opportunities to profit from carbon, so there is not going to be an incentive to move away from it. I get that, and I do not see carbon capture as a future, but I realize we are going to be using oil for the foreseeable future in some form or another, because we are not going to be able to flip a switch tomorrow and be completely off of oil. In the meantime, if there is something we can do to help invest in these technologies to help capture some of that carbon, I am all for exploring the various different options we have out there.

Business of Supply

As we know, we are in a crisis right now when it comes to our environment. Personally, I do not think we should be picking and choosing which environmental policy is better or worse. We can certainly put them on a scale from what we see as best to worse, but I really think we should be throwing our weight behind as many different opportunities as possible. That is how I see a productive outcome for this. If that means that carbon capture is part of that now, I am okay with it. I want to see us get to a net-zero place, but I realize we might have to find ways to deal with some other forms of carbon in the near future.

I also want to talk about the Canada Infrastructure Bank a little, because I know it is a bit of a political lightning rod. I apologize for picking on the member for Elmwood—Transcona, but he was the last one to bring it up. He suggested that it is just about buying buses. That is not the case.

I would encourage the member, all members, and the public for that matter, to go to the website cib-bic.ca to see the various different projects that are being funded by the Infrastructure Bank, everything from Alberta irrigation to Algoma Steel retrofits and hydro-electric expansion. Yes, there are buses in there, but there is so much more in addition to that, such as upgrades to terminals, increases in broadband, highway improvements, retrofits with respect to various different large-scale operations, fibre links, particularly in indigenous communities, and the list goes on.

● (2040)

They suggest that the Canada Infrastructure Bank is there only to help municipalities get electric buses, and yes, that is one of the things in there. I imagine, out of the billions of dollars that have been allocated and spent from there, that it is a tiny fraction of it when we add it all up, because there are so many other very important projects happening. I hate the thought that we are trying to diminish the value of this bank, specifically for political gain.

Public transportation, green infrastructure, broadband, trade and transportation, clean power and indigenous infrastructure are the main objectives of the Canada Infrastructure Bank and what the bank is able to fund and move forward on. Members do not have to remember the website, but just google “Canada Infrastructure Bank”. They will get to the website almost immediately and see the projects going on in all the different provinces within Canada.

The other thing that I have heard relates directly back to the estimates because, quite frankly, the supports that the government has been moving forward with over the last couple of years and continues to in this budget are to help Canadians deal with the rise in costs and, in particular, the cost of living increases. We are focused on providing supports to those who need them the most, rather than trying to provide blanket tax reductions like the Conservatives were calling for earlier today with the removal of GST on certain products.

We believe that it is most important not to attempt to apply the same tax reduction on everybody or provide boutique tax credits. As we know, we got rid of the boutique tax credits that Stephen Harper had before, because our focus is more on helping those who need it the most. Guess what? When we help those who need it the most, does anyone know what they are doing with that money? They are not putting it in tax-free savings accounts; they are actual-

ly spending the money, and the money continues to generate economic activity in our communities, our provinces and throughout the country.

It is a win-win. It is not just about giving supports to those who need it the most. It is also about helping to generate economic activity, because we know the individuals who need the money the most are those who will be spending it.

One of the huge misconceptions in this place, at least as it comes from the Conservatives in this direction, that I have heard repeatedly over the last number of weeks is with respect to the rates of inflation. If we were only to listen to Conservatives, we would think that inflation was a Canada-only problem. Inflation is a problem right now throughout the globe. In fact, Canada is below the OECD average when it comes to inflation. We are actually doing better in terms of inflation than most developed countries in the world.

I do not want to suggest for a second that that means people are not struggling with the rising cost of living. What I am trying to say is that this government is absolutely committed to doing whatever it can to bring those costs back down for Canadians, so that people can see some relief from those rises in costs.

I will conclude by saying that I strongly believe that the direction the government has been moving in in its budgets, what it did with supports during COVID and how it supported businesses and individuals coming out of COVID through the various measures, have all been to the good. Have they led to some economic challenges? Yes, and we have certainly seen that throughout the world, in other developed countries as well. Is the government focused right now on turning its attention to dealing with the affordability crisis that is happening with many people? Absolutely, and this budget goes to that. The elements contained within the estimates go to supporting Canadians, because we genuinely believe that a stronger economy is going to happen only when we have a strong middle class in place and people are able to prop up and support our economy and keep it moving forward.

● (2045)

Hon. Mike Lake (Edmonton—Wetaskiwin, CPC): Madam Speaker, in our previous interaction, the NDP member for Elmwood—Transcona was pretty clear that the NDP was unable to negotiate or, at least, he implied that the NDP was unable to negotiate the Canada mental health transfer into their agreement on the budget.

The Liberal platform clearly promised \$250 million in 2021-22 and \$625 million in 2022-23 for a Canada mental health transfer. I am wondering if the hon. member can tell us why the Liberals would have rejected that in the 2022 budget.

Business of Supply

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, I do not have the specifics as to why the exact budgetary items are in there, but what I will say is that, back to the exchange with the member for Elmwood—Transcona, the NDP, as we can see, through the exchanges that I have had with its members and the exchanges that we see during question period from time to time, there is still some animosity there, for lack of a better expression, with respect to where we see the end goal.

What the NDP was able to do in that supply and confidence agreement is that it was able to say that there were a few issues that it was very passionate about, that it was going to bring those to the table and that it was going to push and advance its objectives on behalf of Canadians.

If only the Conservatives had done the same thing, this member may have, if we had a supply and confidence agreement with the Conservatives, been able to push forward that agenda. I wonder if he brought that up in a similar discussion with the Conservatives.

Hon. Mike Lake: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, just based on the conversation, surely if you seek it, you would find unanimous consent to allow me to table page 75 from the Liberal platform, which promises for a Canada mental health transfer under new investments—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I think the hon. member knows that this is not a point of order.

[*Translation*]

The hon. member for Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères.

Mr. Xavier Barsalou-Duval (Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères, BQ): Madam Speaker, the speech my colleague opposite just gave was mainly about the government's management of the pandemic. In any case, that is what I heard. He boasted about doing a very good job. He might think so, but I am not certain that everyone agrees. I certainly do not.

I think that seniors were among those who were abandoned during the pandemic. It is important for my colleague opposite to acknowledge that fact, because the government does not have a great track record when it comes to seniors.

I would like to know why the government abandoned seniors. Other than sending them a small cheque before the election, the Liberals cut them dead.

[*English*]

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, speaking of track records, the Bloc Québécois quite often, through unanimous consent motions, voted in favour of all of those supports for Canadians. This member and, if memory serves me correctly, the Bloc even, on a couple of occasions that were not unanimous consent motions, in particular in the last Parliament, supported these measures.

I realize that hindsight is 20/20 and he might be having regrets, but the reality of the situation is that he voted in favour of it. For him to be so critical at this point, it would have been great if he was able to share some of that foresight with the government that he suddenly has now, in advance of the money being spent, when he voted in favour of it.

Mr. Lloyd Longfield (Guelph, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. member for mentioning the infrastructure bank in a positive way. We have heard many comments through tonight's debate that the infrastructure bank is seen by some members as negative. In terms of infrastructure investment and closing the gap on infrastructure, attracting private capital and using the expertise from private and public partnerships, the hon. member was a mayor of a major city in Canada and knows the limitations that municipal governments have around infrastructure.

Could the member speak to the importance of having these types of innovative investments in our infrastructure in Canada?

● (2050)

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, it is a revolutionary way of building infrastructure. I think of the third crossing of the Cataraqui River, which is a 1.4-kilometre-long bridge that is three and a half years into production, to be done later this fall in my riding of Kingston. It was the exact same idea, although not funded through this particular bank. It was a partnership between all three levels of government and the contractor.

They would come together and they risk-managed together. They developed the project together. They will build the project together. They will deal with changes in the supply and availability of steel or concrete, for example, and they will deal with it all together. It is, quite frankly, a revolutionary way, in my opinion, having been in that position, of working on large-scale infrastructure projects where municipalities, in particular, are very hesitant to go it on their own, because they might not have the experience in it or they might not have the ability to deal with cost overruns, for example. It truly is, at least in my community, making a big difference.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Kody Blois (Kings—Hants, Lib.): Madam Speaker, as always, it is a privilege for me to rise in the House to discuss the main estimates this evening and share my constituents' perspectives.

There are several important initiatives worth highlighting, but my focus this evening will be on three specific areas. I believe these ideas are important for our country.

I want to talk about the agricultural sector first. One in eight jobs in this country is related to our agricultural sector, from Newfoundland to British Columbia and all points in between, particularly in rural areas, but also in urban settings. The importance of this sector cannot be underestimated.

I am delighted to see investments to support and help develop our wine sector. My riding is home to several vineyards producing world-class vines. In fact, our Tidal Bay vineyards are attracting attention for their quality. I encourage my colleagues to try some of our wines. Perhaps I can even bring some to Ottawa. Of course, I am also speaking to all Canadians who may be watching what is going on in the House tonight.

Business of Supply

Supply management is extremely important. Our government has signalled its intent to fairly compensate supply-managed farmers in the fall economic update. In my riding, Kings—Hants, there are roughly 200 or 300 supply-managed farms. Kings—Hants currently has the largest concentration of that type of farm east of Quebec and among the Atlantic provinces.

I am concerned by the fact that some members of the Conservative Party are openly suggesting that we dismantle the system. In light of the global crisis and the concerns about the importance of protecting the sustainability and capacity to produce food, I think that supply management is very important for domestic production capacity. It is important to distinguish between the position of some parliamentarians and that of the government, which is very supportive of supply management.

I am also very proud of the work of our Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food for several reasons, but especially for two reasons.

I am proud of the significant improvements to our business risk management programs. The Harper government made cuts to those programs, which are very important to our farmers and producers. In November 2020, the minister announced federal funding to remove the reference margin limit. The provinces and the territories will also contribute to ensuring that the programs are improved.

We also now have federal funding to increase the compensation rate from 70% to 80%. I am not certain about the current status of that initiative, but I think some provinces, like Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, are opposed to it.

• (2055)

Nevertheless, I am very proud of the work that the minister and our government have done to make sure that the federal leadership fund is being showcased.

I also think the new Canadian agricultural partnership is important. Every five years, the provinces and territories, in collaboration with the Government of Canada, create programs within a certain framework and funds to support our farmers. It is very important to increase the funds available for this partnership and these programs.

I understand that there is a possibility that the government will set aside these funds in the 2023 budget. This is a very important point for all members of the House, especially members representing rural ridings.

[*English*]

I think it is also important, when we talk about agriculture, to talk about the war in Ukraine, and I have talked at great length about this and about global food insecurity. Indeed, we are studying it right now at the agriculture committee, but I think that, although there might not be any explicit mention in the estimates about this, it is something all parliamentarians should be seized with. We have a responsibility and a way that we can lead. This issue is not going to be just a 2022 issue. This will be a two-, three- or five-year period, in terms of the critical infrastructure.

We heard from Yulia Klymenko, one of the members of parliament in Ukraine, about how Russia is systematically targeting critical infrastructure that relates to agriculture. We do not build that overnight. Yes, of course we need to be there to support Ukraine,

but the consequences of Russia's illegal invasion are going to be felt for quite some time. I think Canada has a role and a responsibility to continue to be there to support Ukraine, as we have, and to consider ways in which we can do even more in the days ahead and how our industry can respond.

That is point number one. Let us go to point number two: regulatory reform, modernization and reducing internal trade barriers.

I do not think this is a very sexy topic, per se. It is not always discussed at great length here in the House, but it is crucially important as a tool for public policy. My predecessor, Scott Brison, served as the President of the Treasury Board. I know there are a number of initiatives that the government has taken on. Budget 2022, along with the main estimates, does have some areas in which the government will be looking at those measures. I think we can do even more. I think we need to get serious about how we create a culture in the Government of Canada around how we can better regulate industries, how we can modernize our practices in service delivery and how we can put forward a regulatory environment that is not command and control.

It has often been said, but if I went to the best baker in Montreal, in Madam Speaker's region of the country, I would not say to the baker, "Here is the recipe; build this cake". I would say, "You are the baker and here is how I want the cake to look. I want it to have chocolate icing. I want it to be soft and delicious," and I would set the outcomes of what I want, and then the baker would tell me how he or she is going to build that cake. That is how we should be looking at regulations and how we move forward on those regulations. We should let individuals and organizations show us the pathway to the outcomes we expect, as opposed to a command-and-control type of format.

There are internal trade barriers. I just mentioned the world-class wines in Nova Scotia. It is easier for my producers to get them to France and to Europe than it is to Ontario. We are a country. We have to be able to work on reducing those types of barriers. Again, this is very technical stuff, but it is important. Labour mobility is an important element as well.

Last, I will say a couple of things about the importance of innovation, competitiveness and long-term economic success. I think we have a tremendous capacity in critical minerals. I was pleased to see the exploration tax credit. I would love to see more work on the Atlantic loop and advancing that project for a clean-energy future in Atlantic Canada. There is money that is set aside for those types of grid investments. I look forward to working with colleagues in the House and indeed the government to advance those.

The final thing I will say is about small modular reactors. They are extremely important for our energy future for lowering emissions.

I will leave it at that, because I know we want to get to questions. I look forward to taking questions from my hon. colleagues here tonight.

• (2100)

Mrs. Tracy Gray (Kelowna—Lake Country, CPC): Madam Speaker, I took particular interest when the member was talking about interprovincial trade barriers, and I appreciate his comments on that. I know we have the Canadian Free Trade Agreement and the government has been working on that. The last time it disclosed its annual report was back in 2021. We have not seen the report that ends March 2022. It has not been disclosed yet on the website.

I wonder if the member can explain, since he is in the government, some of the recent activities the government has been working on to eliminate some of the interprovincial trade barriers.

Mr. Kody Blois: Madam Speaker, it is in the mandate letter of the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. I sit in the government caucus but I am certainly not in the Privy Council, so with regard to extreme details on what conversations are being had intimately with provincial counterparts or territorial counterparts, I do not have information. I do know this is on the government's radar. I also know that, particularly as it relates to labour mobility, there is going to be a focus in that domain. Obviously, I would like to see that extend to certain agriculture products as well.

Again, these are very technical terms, but the Senate report suggests that if we can eliminate those barriers, 2% to 4% GDP growth can be accomplished. It is important. I will continue to work with the member opposite to advance these principles.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Xavier Barsalou-Duval (Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères, BQ): Madam Speaker, I found it very interesting when my colleague across the way mentioned that he did not have all the information on the decisions the government makes since he is not a member of the Privy Council.

In that context, and since he will be in caucus tomorrow, I wonder if he will have the opportunity to ask the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Infrastructure and Communities why the government is not respecting the bilateral agreements it signed with the provinces.

Mr. Kody Blois: Madam Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for the question.

The question is quite vague. If the member wants me to raise a question with the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Infrastructure and Communities, I will.

I think that the Government of Canada has a very strong relationship with the provinces and territories, especially Quebec. Given the pandemic and the initiatives to help the health care systems and networks, among other things, the relationship between the Government of Canada and the provinces and territories is very solid.

Business of Supply

[*English*]

Mr. Lloyd Longfield (Guelph, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I congratulate the hon. member on his use of French in the House. I thank the interpreters for helping me understand the member's speech. I wish I were half as good as he is.

I want to dive into the environmental piece. You ended on small modular reactors—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I have to remind the hon. member that I did not end on anything.

Mr. Lloyd Longfield: I am sorry, Madam Speaker. I started talking to him instead of you.

The hon. member ended his speech on small modular reactors and the investments we are making in clean growth and clean technology, things that agriculture is benefiting from through our clean growth hub. There are also expenditures for helping to get Canada to the next level of clean technology.

Could the hon. member mention how the estimates we are dealing with tonight are going to help us move forward in this area?

• (2105)

Mr. Kody Blois: Madam Speaker, my hon. colleague from Guelph has been a strong champion, for a number of Parliaments now, in advancing the very issues that he just talked about. He could very well speak to the House in great detail on them because I know he is very knowledgeable.

There are a couple of things I will say. The critical minerals strategy we are advancing is extremely important for clean growth and clean technology. We talk about EVs. We talk about a transition to a low-carbon economy. Critical minerals play an important role in that. The 30% exploration tax credit is extremely important and so too is the strategy. I will reiterate the importance of regulatory reform to drive innovation in some of these different technologies.

I am proud of the work that our government has done on this file. It is important for economic success. It is important for fighting climate change. Those two things are not mutually exclusive. Indeed, they have to run together even more.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Madam Speaker, I should let you know that I will be sharing my time with my colleague from Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo.

I want to start by congratulating my colleague from Kings—Hants on his French. He delivered half his speech in French earlier, and it was really impressive. I want to congratulate him and encourage all my colleagues to learn the second official language. By “second official language”, I do not mean that French is the second official language, but it is the second language of an English speaker. In my case, English is my country's second official language. I just wanted to make that clear.

Business of Supply

We are here to talk about budget items and votes for various departments, including Justice Canada. As we all know, my colleague from Fundy Royal moved a motion about that department. As a result, we are talking about judicial processes, the administration of justice in Canada, the Supreme Court of Canada and decisions that affect everyone.

More specifically, I want to talk about a decision handed down a few weeks ago that had broad repercussions across the country, especially in the region where I am from, Quebec City. The Supreme Court of Canada struck down a law on consecutive sentencing that had been duly passed by this Parliament in 2011 and had been in force until the Supreme Court's ruling.

This decision is in connection with the Quebec City mosque tragedy that occurred on January 29, 2017. I will recap those sad events. Anyone who was directly or indirectly affected by this incident remembers exactly where they were when they heard the news. People were gathered at the mosque, united by their faith, their charity and the communion of spirit, when a crazed gunman, a nameless criminal, walked in and emptied his gun, killing six men at that mosque. Our thoughts are with the 19 injured worshippers who survived, and with the loved ones of the six people who lost their lives.

At the end of the trial, the Hon. François Huot, the trial judge, handed down a 40-year sentence, which might have surprised some people. As I was saying earlier, a law had been passed by Parliament allowing for cumulative sentences. A criminal who killed three people would be sentenced to three times 25 years.

I want to say that this is a Canadian law. All too often, I have heard people refer to it as a Conservative law. This law was passed by a Conservative government, but it was kept in place by the current government. To be more specific, the 2011 law was applied until 2015 by the Conservative government, for more than three and a half years. However, this law remained in force from 2015 until the recent ruling by the Supreme Court of Canada, which is almost seven years. Therefore, this law was accepted and applied by the current Liberal government for almost twice as long as the previous Conservative government.

I wanted to clarify that because, as I was drafting this speech, I came across articles that described the law as a relic of the Harper era, as though that were a bad thing. God knows Canada sure had some good years when the Conservative government was running the country.

If the Liberals hated the law so much, all they had to do was set it aside and repeal it, just as they did in other cases. In fact, during this government's first months in power, the Hon. Rona Ambrose, our leader at the time, gave me the tremendous responsibility of being our party's labour critic. In that capacity, I spoke to Bill C-4, which repealed two laws governing transparency and democracy in unions, laws that had been passed under the previous Conservative government. The duly elected Liberal government had made a campaign promise to repeal those two laws. Having won a majority, it introduced a bill and repealed them. However, the Liberal government chose to maintain the consecutive sentencing law that is still attributed to the Harper era.

• (2110)

Let us get back to the sequence of events. Justice François Huot pronounces a final guilty verdict and imposes a prison sentence of 40 years, in other words, 25 years plus 15 years. He rewrites Canada's cumulative sentencing law as he sees fit, noting that he was uncomfortable with the "25 years plus 25 years plus 25 years" approach. He says himself in his ruling that he adapted the law as he saw fit and imposed a sentence of 40 years. It was a fairly extensive document, 246 pages long. He also examined the case law in more than 195 countries.

The Court of Appeal was asked to review that ruling. It struck it down. The three judges found that this was a bad piece of legislation, that it was unconstitutional. In the end, the Supreme Court ruled against this law, saying that it was totally unfair, unconstitutional and ultimately—and I am paraphrasing here—had no place in the Canadian judicial process.

One can disagree with a law, even a law that has been upheld by the Liberal government. However, there is a reality when it comes to crime, when it comes to murder, or what we call mass murder. I dislike that expression, but there is no doubt what it means: a compulsive killer emptying a gun on innocent victims. We have seen it too many times in our country. Once is one time too many. Having been through the mosque attack—I knew some of the people—I say we must think of the victims. This is about more than just the court case, the robes and the Supreme Court. It is about more than the legal process and the courts. We are talking about men and women who are suffering.

I would like to read an article by Dominique Lelièvre that was published in the *Journal de Québec* on Friday, May 27, just a few hours after the Supreme Court decision. The author quotes survivors and victims' loved ones:

Orphans of the Sainte-Foy mosque may pass their father's killer on the streets of Quebec City 20 years from now, laments the Muslim community, which is disappointed in the Supreme Court's decision....

"In our opinion, this ruling does not consider the magnitude of the atrocity and the scourge of mass killings proliferating in North America, nor does it recognize the hateful, Islamophobic and racist nature of the crime," said Mohamed Labidi, president of the organization [the CCIQ], at the mosque on Sainte-Foy Road where six worshippers were brutally gunned down in January 2017.

"Although we are disappointed in this decision by the highest court in the land, it does enable us to close this legal chapter. Now we want to focus on the future."

What troubles the survivors and the victims' loved ones most is that the children of these victims might one day encounter the murderer.

"That is the biggest fear of the victims' families. The Parole Board might delay his release and take this into account, but that's our real fear, that the orphans who will become men and women will come face to face with their father's killer when he is free," said Mr. Labidi. He vowed to stand by these children when the time comes....

When contacted by *Le Journal*, Aymen Derbali, a father who was left severely disabled after miraculously surviving being shot seven times during the attack, said that he "respects" the court's decision, although he was "very disappointed" in the ruling.

"What worries me as a citizen is that this encourages future criminals to commit mass murder, since the sentence would be the same," he said.

All the same, this decision was the culmination of a long saga that will help him close this painful chapter of his life. He wants to dedicate all of his energy to his family, to his children's future and to his humanitarian aid projects.

Business of Supply

"I'm turning the page. I started this process a little while ago, but with this decision... Finally, there was a decision. The law will be enforced the same way across Canada," he said with a sigh.

...

Boufeldja Benabdallah, the co-founder of the CCIQ, suggested that the court did not sufficiently account for the pain experienced by the victims' loved ones, compared to the offender's right to rehabilitation.

"The Supreme Court made a purely legal observation that, in our opinion, did not take into account the humanity of these families. It took into account the humanity of a murderer who will have to be rehabilitated later on.... Today, it feels like the balance has been upset," he said.

Now that all the legal appeals have been exhausted, he says that he wants to do something worthwhile by continuing to advocate for communal harmony, which he says has grown immensely in the past five years, like a healing balm on the scars of the tragedy.

● (2115)

People did not just come the day after the attack but reached out to us over the past five years, and we too made the effort to reach out to them.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I am sorry. The subject is really moving. However, we must resume debate.

The hon. member for Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo.

[*English*]

Mr. Frank Caputo (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, CPC): Madam Speaker, that may be a first. It is always a pleasure to rise on behalf of the citizens of Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, especially on such an important night in this Parliament. Every day is obviously important, but when we discuss important motions, when we talk about money and confidence votes, it is an extremely important day.

Today we are talking about Department of Justice estimates. One thing I want to discuss from the get-go, to lay the groundwork for what I am about to say, and this will likely build upon some of what my colleagues have had to say, is about justice versus criticizing the judiciary. I believe that all of us here want the same thing. All of us obviously want a safe Canada. I cannot look at any member here and think that anyone does not want a safe Canada. That would be nonsense.

There are times, though, when I look at the Supreme Court and some court decisions, and I may not agree. There are times when I could look at the court's decisions and I understand how it got to the decision, and while I respect that, I may not agree with the ultimate conclusion. There are times when I look at the court's decision and the logic is unassailable, and it is clear that the right decision was made. Then there are obviously going to be times when we look at a decision and we say to ourselves, "I just do not understand how we got to that decision."

Our role as parliamentarians is unique, because we have this separation of the legislative branch and the judicial branch, but the two go hand in hand. When I was doing my first law degree, one thing I was taught, and I know that some judges do reject this, was that Parliament and the judiciary are in a dialogue, so to speak. The way that this dialogue typically happens is between the courts and Parliament. Generally what will happen is that there is impugned legislation, that legislation is challenged, and if that legislation is challenged and upheld, then there is no dialogue to be had because the courts have said that Parliament got it right.

Then there are situations where the court strikes down the legislation, sometimes with a sunset clause, saying there is one year to fix it, or other times when the legislation is simply struck down, saying why the legislation did not meet the constitutional bar. That is where that dialogue frequently happens. Parliament acts, the court interprets the laws, and then it is incumbent on Parliament to act again.

The distinction that we are talking about, though, is Parliament acting. How should Parliament act? Some people may say that is criticizing a decision. My respectful view is that it is not, because what we are doing here is that we are actually part of that dialogue, part of that law-making component that is so special and so central to this place.

This is my recollection, and I think I'm going back to 1994 here, when I was still in high school, but that is how section 33.1, which was struck down a little while ago, actually came to be in its form that was, again, struck down. Again, we are going back 15 or 20 years, so please do not quote me on that law.

I am also mindful of the Chief Justice's recent comments about the politicization of the courts. We need to be able to have a candid discussion about what legislation should flow from the Supreme Court's decision, perhaps not about the merits of the case but whether we are comfortable with the outcomes of a decision that is predicated on the legislation.

I gave an intervention a week ago and that intervention was about the fact that I thought Parliament should be acting because there was a decision that offended my sensibilities when a seven- or eight-year-old was abused by a parent. That mother avoided jail and was given a community-based sentence. In doing that, my goal was not to necessarily say what this judge should have done, and I did not name the judge for a reason. I do not think that is the way we should be doing it.

● (2120)

The point was to ask whether we should be looking at the legislation that led to this outcome. This outcome is based on legislation. There is a question, and a very live question in my mind, about whether we should be questioning that. That is one of the issues I have today. The point is this: How should Parliament respond to these decisions that some may agree with and some may not agree with?

The cases I am going to look at are the Sullivan and Brown grouping of decisions. Those are the extreme intoxication decisions. There is a case about consecutive sentences for parole eligibility, although I think the extreme intoxication cases are a little different from my view.

Right now, we do not have a law in place because it has been struck down, but the upshot is that, based on the court's decision, a person can avoid criminal liability based on extreme intoxication. This was always the case for murder because a person has to specifically intend to kill somebody or cause grievous bodily harm and be reckless as to the outcome. That is a specific-intent offence.

Business of Supply

The point is that a person who voluntarily consumed drugs no longer in this case could have the intent to kill or intent to have any criminality. This is what I find interesting and this is what I want to focus on. The courts have acted. How should Parliament respond?

In my view, the court, at paragraph 12, laid out a road map for us, and it said:

Parliament did not enact a new offence of dangerous intoxication, nor did it adopt a new mode of liability for existing violent offences based on a proper standard of criminal negligence. With the utmost respect, I am bound to conclude the path Parliament chose in enacting s. 33.1 was not, from the point of view of ss. 7 and 11(d) of the Charter, constitutionally compliant.

What I found interesting on my reading of that, and others may disagree and that is fine, is that it is almost as though the court is giving us a road map here of criminal negligence. That is what it seems to me. I have not watched the debate, but it is something I want to do and I was recently encouraged to do it.

This very point, from what I can gather, was hit on about the foreseeability of these consequences of self-induced intoxication, followed by subsequent violence. I hope we all agree in this place that this is an issue that needs to be addressed. The problem is that it has not yet been addressed.

I was one of four signatories on a letter to the government saying we will work with the government to address this and to address it as soon as possible. Frankly, I would have liked to see legislation tabled within a week or two of this. I am mindful of the justice minister's comments saying that they are looking at it, but this is critical.

A lot of victims groups and women's groups have sounded the alarm, and for good reason. This is an important issue that really needs to be dealt with. Sometimes we talk about virtue signalling. This is one case where we, as a united House, should be signalling to the public and to potential victims that we are prepared to cover this legislative gap.

I will close with this. If the government does wish to act, I will be prepared to help in a non-partisan way. I believe the other three signatories would be prepared to act in a non-partisan way. We are expending hundreds of millions of dollars when it comes to the administration of justice. This is one area that I have chosen to focus on that, in my view, has a gap.

There are other gaps that we can get into, like Bill C-5 and things like that. However, this is one of the areas that I invite the government to consider when it is considering its spending and what it is doing in its legislative agenda.

● (2125)

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons (Senate), Lib.): Madam Speaker, I really appreciated the member's perspective on the role of the court being a sacred institution within our democratic process. Most importantly, we need to maintain a certain degree and level of respect of the court, and to work with the court. I do not disagree with his comments that our job is to help and react when it comes to making better legislation based on, perhaps, an outcome from the court.

Does he apply the same logic to other institutions within government or at arm's length from government? Does he see the same value in ensuring that we hold these institutions and the fundamental objective of the institution in high regard as well, so as to not publicly go after, criticize and try to jeopardize those institutions, such as the Bank of Canada?

Mr. Frank Caputo: Madam Speaker, I had no idea that my hon. colleague was going in that direction with that preamble.

Obviously, I come from a legal background, and I do agree with my colleague that the courts are sacrosanct and that we have arm's-length relationships. However, what the member is getting at is something that has been an issue in an active leadership race and, frankly, it would be imprudent for me to weigh in on this.

Hon. Rob Moore (Fundy Royal, CPC): Madam Speaker, I listened with interest to my colleague's speech. It was very thoughtful, and it touched on a number of really important points.

There seems to be a perception among some that a decision is rendered and that is the end of the discussion. However, my colleague mentioned a charter dialogue, the appropriateness of Parliament responding and our doing our job on something that I feel, and many feel, needs to be addressed, which is this issue of a self-induced intoxication defence.

Mr. Frank Caputo: Madam Speaker, this is an incredibly important question. My colleague raises the point about the court decision being the end of it. It is not the end of it. It is the end of the beginning, because now we move on to the next phase. The next phase is how Parliament should intervene.

Parliament creates the laws, and the courts interpret them. The courts interpret law A a certain way. Now we move to law B. Law A was the beginning, and law B is the next step. It is fundamentally important that we not only understand where we were, but where we are going. Where we need to go on the issue of self-induced intoxication is with a constitutionally compliant law, perhaps rooted in criminal negligence, that ultimately protects victims and vulnerable people from situations of which we are obliged to protect them.

● (2130)

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, I really want to ask the hon. member for Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo a question that relates to events today in British Columbia regarding events that happened in his riding. That, of course, is the finding of the coroner that the over 600 people who died from the heat dome last summer were in fact preventable deaths.

I know that the hon. member is thoughtful, and I know this is not the topic of his speech, but I wonder if he has any thoughts on those findings. Certainly, for me, it rings a bell with negligence in allowing so many British Columbians to die without proper warning and without proper aid.

Mr. Frank Caputo: Madam Speaker, with all candour, I have not had a chance to review the coroner's report. However, I did see something tangentially, in passing, in the news.

Business of Supply

I cannot pass any judgment. The fact that people died in a heat dome is difficult for all of us. Our thoughts and prayers go out to all of those people. We never want to see this again. My hope is that if there is anything we can do as parliamentarians to assist in that regard, let us do it. However, a lot of that will fall to the province as well.

[Translation]

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Madam Speaker, I have a very short question for my colleague. He mentioned the importance of taking action, of moving to plan B. Is it important to act quickly to protect the potential victims of future attackers?

[English]

Mr. Frank Caputo: Madam Speaker, we need to act quickly. When the decision was rendered about the constitutionality or lack of constitutionality of an anti-oil decision from Alberta, the Prime Minister said we would be appealing it right away. Where is that vigour to protect victims here? That should have been the next issue that we were dealing with. We should have dealt with it yesterday.

Ms. Iqra Khalid (Mississauga—Erin Mills, Lib.): Madam Speaker, before I begin, I will let you know that I am sharing my time with the member for Vancouver Granville.

I am pleased to stand today to speak to the work by Justice Canada to implement the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act. It is a key piece to reconciliation, ensuring the effective implementation of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act in consultation and co-operation with indigenous peoples.

This initiative is a key priority for our government. It brings to light the commitment made in the 2021 Speech from the Throne to implement the declaration at the federal level. It also supports the directions in Justice Canada's mandate letter to prioritize the implementation of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act and to work with indigenous people to accelerate the joint development of an action plan to achieve the goals of the declaration.

The main estimates include \$3.3 million to support broad and distinctions-based engagements with indigenous peoples and to develop an action plan by June 2023 as well as annual progress reports to Parliament for the 2021-22 and then 2022-23 fiscal years.

Budget 2021 provided short-term funding to Justice Canada, which was \$5.8 million over two years through to March 2023, to support the implementation of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act in consultation and co-operation with indigenous people.

Budget 2021 also provided \$23.6 million over two years to CIRNAC to support indigenous participation in the engagement process, including support for indigenous-led consultations. On December 10, 2021, the government launched a broad and inclusive engagement process with aboriginal peoples and a call for proposals for funding for aboriginal participation in the process, including support for aboriginal-led consultations.

The call for proposals closed on April 15 of this year, and 151 projects were approved in whole or in part. The department ensured that the participating groups reflected first nations, Inuit and Métis peoples across Canada. Regardless of whether or not a particular indigenous governing body, representative organization, group or community has received funding, there will be a number of avenues for them to contribute their perspectives on the UNDA implementation.

Timelines are tight. The UNDA put in place a two-year time frame to complete the action plan by June 2023. The plan must include a broad suite of measures, including, but not limited to, measures to tackle violence and discrimination against indigenous peoples and measures to promote understanding through human rights education. Funding is available to communities, nations and organizations across the country to support the participation of partners in the engagement process, with a focus on supporting indigenous-led work to identify priority areas for the implementation of the UN declaration.

Budget 2022 proposes to provide \$65.8 million over five years starting in 2022-23, and \$11 million ongoing, to Justice Canada and Natural Resources Canada to accelerate work to meet legislated requirements under the UNDA, including the co-development of an action plan with indigenous partners.

While the details of the budget are still being reviewed, we expect that part of this investment will be to support indigenous capacity going forward. This generational work will help advance reconciliation and forge stronger and renewed nation-to-nation, Inuit-to-Crown and government-to-government relationships.

The main objective of this funding that is received is to support both departments' capacity to advance reconciliation through a three-year funding for the reconciliation secretariat. It is also to provide capacity funding directly to indigenous groups, organizations and communities to enable them to collaborate with the department on shared justice priorities, including developing an indigenous justice strategy.

● (2135)

As emphasized in the Speech from the Throne 2021, the government remains highly committed to advancing reconciliation with indigenous peoples and accelerating the work on the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's calls to action, the National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls and 2SLGBTQQIA+ people's calls for justice and the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

Business of Supply

This funding supports key government priorities, including the implementation of the direction in the justice minister's mandate letter from 2022 to develop, in consultation and co-operation with provinces, territories and indigenous partners, an indigenous justice strategy to address systemic discrimination and the overrepresentation of indigenous people in the criminal justice system.

Of this funding, \$13.2 million will enable the department to build its capacity, which had never previously been funded, to work in co-operation with indigenous governments and representatives in order to continue to develop the relationships needed for reconciliation over the next two years. Importantly, \$11 million or 45% of this funding has been provided directly to indigenous groups to support indigenous-led engagement within communities and organizations over the next two years and collaboration with the department on an indigenous justice strategy to develop solutions to justice-specific barriers that indigenous people face, including systemic racism and overrepresentation in the justice system.

Policies, programs and legislative initiatives based on the lived experiences of indigenous peoples will benefit first nations, Inuit and Métis people as they seek to reduce contact with the mainstream justice system, promote access to fair and equitable treatment in the justice system and revitalize indigenous legal systems.

The departmental funding will also support department-led engagement sessions with key stakeholders to ensure that a broad spectrum of indigenous voices and perspectives is fully reflected in the indigenous justice strategy.

Provinces and territories will be key partners in this work on the indigenous justice strategy, as they are responsible for the administration of justice all across Canada. Accordingly, the Department of Justice will anticipate leveraging existing federal-provincial-territorial partnership fora to engage jurisdictions, while also using the new departmental funding to convene regional dialogues that involve provincial and territorial governments.

Further to reforming the mainstream justice system, this is another area of work that is expected to be advanced under the indigenous justice strategy. The main objective of this initiative is to increase the Department of Justice's capacity to continue to lead negotiations with indigenous groups on the administration of justice in order to ultimately support those indigenous groups in fully achieving their self-determination. This essential initiative responds to a number of key government commitments, including implementing the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, the calls to action from the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, specifically call to action 42, and the National Inquiry into the Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls report.

The Minister of Justice's 2022 mandate letter commits to advancing the priorities of indigenous communities to regain jurisdiction over the administration of justice in collaboration with the provinces and territories and to support the revitalization of indigenous laws, legal systems and traditions.

I am running out of time, and I have a lot more to say on this topic, but I will say that after over 150 years of top-down direction for indigenous peoples in our country, it is high time that we really in-

vested in building that people-to-people relationship, ensuring the empowerment of indigenous communities all across Canada and ensuring that self-determination and self-governance are a priority.

● (2140)

Mr. Frank Caputo (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the main point of my hon. colleague's speech was reconciliation in indigenous communities. One issue is this. We know that indigenous people are vastly overrepresented in our justice system, but also in victimization rates, yet her government has left the victim ombud position empty for quite some time now.

Is the member able to somehow reconcile the contents of her speech with leaving such an important position open, given the victimization of indigenous people in communities?

Ms. Iqra Khalid: Mr. Speaker, as I said, it is really important for us to listen to indigenous communities with respect to the kinds of services they need. The secretariat will endeavour to find out the best ways to support victims who are indigenous. I know we have a lot of work to do to decrease that overrepresentation within our justice system and to provide that support to indigenous communities and those who are victimized. We will keep on pushing that needle further.

Ms. Laurel Collins (Victoria, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the member spoke a lot about indigenous rights and ensuring the government is investing in meaningful reconciliation. As she was speaking, I was thinking about an organization in my community, the Aboriginal Coalition to End Homelessness, which has a shovel-ready project, a healing house. It offers for indigenous, by indigenous housing. This project envisions housing that also offers culturally supportive detox to the indigenous street community.

The government has committed and has promised for indigenous, by indigenous housing. In this budget there is significant investment in on-reserve housing, but not the same level of investment for urban indigenous people.

I am wondering if the member will commit to pushing her government for significant investment in for indigenous, by indigenous housing for urban, indigenous people and for supporting projects like the amazing one I mentioned, the healing house by the Aboriginal Coalition to End Homelessness.

Ms. Iqra Khalid: Mr. Speaker, I am on the record saying that housing is a human right. It is a basic right that all Canadians, including indigenous communities, deserve. We are prioritizing housing and ensuring that we are building and providing that culturally sensitive support to communities like the indigenous community.

Business of Supply

I look forward to working with the member opposite to ensure that we are advocating and pushing in the right way, so that all indigenous communities are able to have that basic right to housing.

• (2145)

Hon. Sean Fraser (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague concluded her remarks by talking about the importance of transitioning away from a top-down approach when it comes to decision-making processes that impact indigenous communities.

In our home province, Mr. Speaker, you would appreciate the changes that were embraced when the keys were handed over to Mi'kmaq communities when it came to the education system. They saw their graduation rate go from thirty-something per cent to in excess of 90%, on par with non-indigenous students across Nova Scotia. That would not have been possible, in my mind, had we continued to implement a colonial-style mentality when it came to the education system for Mi'kmaq students.

I am wondering if my colleague could offer commentary on the importance of empowering people to make decisions that impact their own communities when it comes to indigenous communities' abilities to make decisions, and whether she has any examples from her experiences as a member of Parliament in which this kind of a model might show opportunities for future growth.

Ms. Iqra Khalid: Mr. Speaker, I absolutely, wholeheartedly agree with the example provided by the minister. That nation-to-nation connection of supporting communities and uplifting them, I think, is the only way that we can really achieve proper truth and reconciliation, really building those partnerships with communities and creating a next generation of empowered indigenous peoples who have respect for their culture, who are able to thrive within their culture and who are also able to become meaningful proponents for all that they represent.

Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed (Vancouver Granville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the opportunity to rise to speak to the estimates. Several important steps are being taken by the government to support the effective and efficient functioning of the justice system, in particular regarding access to justice for youth, indigenous and Black persons and those who are economically disadvantaged.

As the House is well aware, our justice system has been faced with mounting challenges in recent years. Some of these challenges, such as the increasing length and complexity of trials, preceded the COVID pandemic. Other challenges, such as the need to conduct trials virtually, were generated by the pandemic. Some of the justice system's challenges were felt most acutely by our provincial partners, as they bear the responsibility for the administration of justice, including the increased costs of technology and other public health measures.

Of course, many of these challenges affect not only governments, but also individuals. These include the many individuals who struggle to afford legal assistance when they need it. Many of them also experience systemic disadvantages and discrimination. In some cases, these individuals come into contact with the justice system.

Through the budget, our government made multiple investments to support the justice system to ensure that it treats those who come before it in a fair, equitable and effective manner. Budget 2021 announced an ongoing annual \$43.3-million increase in funding for the youth justice services funding program. New six-year funding agreements for the April 21, 2021, to March 31, 2027, time frame were successfully negotiated and are now being put into place with the provinces and territories to implement this funding.

This funding will enable the expansion and sustainability of critical youth justice services and programs delivered by the provinces and territories. Priority funding areas under the youth justice services funding program include diversion and alternatives to custody programming, which will allow more youth to stay out of the formal youth criminal justice system and/or custody. This new funding will allow jurisdictions to further develop and expand the range of culturally safe and responsive programming available to better support indigenous youth and other racialized youth populations over-represented in the youth criminal justice system. This is particularly true for diversion programming, for which an increased demand is anticipated resulting from the implementation of former Bill C-75.

While we are all pleased that there has been a downward trend in youth crime rates over time, this new funding is needed, as there has not been an increase in funding since 2006, when the Harper government came into power and implemented its failed criminal justice policy that did not focus on rehabilitation or diversion. We are fixing that through many measures, including budgetary measures such as this one and Bill C-5.

The general youth population is increasing, which is expected to affect the demand for youth justice programming and apply additional pressures on the provinces and territories. There is a need to respond more effectively to the diversity of risks and needs of today's youth population. The new funding will therefore enable the sustainability and expansion of critical and more responsive youth justice services and programs.

Our government also re-profiled \$40 million in funding for criminal legal aid, provided through the 2020 fall economic statement to 2021 and 2022-23. The COVID pandemic generated significant multi-faceted and long-term impacts on legal aid in Canada. It also produced socio-economic conditions that foster high demand for legal aid, while simultaneously complicating the delivery of legal aid services and limiting non-governmental income sources such as law foundations. This additional investment of \$40 million in criminal legal aid funding provided over two years is allowing legal aid plans to better align themselves with the reopening of the courts and provide services to accused people whose cases are backlogged. The additional funding also addresses deficits resulting from decreased law foundation funding and supports legal aid plans in fully implementing technological innovations and ensuring interoperability with the courts.

Business of Supply

Vulnerable populations, including low-income individuals and women, have been disproportionately affected by the pandemic. In view of their mandate to help the disadvantaged, some legal aid plans relaxed eligibility guidelines early in the pandemic to support individuals facing job loss.

As the courts reopen, they are dealing with backlogs of cases accumulated during the pandemic. The additional funding for criminal legal aid will enable jurisdictions to meet increased demand, thereby reducing the number of individuals who self-represent. Self-represented accused people cost the system both money and time because of adjournments, multiple court appearances, a lack of information and confusion about proceedings. We are continuing to provide additional needed support to the legal aid system to address these systemic pressures so the justice system remains accessible to all Canadians.

- (2150)

The past decades have seen a criminal justice system characterized by the increasingly disproportionate representation of indigenous and Black persons and vulnerable persons such as those experiencing a mental health and/or substance use disorder. The 2020 fall economic statement announced \$6.6 million over five years, followed by \$1.6 million annually, to support the implementation of impact of race and culture assessments, or IRCAs, nationally. From this, \$1.3 million is available for 2022-23. IRCAs are better presentencing reports that help sentencing judges better understand the effects of poverty, marginalization, racism and social exclusion on the offender and their experience with the criminal justice system.

Federal funding will support the development of training curricula for IRCA writers, professional development programs for criminal defence lawyers and Crown prosecutors, and education programs for judges on IRCAs and on the preparation of IRCA reports for eligible racialized accused. The Government of Canada is committed to providing fair and equal access to justice for Black individuals and other racialized people by addressing systemic racism and discrimination in the criminal justice system and overturning a decade of failed Conservative criminal justice policy.

Building on previous investments, budget 2021 also announced an investment of \$26.8 million for 2021-22 to support the delivery of immigration and refugee legal aid services. This funding supports access to justice for economically disadvantaged asylum seekers by ensuring that provinces delivering immigration and refugee legal aid have the capacity to maintain service delivery levels. This includes the processing of many asylum claims from individuals who arrived in Canada prior to the pandemic-related border closures, those who made asylum claims from within Canada during the pandemic and those who are now arriving at Canada's borders.

Additionally, the 2020 fall economic statement provided \$49.3 million over five years, starting in 2021, and \$9.7 million in ongoing funding to increase the application of Gladue principles in the criminal justice system to help address the overrepresentation of indigenous people and address systemic discrimination. As the House is aware, Gladue principles seek to ensure the systemic or background factors that may have played a part in bringing an indigenous person in contact with the law are considered in criminal justice decision-making, and that community-based, culturally appro-

priate restorative and traditional indigenous justice supports are available to help individuals meet the conditions of their sentences and implement healing plans.

This investment includes funding to support the development and expanded use of Gladue reports, including the training of Gladue report writers, and will support community-based and indigenous-led post-sentence Gladue aftercare. This funding will also support projects focused on addressing systemic barriers and bias in the criminal justice system. The implementation of Gladue principles in the criminal justice system is also a key federal initiative in the Government of Canada's federal pathway to address missing and murdered indigenous women, girls and 2SLGBTQQIA+ people.

Finally, building on the success of our existing work to address overrepresentation in the criminal justice system, and to improve indigenous people's access to justice in all areas of the justice system, budget 2021 provided \$27.1 million over three years for indigenous community-based justice programs to address long-standing program integrity needs and to provide trauma-informed training on working with victims of crime. Funding will also help indigenous families navigate the family justice system and access community-based family mediation services.

Among other objectives, these efforts seek to prevent crime and protect victims by addressing matters before they escalate. They also aim to help decrease the disproportionate number of indigenous children in care across the country and allow these children to remain with their families where appropriate and connect to their communities and culture where possible. In tandem with support for the implementation of Gladue principles, this work will further support the Government of Canada's efforts to advance reconciliation with indigenous peoples in Canada, eliminate systemic discrimination from the justice system and respond to the MMIWG final report's calls for justice and the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's calls to action.

Through the main estimates, we are seeking to access the funding to support these initiatives this year. I am thankful for the opportunity to speak on the critical steps we have taken to support the justice system, and I hope that all members of the House will support these estimates to advance this important work in criminal justice reform.

● (2155)

Mr. Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the public servants who wrote that very comprehensive speech recited by the member for Vancouver Granville.

He spoke about a lot of justice measures taking place, but I would be remiss if I did not point out that the Government of Canada took an unprecedented and historic step in the last few weeks, which was the decriminalization of fentanyl. In the release, the government stated that the decriminalization of fentanyl, which has killed hundreds of people in that individual's riding, is a good step toward protecting lives.

Can the member confirm and state in the House that the decriminalization of fentanyl will protect Canadians?

Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed: Mr. Speaker, in the riding I represent, which has many health care workers and many families and folks who have been affected by the opioid crisis, there is support for this important initiative. What it does is treats addiction as a health issue, not as a criminal justice issue. It is about time that Canadians recognize that members opposite continue to further victimize those who are dealing with addictions. It is time that we dealt with this as a health issue, not as a criminal justice issue.

Ms. Laurel Collins (Victoria, NDP): Mr. Speaker, given what the member across the way just said, is he embarrassed and ashamed of his government for voting against a bill from the New Democrats that would decriminalize, follow the advice of health experts and save lives across the country, not just in British Columbia?

Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed: Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the fact that our government was able to work with the NDP Government of British Columbia and a former NDP MP, who is now the mayor of Vancouver, to ensure that British Columbians have a plan in place that will be the example for the rest of the country of how this can work and work well.

Mr. Ron McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. member to expound on the value of the decriminalization of small amounts of drugs in British Columbia for a limited period so that we can gather data and can expand this powerful approach to the rest of the country.

Mr. Taleeb Noormohamed: Mr. Speaker, health care professionals, the law enforcement community and all kinds of folks who deal directly with individuals affected by this issue support this initiative and support this work. We are proud to be working in tandem with the province and with law enforcement to get this done for British Columbians, and for all Canadians eventually.

● (2200)

The Deputy Speaker: It being 10 p.m., it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the business of supply.

Business of Supply

Call in the members.

* * *

● (2230)

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—MEASURES FOR IMMEDIATE FINANCIAL RELIEF

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

The Deputy Speaker: The first question is on the opposition motion relating to the business of supply.

● (2240)

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

(Division No. 127)

YEAS

Members

Abouttaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Benzen	Bergen
Berthold	Bezan
Block	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Calkins	Caputo
Carrie	Chambers
Chong	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho
Davidson	Deltell
Doherty	Dreeshen
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Ferreri
Findlay	Gallant
Généreux	Genuis
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gourde
Gray	Hallan
Kelly	Kitchen
Kmiec	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Kusie	Lake
Lantsman	Lawrence
Lehoux	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
MacKenzie	Maguire
Martel	Mazier
McCauley (Edmonton West)	Melillo
Moore	Morantz
Motz	Muys
Nater	Paul-Hus
Perkins	Poilievre
Rayes	Redekopp
Reid	Rempel Garner
Richards	Roberts
Rood	Ruff
Scheer	Schmale
Seeback	Shields
Shipley	Small
Soroka	Steinley
Stewart	Strahl
Stubbs	Thomas
Tochor	Tolmie
Uppal	Van Popta
Vecchio	Vidal

Business of Supply

Vien
Vis
Wagantall
Wagh
Williams
Zimmer— 111

Viersen
Vuong
Warkentin
Webber
Williamson

Martinez Ferrada
Mathysen
May (Saamich—Gulf Islands)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McPherson
Mendicino
Michaud
Morrice
Murray
Ng
Normandin
Oliphant
Plamondon
Qualtrough
Rodriguez
Romanado
Sajjan
Samson
Savard-Tremblay
Schieffe
Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Sorbara
St-Onge
Tassi
Thériault
Thompson
Turnbull
Van Bynen
Vandal
Vignola
Weiler
Yip
Zarrillo

Masse
May (Cambridge)
McDonald (Avalon)
McKay
McLeod
Mendès
Miao
Miller
Morrissey
Naqvi
Noormohamed
O'Connell
Perron
Powlowski
Robillard
Rogers
Sahota
Saks
Sari
Scarpaleggia
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Singh
Ste-Marie
Sudds
Taylor Roy
Therrien
Trudel
Valdez
van Koeverden
Vandenbeld
Virani
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi— 198

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Ali
Arseneault
Ashton
Bachrach
Bains
Barron
Battiste
Beech
Bennett
Bérubé
Bittle
Blair
Blaney
Boulerice
Brière
Carr
Chabot
Chahal
Champoux
Chen
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cormier
Dabrusin
Davies
Desilets
Dhaliwal
Diab
Drouin
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser
Gaheer
Garrison
Gazan
Gill
Green
Hanley
Hepfner
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Ien
Johns
Julian
Kelloway
Khera
Kusmierczyk
Lalonde
Lametti
Lapointe
Lattanzio
LeBlanc
Lemire
Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)

Alghabra
Anandasangaree
Arya
Atwin
Badawey
Baker
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bendayan
Bergeron
Bibeau
Blaikie
Blanchette-Joncas
Blois
Bradford
Brunelle-Duceppe
Casey
Chagger
Champagne
Chatel
Chiang
Collins (Victoria)
Coteau
Damoff
DeBellefeuille
Desjarlais
Dhillon
Dong
Dubourg
Duguid
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Fergus
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Garneau
Gaudreau
Gerretsen
Gould
Hajdu
Hardie
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Idlout
Jaczek
Jowhari
Kayabaga
Khalid
Koutrakis
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Larouche
Lauzon
Lebouthillier
Lightbound
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacGregor
Maloney

PAIRED

Members

Anand
Dowdall
Guilbeault
Jeneroux
Ng
O'Toole

Boissonnault
Fast
Hoback
Joly
O'Regan
Patzner— 12

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

* * *

● (2245)

MAIN ESTIMATES, 2022-23

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—JUSTICE

The House resumed consideration of Motion No. 1.

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on opposed Vote No. 1. Pursuant to order made on Monday, May 2, the question is deemed put and a recorded division is deemed requested. The question is as follows:

That Vote 1, in the amount of \$274,137,786, under Department of Justice—Operating expenditures, in the main estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2023, be concurred in.

● (2255)

During the taking of the vote:

The Deputy Speaker: I have to back up to Madam Petitpas Taylor's vote. She had voted electronically and had voted nay in the first case. If she wants to change her vote, she will have to ask consent to change her vote.

[Translation]

Hon. Ginette Petitpas Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I wanted my vote to be recorded as in favour of the motion.

[English]

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed to the hon. member's proposal will please say nay.

Madam Petitpas Taylor can now vote accordingly.

(The House divided on Motion No. 1, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 128)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anandasangaree
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barron	Barsalou-Duval
Battiste	Beaulieu
Beech	Bendayan
Bennett	Bergeron
Bérubé	Bibeau
Bittle	Blaikie
Blair	Blanchette-Joncas
Blaney	Blois
Boulerice	Bradford
Brière	Brunelle-Duceppe
Carr	Casey
Chabot	Chagger
Chahal	Champagne
Champoux	Chatel
Chen	Chiang
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Damoff
Davies	DeBellefeuille
Desilets	Desjarlais
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Dong
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Dzerowicz
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith	Fergus
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fortin	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Gaheer	Garneau
Garrison	Gaudreau
Gazan	Gerretsen
Gill	Gould
Green	Hajdu
Hanley	Hardie
Hepfner	Holland
Housefather	Hughes
Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Idlout
Ien	Jaczek
Johns	Jones
Jowhari	Julian
Kayabaga	Kelloway
Khalid	Khera
Koutrakis	Kusmierczyk
Kwan	Lalonde

Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Larouche	Lattanzio
Lauzon	LeBlanc
Lebouthillier	Lemire
Lightbound	Long
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney	Martinez Ferrada
Masse	Mathysen
May (Cambridge)	May (Saaneich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod	McPherson
Mendès	Mendicino
Miao	Michaud
Miller	Morrice
Morrissey	Murray
Naqvi	Ng
Noormohamed	Normandin
O'Connell	Oliphant
Perron	Petitpas Taylor
Plamondon	Powlowski
Qualtrough	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rogers
Romanado	Sahota
Sajjan	Saks
Samson	Sarai
Savard-Tremblay	Scarpaleggia
Schieffe	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simard	Singh
Sorbara	Ste-Marie
St-Onge	Sudds
Tassi	Taylor Roy
Thériault	Therrien
Thompson	Trudel
Turnbull	Valdez
Van Bynen	van Koeverden
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vignola	Virani
Weiler	Wilkinson
Yip	Zahid
Zarrillo	Zuberi— 200

Business of Supply

NAYS

Members

Aitchison
Allison
Baldinelli
Barrett
Bergen
Bezan
Bragdon
Brock
Caputo
Chambers
Cooper
Dancho
Deltell
Dreeshen
Ellis
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Ferreri
Gallant
Genuis
Godin
Gourde
Hallan
Kitchen

Business of Supply

Kmiec	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Kusie	Lake
Lantsman	Lawrence
Lehoux	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
MacKenzie	Maguire
Martel	Mazier
McCauley (Edmonton West)	Melillo
Moore	Morantz
Motz	Muys
Nater	Paul-Hus
Perkins	Poilievre
Rayes	Redekopp
Reid	Rempel Garner
Richards	Roberts
Rood	Ruff
Scheer	Schmale
Seeback	Shields
Shiple	Small
Soroka	Steinley
Stewart	Strahl
Stubbs	Thomas
Tochor	Tolmie
Uppal	Van Popta
Vecchio	Vidal
Vien	Viersen
Vis	Vuong
Wagantall	Warkentin
Waugh	Webber
Williams	Williamson
Zimmer— 111	

PAIRED

Members

Anand	Boissonnault
Dowdall	Fast
Guilbeault	Hoback
Jeneroux	Joly
Ng	O'Regan
O'Toole	Patzer— 12

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 1 carried.

[Translation]

Hon. Mona Fortier (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2023, except any vote disposed of earlier today and less the amounts voted in the interim supply, be concurred in.

• (2300)

[English]

The Deputy Speaker: If a member of a recognized party present in the House wishes to request a recorded vote or that the motion be adopted on division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

The hon. whip for the government.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I believe that if you seek it you will find agreement to apply the result from the previous vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting yes.

Mr. Blaine Calkins: Mr. Speaker, Conservatives agree to apply the vote, and we will be voting nay.

[Translation]

Ms. Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting in favour of the motion.

[English]

Ms. Rachel Blaney: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agree to apply and will be voting yes.

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, the Greens agree to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.

Mr. Kevin Vuong: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the results of the previous vote and will be voting against.

[Translation]

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

(Division No. 129)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anandasangaree
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barron	Barsalou-Duval
Battiste	Beaulieu
Beech	Bendayan
Bennett	Bergeron
Bérubé	Bibeau
Bittle	Blaikie
Blair	Blanchette-Joncas
Blaney	Blois
Boulerice	Bradford
Brière	Brunelle-Duceppe
Carr	Casey
Chabot	Chagger
Chahal	Champagne
Champoux	Chatel
Chen	Chiang
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Damoff
Davies	DeBellefeuille
Desilets	Desjarlais
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Dong
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Dzerowicz
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith	Fergus
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fortin	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Gaheer	Garneau
Garrison	Gaudreau
Gazan	Gerretsen
Gill	Gould
Green	Hajdu
Hanley	Hardie
Hepfner	Holland
Housefather	Hughes
Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Idlout
Ien	Jaczek
Johns	Jones

Business of Supply

Jowhari	Julian	Généreux	Genuis
Kayabaga	Kelloway	Gladu	Godin
Khalid	Khera	Goodridge	Gourde
Koutrakis	Kusmierczyk	Gray	Hallan
Kwan	Lalonde	Kelly	Kitchen
Lambropoulos	Lametti	Kniec	Kram
Lamoureux	Lapointe	Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Larouche	Lattanzio	Kusie	Lake
Lauzon	LeBlanc	Lantsman	Lawrence
Lebouthillier	Lemire	Lehoux	Lewis (Essex)
Lightbound	Long	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	Lloyd	Lobb
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)	MacKenzie	Maguire
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Martel	Mazier
Maloney	Martinez Ferrada	McCauley (Edmonton West)	Melillo
Masse	Mathysen	Moore	Morantz
May (Cambridge)	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	Motz	Muys
McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty	Nater	Paul-Hus
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	Perkins	Poilievre
McLeod	McPherson	Rayes	Redekopp
Mendès	Mendicino	Reid	Rempel Garner
Miao	Michaud	Richards	Roberts
Miller	Morrice	Rood	Ruff
Morrissey	Murray	Scheer	Schmale
Naqvi	Ng	Seeback	Shields
Noormohamed	Normandin	Shiple	Small
O'Connell	Oliphant	Soroka	Steinley
Perron	Petitpas Taylor	Stewart	Strahl
Plamondon	Powlowski	Stubbs	Thomas
Qualtrough	Robillard	Tochor	Tolmie
Rodriguez	Rogers	Uppal	Van Popta
Romanado	Sahota	Vecchio	Vidal
Sajjan	Saks	Vien	Viersen
Samson	Sarai	Vis	Vuong
Savard-Tremblay	Scarpaleggia	Wagantall	Warkentin
Schiefke	Sgro	Waugh	Webber
Shanahan	Sheehan	Williams	Williamson
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)	Zimmer— 111	
Simard	Singh		
Sorbara	Ste-Marie		
St-Onge	Sudds		
Tassi	Taylor Roy		
Thériault	Therrien		
Thompson	Trudel		
Turnbull	Valdez		
Van Bynen	van Koeverden		
Vandal	Vandenbeld		
Vignola	Virani		
Weiler	Wilkinson		
Yip	Zahid		
Zarrillo	Zuberi— 200		

NAYS

Members

Aboultouf	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Benzen	Bergen
Berthold	Bezan
Block	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Calkins	Caputo
Carrie	Chambers
Chong	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho
Davidson	Deltell
Doherty	Dreeshen
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Ferreri
Findlay	Gallant

PAIRED

Members

Anand	Boissonnault
Dowdall	Fast
Guilbeault	Hoback
Jeneroux	Joly
Ng	O'Regan
O'Toole	Patzer— 12

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

[*English*]

Hon. Mona Fortier moved that Bill C-24, An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the federal public administration for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2023, be read the first time and printed.

(Motion deemed adopted and bill read the first time)

Hon. Mona Fortier moved that the bill be read the second time and referred to a committee of the whole.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: 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.

*Business of Supply**[English]*

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I believe if you seek it you will find agreement to apply the result from the previous vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting yes.

Mr. Blaine Calkins: Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives agree to apply the vote and will be voting against the motion.

[Translation]

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting in favour of the motion.

[English]

Ms. Rachel Blaney: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply and will be voting in favour.

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, the Greens agree to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.

Mr. Kevin Vuong: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the results of the previous vote and vote against.

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

(Division No. 130)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anandasangaree
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barron	Barsalou-Duval
Battiste	Beaulieu
Beech	Bendayan
Bennett	Bergeron
Bérubé	Bibeau
Bittle	Blaikie
Blair	Blanchette-Joncas
Blaney	Blois
Boulerice	Bradford
Brière	Brunelle-Duceppe
Carr	Casey
Chabot	Chagger
Chahal	Champagne
Champoux	Chatel
Chen	Chiang
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Damoff
Davies	DeBellefeuille
Desilets	Desjarlais
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Dong
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Dzerowicz
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith	Fergus
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fortin	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Gaheer	Garneau
Garrison	Gaudreau
Gazan	Gerretsen
Gill	Gould
Green	Hajdu

Hanley	Hardie
Hepfner	Holland
Housefather	Hughes
Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Idlout
Ien	Jaczek
Johns	Jones
Jowhari	Julian
Kayabaga	Kelloway
Khalid	Khera
Koutrakis	Kusmierczyk
Kwan	Lalonde
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Larouche	Lattanzio
Laouz	LeBlanc
Lebouthillier	Lemire
Lightbound	Long
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney	Martínez Ferrada
Masse	Mathysen
May (Cambridge)	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod	McPherson
Mendès	Mendicino
Miao	Michaud
Miller	Morrice
Morrissey	Murray
Naqvi	Ng
Noormohamed	Normandin
O'Connell	Oliphant
Perron	Petitpas Taylor
Plamondon	Powlowski
Qualtrough	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rogers
Romanado	Sahota
Sajjan	Saks
Samson	Sarai
Savard-Tremblay	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simard	Singh
Sorbara	Ste-Marie
St-Onge	Sudds
Tassi	Taylor Roy
Thériault	Therrien
Thompson	Trudel
Turnbull	Valdez
Van Bynen	van Koeverden
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vignola	Virani
Weiler	Wilkinson
Yip	Zahid
Zarrillo	Zuberi— 200

NAYS

Members

Aitchison
Allison
Baldinelli
Barrett
Bergen
Bezan
Bragdon
Brock
Caputo
Chambers
Cooper

Business of Supply

Dalton	Dancho
Davidson	Deltell
Doherty	Dreeshen
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Ferreri
Findlay	Gallant
Généreux	Genuis
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gourde
Gray	Hallan
Kelly	Kitchen
Kmiec	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Kusie	Lake
Lantsman	Lawrence
Lehoux	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
MacKenzie	Maguire
Martel	Mazier
McCauley (Edmonton West)	Melillo
Moore	Morantz
Motz	Muys
Nater	Paul-Hus
Perkins	Poilievre
Rayes	Redekopp
Reid	Rempel Garner
Richards	Roberts
Rood	Ruff
Scheer	Schmale
Seeback	Shields
Shipley	Small
Soroka	Steinley
Stewart	Strahl
Stubbs	Thomas
Tochor	Tolmie
Uppal	Van Popta
Vecchio	Vidal
Vien	Viersen
Vis	Vuong
Wagantall	Warkentin
Waugh	Webber
Williams	Williamson
Zimmer— 111	

PAIRED

Members

Anand	Boissonnault
Dowdall	Fast
Guilbeault	Hoback
Jeneroux	Joly
Ng	O'Regan
O'Toole	Patzer— 12

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried. Accordingly, this bill stands referred to a committee of the whole.

(Bill read the second time and the House went into committee of the whole thereon, Mrs. Carol Hughes in the chair)

(On clause 2)

Mr. Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC): Madam Chair, can the President of the Treasury Board advise the House if the bill is in its usual form?

[Translation]

Hon. Mona Fortier (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Madam Chair, the presentation of this bill is identical to that used during the previous supply period.

• (2305)

The Deputy Chair: Shall clause 2 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 2 agreed to)

The Deputy Chair: Shall clause 3 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 3 agreed to)

[English]

The Deputy Chair: Shall clause 4 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 4 agreed to)

The Deputy Chair: Shall clause 5 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 5 agreed to)

The Deputy Chair: Shall schedule 1 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Schedule 1 agreed to)

[Translation]

The Deputy Chair: Shall schedule 2 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Schedule 2 agreed to)

The Deputy Chair: Shall clause 1, the short title, carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 1 agreed to)

The Deputy Chair: Shall the preamble carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Preamble agreed to)

[English]

The Deputy Chair: Shall the title carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

Business of Supply

(Title agreed to)

The Deputy Chair: Shall the bill carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Bill agreed to)

The Deputy Chair: Shall I rise and report the bill?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Bill reported)

[*Translation*]

Hon. Mona Fortier moved that Bill C-24, An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the federal public administration for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2023, be concurred in at report stage.

[*English*]

The Deputy Speaker: 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. government whip.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I believe you will find that there is unanimous consent for the result of the previous vote to apply to this vote with the Liberal members voting yes.

[*English*]

Mr. Blaine Calkins: Mr. Speaker, Conservatives agree to apply the vote and will be voting against the motion.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will vote in favour of the motion.

[*English*]

Ms. Rachel Blaney: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agree to apply and will be voting in favour.

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, the Greens agree to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.

Mr. Kevin Vuong: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the results of the previous vote, voting against.

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

(*Division No. 131*)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anandasangaree
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barron	Barsalou-Duval
Battiste	Beaulieu
Beech	Bendayan

Bennett	Bergeron
Bérubé	Bibeau
Bittle	Blaikie
Blair	Blanchette-Joncas
Blaney	Blois
Boulerice	Bradford
Brière	Brunelle-Duceppe
Carr	Casey
Chabot	Chagger
Chahal	Champagne
Champoux	Chatel
Chen	Chiang
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Damoff
Davies	DeBellefeuille
Desilets	Desjarlais
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Dong
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Dzerowicz
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith	Fergus
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fortin	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Gaheer	Garneau
Garrison	Gaudreau
Gazan	Gerretsen
Gill	Gould
Green	Hajdu
Hanley	Hardie
Hepfner	Holland
Housefather	Hughes
Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Idlout
Ien	Jaczek
Johns	Jones
Jowhari	Julian
Kayabaga	Kelloway
Khalid	Khera
Koutrakis	Kusmierczyk
Kwan	Lalonde
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Larouche	Lattanzio
Lauzon	LeBlanc
Lebouthillier	Lemire
Lightbound	Long
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney	Martinez Ferrada
Masse	Mathysen
May (Cambridge)	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod	McPherson
Mendès	Mendicino
Miao	Michaud
Miller	Morrice
Morrissey	Murray
Naqvi	Ng
Noormohamed	Normandin
O'Connell	Oliphant
Perron	Petitpas Taylor
Plamondon	Powlowski
Qualtrough	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rogers
Romanado	Sahota
Sajjan	Saks

Samson
Savard-Tremblay
Schiefke
Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Sorbara
St-Onge
Tassi
Thériault
Thompson
Turnbull
Van Bynen
Vandal
Vignola
Weiler
Yip
Zarrillo

Sarai
Scarpaleggia
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Singh
Ste-Marie
Sudds
Taylor Roy
Therrien
Trudel
Valdez
van Koeverden
Vandenbeld
Virani
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi — 200

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albas
Arnold
Barlow
Benzen
Berthold
Block
Brassard
Calkins
Carrie
Chong
Dalton
Davidson
Doherty
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Epp
Falk (Provencher)
Findlay
Généreux
Gladu
Goodridge
Gray
Kelly
Kmiec
Kramp-Neuman
Kusie
Lantsman
Lehoux
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lloyd
MacKenzie
Martel
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Moore
Motz
Nater
Perkins
Rayes
Reid
Richards
Rood
Scheer
Seeback
Shipley
Soroka
Stewart
Stubbs
Tochor
Uppal
Vecchio
Vien

Aitchison
Allison
Baldinelli
Barrett
Bergen
Bezan
Bragdon
Brock
Caputo
Chambers
Cooper
Dancho
Deltell
Dreeshen
Ellis
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Ferreri
Gallant
Genius
Godin
Gourde
Hallan
Kitchen
Kram
Kurek
Lake
Lawrence
Lewis (Essex)
Liepert
Lobb
Maguire
Mazier
Melillo
Morantz
Muys
Paul-Hus
Poilievre
Redekopp
Rempel Garner
Roberts
Ruff
Schmale
Shields
Small
Steinley
Strahl
Thomas
Tolmie
Van Popta
Vidal
Vierson

Business of Supply

Vis
Wagantall
Waugh
Williams
Zimmer — 111

Vuong
Warkentin
Webber
Williamson

PAIRED

Members

Anand
Dowdall
Guilbeault
Jeneroux
Ng
O'Toole

Boissonnault
Fast
Hoback
Joly
O'Regan
Patzner — 12

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried. When shall the bill be read a third time? By leave, now?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Mona Fortier moved that Bill C-24, An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the federal public administration for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2023, be read the third time and passed.

[*English*]

The Deputy Speaker: 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. government whip.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I believe you will find that there is unanimous consent for the result of the previous vote to apply to this vote with the Liberal members voting yes.

[*English*]

Mr. Blaine Calkins: Mr. Speaker, Conservatives agree to apply and will be voting against the motion.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will vote in favour.

[*English*]

Ms. Rachel Blaney: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agree to apply and will be voting yea.

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, the Greens agree to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.

Mr. Kevin Vuong: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the results of the previous vote, voting against.

[*Translation*]

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

(*Division No. 132*)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Ali

Alghabra
Anandasangaree

Business of Supply

Arseneault	Arya	O'Connell	Oliphant
Ashton	Atwin	Perron	Petitpas Taylor
Bachrach	Badawey	Plamondon	Powlowski
Bains	Baker	Qualtrough	Robillard
Barron	Barsalou-Duval	Rodriguez	Rogers
Battiste	Beaulieu	Romanado	Sahota
Beech	Bendayan	Sajjan	Saks
Bennett	Bergeron	Samson	Sarai
Bérubé	Bibeau	Savard-Tremblay	Scarpaleggia
Bittle	Blaikie	Schiefke	Sgro
Blair	Blanchette-Joncas	Shanahan	Sheehan
Blaney	Blois	Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Boulerice	Bradford	Simard	Singh
Brière	Brunelle-Duceppe	Sorbara	Ste-Marie
Carr	Casey	St-Onge	Sudds
Chabot	Chagger	Tassi	Taylor Roy
Chahal	Champagne	Thériault	Therrien
Champoux	Chatel	Thompson	Trudel
Chen	Chiang	Turnbull	Valdez
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)	Van Bynen	van Koeverden
Cormier	Coteau	Vandal	Vandenbeld
Dabrusin	Damoff	Vignola	Virani
Davies	DeBellefeuille	Weiler	Wilkinson
Desilets	Desjarlais	Yip	Zahid
Dhaliwal	Dhillon	Zarrillo	Zuberi— 200
Diab	Dong		
Drouin	Dubourg		
Duclos	Duguid		
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Dzerowicz		
Ehsassi	El-Khoury	Aboutaif	Aitchison
Erskine-Smith	Fergus	Albas	Allison
Fillmore	Fisher	Arnold	Baldinelli
Fonseca	Fortier	Barlow	Barrett
Fortin	Fragiskatos	Benzen	Bergen
Fraser	Freeland	Berthold	Bezan
Gaheer	Garneau	Block	Bragdon
Garrison	Gaudreau	Brassard	Brock
Gazan	Gerretsen	Calkins	Caputo
Gill	Gould	Carrie	Chambers
Green	Hajdu	Chong	Cooper
Hanley	Hardie	Dalton	Dancho
Hepfner	Holland	Davidson	Deltell
Housefather	Hughes	Doherty	Dreeshen
Hussen	Hutchings	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Iacono	Idlout	Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Ien	Jaczek	Falk (Provencher)	Ferreri
Johns	Jones	Findlay	Gallant
Jowhari	Julian	Généreux	Genuis
Kayabaga	Kelloway	Gladu	Godin
Khalid	Khera	Goodridge	Gourde
Koutrakis	Kusmierczyk	Gray	Hallan
Kwan	Lalonde	Kelly	Kitchen
Lambropoulos	Lametti	Kmiec	Kram
Lamoureux	Lapointe	Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Larouche	Lattanzio	Kusie	Lake
Lauzon	LeBlanc	Lantsman	Lawrence
Lebouthillier	Lemire	Lehoux	Lewis (Essex)
Lightbound	Long	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	Lloyd	Lobb
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)	MacKenzie	Maguire
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Martel	Mazier
Maloney	Martinez Ferrada	McCauley (Edmonton West)	Melillo
Masse	Mathysen	Moore	Morantz
May (Cambridge)	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	Motz	Muys
McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty	Nater	Paul-Hus
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	Perkins	Poilievre
McLeod	McPherson	Rayes	Redekopp
Mendès	Mendicino	Reid	Rempel Garner
Miao	Michaud	Richards	Roberts
Miller	Morrice	Rood	Ruff
Morrissey	Murray	Scheer	Schmale
Naqvi	Ng	Seeback	Shields
Noormohamed	Normandin	Shiple	Small

NAYS

Members

Business of Supply

Soroka
Stewart
Stubbs
Tochor
Uppal
Vecchio
Vien
Vis
Wagantall
Wauh
Williams
Zimmer— 111

Steinley
Strahl
Thomas
Tolmie
Van Popta
Vidal
Viersen
Vuong
Warkentin
Webber
Williamson

Brière
Carr
Chabot
Chahal
Champoux
Chen
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cormier
Dabrusin
Davies
Desilets
Dhaliwal
Diab
Drouin
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser
Gaheer
Garrison
Gazan
Gill
Green
Hanley
Hepfner
Housefather
Hutchings
Idlout
Jaczek
Jones
Julian
Kelloway
Khera
Kusmierczyk
Lalonde
Lametti
Lapointe
Lattanzio
LeBlanc
Lemire
Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Martinez Ferrada
Mathysen
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McPherson
Mendicino
Michaud
Morrice
Murray
Ng
Normandin
Oliphant
Petitpas Taylor
Powlowski
Robillard
Rogers
Sahota
Saks
Sarai
Scarpaleggia
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Singh

Brunelle-Duceppe
Casey
Chagger
Champagne
Chatel
Chiang
Collins (Victoria)
Coteau
Damoff
DeBellefeuille
Desjarlais
Dhillon
Dong
Dubourg
Duguid
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Fergus
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Garneau
Gaudreau
Gerretsen
Gould
Hajdu
Hardie
Holland
Hussen
Iacono
Ien
Johns
Jowhari
Kayabaga
Khalid
Koutrakis
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Larouche
Lauzon
Lebouthillier
Lightbound
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacGregor
Maloney
Masse
May (Cambridge)
McDonald (Avalon)
McKay
McLeod
Mendès
Miao
Miller
Morrissey
Naqvi
Noormohamed
O'Connell
Perron
Plamondon
Qualtrough
Rodriguez
Romanado
Sajjan
Samson
Savard-Tremblay
Schieffe
Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Sorbara

PAIRED

Members

Anand
Dowdall
Guilbeault
Jeneroux
Ng
O'Toole

Boissonnault
Fast
Hoback
Joly
O'Regan
Patzner— 12

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed)

* * *

● (2310)

Hon. Mona Fortier (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That the Supplementary Estimates (A) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2023, be concurred in.

[*English*]

The Deputy Speaker: 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. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, I would request a recorded division.

● (2320)

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

(*Division No. 133*)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Ali
Arseneault
Ashton
Bachrach
Bains
Barron
Battiste
Beech
Bennett
Bérubé
Bittle
Blair
Blaney
Boulerice

Alghabra
Anandasangaree
Arya
Atwin
Badawey
Baker
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Bendayan
Bergeron
Bibeau
Blaikie
Blanchette-Joncas
Blois
Bradford

Business of Supply

Ste-Marie	St-Onge
Sudds	Tassi
Taylor Roy	Thériault
Therrien	Thompson
Trudel	Turnbull
Valdez	Van Bynen
van Koeverden	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Vignola
Virani	Weiler
Wilkinson	Zahid
Zarrillo	Zuberi — 198

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Benzen	Bergen
Berthold	Bezan
Block	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Calkins	Caputo
Carrie	Chambers
Chong	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho
Davidson	Deltell
Doherty	Dreeschen
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Ferreri
Findlay	Gallant
Généreux	Genuis
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gourde
Gray	Hallan
Kelly	Kitchen
Kmiec	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Kusie	Lake
Lantsman	Lawrence
Lehoux	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
MacKenzie	Maguire
Martel	Mazier
McCauley (Edmonton West)	Melillo
Moore	Morantz
Motz	Muys
Nater	Paul-Hus
Perkins	Poilievre
Rayes	Redekopp
Reid	Rempel Garner
Richards	Roberts
Rood	Ruff
Scheer	Schmale
Seeback	Shields
Shipley	Small
Soroka	Steinley
Stewart	Strahl
Stubbs	Thomas
Tochor	Tolmie
Uppal	Van Popta
Vecchio	Vidal
Vien	Viersen
Vis	Vuong
Wagantall	Warkentin
Wagh	Webber
Williams	Williamson
Zimmer — 111	

PAIRED

Members

Anand	Boissonnault
Dowdall	Fast
Guilbeault	Hoback
Jeneroux	Joly
Ng	O'Regan
O'Toole	Patzer — 12

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Hon. Mona Fortier moved that Bill C-25, An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the federal public administration for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2023, be now read the first time.

(Motion deemed adopted, bill read the first time)

Hon. Mona Fortier moved that the bill be read the second time and referred to a committee of the whole.

The Deputy Speaker: 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.

[Translation]

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I believe if you seek it, you will find unanimous agreement to apply the results from the previous vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting yes.

[English]

Mr. Blaine Calkins: Mr. Speaker, Conservatives agree to apply the vote and will be voting against the motion.

[Translation]

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will vote in favour of the motion.

[English]

Ms. Rachel Blaney: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party agrees to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.

Mr. Kevin Vuong: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the results of the previous vote and am voting against.

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

(Division No. 134)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alhabra
Ali	Anandasangaree
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barron	Barsalou-Duval
Battiste	Beaulieu
Beech	Bendayan
Bennett	Bergeron
Bérubé	Bibeau
Bittle	Blaikie
Blair	Blanchette-Joncas

Business of Supply

Blaney	Blois	Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard
Boulerice	Bradford	Singh	Sorbara
Brière	Brunelle-Duceppe	Ste-Marie	St-Onge
Carr	Casey	Sudds	Tassi
Chabot	Chagger	Taylor Roy	Thériault
Chahal	Champagne	Therrien	Thompson
Champoux	Chatel	Trudel	Turnbull
Chen	Chiang	Valdez	Van Bynen
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)	van Koeverden	Vandal
Cormier	Coteau	Vandenbeld	Vignola
Dabrusin	Damoff	Virani	Weiler
Davies	DeBellefeuille	Wilkinson	Zahid
Desilets	Desjarlais	Zarrillo	Zuberi — 198
Dhaliwal	Dhillon		
Diab	Dong		
Drouin	Dubourg		
Duclos	Duguid		
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Dzerowicz	Aboultaif	Aitchison
Ehsassi	El-Khoury	Albas	Allison
Erskine-Smith	Fergus	Arnold	Baldinelli
Fillmore	Fisher	Barlow	Barrett
Fonseca	Fortier	Benzen	Bergen
Fortin	Fragiskatos	Berthold	Bezan
Fraser	Freeland	Block	Bragdon
Gaheer	Garneau	Brassard	Brock
Garrison	Gaudreau	Calkins	Caputo
Gazan	Gerretsen	Carrie	Chambers
Gill	Gould	Chong	Cooper
Green	Hajdu	Dalton	Dancho
Hanley	Hardie	Davidson	Deltell
Hepfner	Holland	Doherty	Dreeshen
Housefather	Hussen	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Hutchings	Iacono	Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Idlout	Ien	Falk (Provencher)	Ferreri
Jaczek	Johns	Findlay	Gallant
Jones	Jowhari	Généreux	Genuis
Julian	Kayabaga	Gladu	Godin
Kelloway	Khalid	Goodridge	Gourde
Khera	Koutrakis	Gray	Hallan
Kusmierczyk	Kwan	Kelly	Kitchen
Lalonde	Lambropoulos	Kmiec	Kram
Lametti	Lamoureux	Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Lapointe	Larouche	Kusie	Lake
Lattanzio	Lauzon	Lantsman	Lawrence
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier	Lehoux	Lewis (Essex)
Lemire	Lightbound	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Long	Longfield	Lloyd	Lobb
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacKenzie	Maguire
MacDonald (Malpeque)	MacGregor	Martel	Mazier
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney	McCauley (Edmonton West)	Melillo
Martinez Ferrada	Masse	Moore	Morantz
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)	Motz	Muys
May (Saanic—Gulf Islands)	McDonald (Avalon)	Nater	Paul-Hus
McGuinty	McKay	Perkins	Poillievre
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod	Rayes	Redekopp
McPherson	Mendès	Reid	Rempel Garner
Mendicino	Miao	Richards	Roberts
Michaud	Miller	Rood	Ruff
Morrice	Morrissey	Scheer	Schmale
Murray	Naqvi	Seeback	Shields
Ng	Noormohamed	Shiple	Small
Normandin	O'Connell	Soroka	Steinley
Oliphant	Perron	Stewart	Strahl
Petitpas Taylor	Piampendon	Stubbs	Thomas
Powlowski	Qualtrough	Tochor	Tolmie
Robillard	Rodriguez	Uppal	Van Popta
Rogers	Romanado	Vecchio	Vidal
Sahota	Sajjan	Vien	Viersen
Saks	Samson	Vis	Vuong
Sarai	Savard-Tremblay	Wagantall	Warkentin
Scarpaleggia	Schieffe	Waugh	Webber
Sgro	Shanahan	Williams	Williamson
Sheehan	Sidhu (Brampton East)	Zimmer — 111	

NAYS

Members

Business of Supply

PAIRED

Members

Anand	Boissonnault
Dowdall	Fast
Guilbeault	Hoback
Jeneroux	Joly
Ng	O'Regan
O'Toole	Patzner — 12

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried. Accordingly, this bill stands referred to a committee of the whole.

(Bill read the second time and the House went into committee of the whole thereon, Mrs. Carol Hughes in the chair)

(On clause 2)

• (2325)

Mr. Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC): Madam Chair, would the President of the Treasury Board again advise the House that the bill is in its usual form?

Hon. Mona Fortier (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Madam Chair, the form of this bill is the same as that passed in the previous supply period.

The Deputy Chair: Shall clause 2 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 2 agreed to)

The Deputy Chair: Shall clause 3 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 3 agreed to)

The Deputy Chair: Shall clause 4 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 4 agreed to)

[Translation]

The Deputy Chair: Shall clause 5 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 5 agreed to)

The Deputy Chair: Shall the schedule carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Schedule agreed to)

The Deputy Chair: Shall clause 1, the short title, carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 1 agreed to)

[English]

The Deputy Chair: Shall the preamble carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Preamble agreed to)

The Deputy Chair: Shall the title carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Title agreed to)

The Deputy Chair: Shall the bill carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Bill agreed to)

[Translation]

The Deputy Chair: Shall I rise and report the bill?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Bill reported)

[English]

Hon. Mona Fortier moved that the bill be concurred in.

The Deputy Speaker: 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. government whip.

[Translation]

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I believe you will find unanimous consent to apply the results of the previous vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting yes.

[English]

Mr. Blaine Calkins: Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives agree to apply and will be voting against the motion.

[Translation]

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will vote in favour.

[English]

Ms. Rachel Blaney: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply and will be voting in favour.

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, the Greens agree to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.

Mr. Kevin Vuong: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the result of the previous vote, voting against.

[Translation]

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

(Division No. 135)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anandasangaree
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barron	Barsalou-Duval
Battiste	Beaulieu
Beech	Bendayan
Bennett	Bergeron
Bérubé	Bibeau
Bittle	Blaikie
Blair	Blanchette-Joncas
Blaney	Blois
Boulerice	Bradford
Brière	Brunelle-Duceppe
Carr	Casey
Chabot	Chagger
Chahal	Champagne
Champoux	Chatel
Chen	Chiang
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Damoff
Davies	DeBellefeuille
Desilets	Desjarlais
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Dong
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Dzerowicz
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith	Fergus
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fortin	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Gaheer	Garneau
Garrison	Gaudreau
Gazan	Gerretsen
Gill	Gould
Green	Hajdu
Hanley	Hardie
Hepfner	Holland
Housefather	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Idlout	Ien
Jaczek	Johns
Jones	Jowhari
Julian	Kayabaga
Kelloway	Khalid
Khera	Koutrakis
Kusmierczyk	Kwan
Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Larouche
Lattanzio	Lauson
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Lemire	Lightbound
Long	Longfield
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacDonald (Malpeque)	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney
Martinez Ferrada	Masse
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	McDonald (Avalon)
McGuinty	McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod

Business of Supply

McPherson	Mendès
Mendicino	Miao
Michaud	Miller
Morrice	Morrissey
Murray	Naqvi
Ng	Noormohamed
Normandin	O'Connell
Oliphant	Perron
Petitpas Taylor	Plamondon
Powlowski	Qualtrough
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rogers	Romanado
Sahota	Sajjan
Saks	Samson
Sarai	Savard-Tremblay
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Brampton East)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard
Singh	Sorbara
Ste-Marie	St-Onge
Sudds	Tassi
Taylor Roy	Thériault
Therrien	Thompson
Trudel	Turnbull
Valdez	Van Bynen
van Koeverden	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Vignola
Virani	Weiler
Wilkinson	Zahid
Zarrillo	Zuberi— 198

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Benzen	Bergen
Berthold	Bezan
Block	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Calkins	Caputo
Carrie	Chambers
Chong	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho
Davidson	Deltell
Doherty	Dreeshen
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Ferreri
Findlay	Gallant
Généreux	Genuis
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gourde
Gray	Hallan
Kelly	Kitchen
Kmiec	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Kusie	Lake
Lantsman	Lawrence
Lehoux	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
MacKenzie	Maguire
Martel	Mazier
McCauley (Edmonton West)	Melillo
Moore	Morantz
Motz	Muys
Nater	Paul-Hus
Perkins	Poilevre
Rayes	Redekopp

Business of Supply

Reid	Rempel Garner
Richards	Roberts
Rood	Ruff
Scheer	Schmale
Seeback	Shields
Shiplay	Small
Soroka	Steinley
Stewart	Strahl
Stubbs	Thomas
Tochor	Tolmie
Uppal	Van Popta
Vecchio	Vidal
Vien	Viersen
Vis	Vuong
Wagantall	Warkentin
Wagh	Webber
Williams	Williamson
Zimmer— 111	

PAIRED

Members

Anand	Boissonnault
Dowdall	Fast
Guilbeault	Hoback
Jeneroux	Joly
Ng	O'Regan
O'Toole	Patzer— 12

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

[*English*]

When shall the bill be read a third time? By leave, now?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Hon. Mona Fortier moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

The Deputy Speaker: 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. government whip.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, let me conclude this very productive evening by stating that I believe if you seek it, you will find agreement to apply the results from the previous vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting yes.

Mr. Blaine Calkins: Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives agree to apply and will be voting nay.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will vote in favour.

[*English*]

Ms. Rachel Blaney: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply and will be voting in favour.

• (2330)

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, the Greens agree to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.

Mr. Kevin Vuong: Mr. Speaker, I agree to apply the result of the previous vote, voting against.

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

(Division No. 136)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Ali	Anandasangaree
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barron	Barsalou-Duval
Battiste	Beaulieu
Beech	Bendayan
Bennett	Bergeron
Bérubé	Bibeau
Bittle	Blaikie
Blair	Blanchette-Joncas
Blaney	Blois
Boulerice	Bradford
Brière	Brunelle-Duceppe
Carr	Casey
Chabot	Chagger
Chahal	Champagne
Champoux	Chatel
Chen	Chiang
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Damoff
Davies	DeBellefeuille
Desilets	Desjarlais
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Dong
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Duncan (Etobicoke North)	Dzerowicz
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith	Fergus
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fortin	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Gaheer	Garneau
Garrison	Gaudreau
Gazan	Gerretsen
Gill	Gould
Green	Hajdu
Hanley	Hardie
Hepfner	Holland
Housefather	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Idlout	Ien
Jaczek	Johns
Jones	Jowhari
Julian	Kayabaga
Kelloway	Khalid
Khera	Koutrakis
Kusmierczyk	Kwan
Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Larouche
Lattanzio	Lauson
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Lemire	Lightbound
Long	Longfield
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacDonald (Malpeque)	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney
Martinez Ferrada	Masse
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)
May (Saainich—Gulf Islands)	McDonald (Avalon)
McGuinty	McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod

Adjournment Proceedings

McPherson	Mendès	Reid	Rempel Garner
Mendicino	Miao	Richards	Roberts
Michaud	Miller	Rood	Ruff
Morrice	Morrissey	Scheer	Schmale
Murray	Naqvi	Seeback	Shields
Ng	Noormohamed	Shiple	Small
Normandin	O'Connell	Soroka	Steinley
Oliphant	Perron	Stewart	Strahl
Petitpas Taylor	Plamondon	Stubbs	Thomas
Powlowski	Qualtrough	Tochor	Tolmie
Robillard	Rodriguez	Uppal	Van Popta
Rogers	Romanado	Vecchio	Vidal
Sahota	Sajjan	Vien	Viersen
Saks	Samson	Vis	Vuong
Sarai	Savard-Tremblay	Wagantall	Warkentin
Scarpaleggia	Schieffe	Waugh	Webber
Sgro	Shanahan	Williams	Williamson
Sheehan	Sidhu (Brampton East)	Zimmer— 111	
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard		
Singh	Sorbara		
Ste-Marie	St-Onge		
Sudds	Tassi		
Taylor Roy	Thériault		
Therrien	Thompson		
Trudel	Turnbull		
Valdez	Van Bynen		
van Koeverden	Vandal		
Vandenbeld	Vignola		
Virani	Weiler		
Wilkinson	Zahid		
Zarrillo	Zuberi— 198		

NAYS

Members

Abouttaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barlow	Barrett
Benzen	Bergen
Berthold	Bezan
Block	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Calkins	Caputo
Carrie	Chambers
Chong	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho
Davidson	Deltell
Doherty	Dreeshen
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Ferreri
Findlay	Gallant
Généreux	Genuis
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gourde
Gray	Hallan
Kelly	Kitchen
Kmieć	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Kusie	Lake
Lantsman	Lawrence
Lehoux	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
MacKenzie	Maguire
Martel	Mazier
McCauley (Edmonton West)	Melillo
Moore	Morantz
Motz	Muys
Nater	Paul-Hus
Perkins	Poilievre
Rayes	Redekopp

PAIRED

Members

Anand	Boissonnault
Dowdall	Fast
Guilbeault	Hoback
Jeneroux	Joly
Ng	O'Regan
O'Toole	Patzer— 12

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed)

The Deputy Speaker: We have a point of order from the hon. whip for the official opposition.

Mr. Blaine Calkins: Mr. Speaker, earlier this evening, the member for Tobique—Mactaquac stood in his place in the House and voted in favour of the opposition motion. There was an assurance from the table officers that he did in fact vote and that the official record would reflect that fact. The electronic dashboard, however, continues to show otherwise. Therefore, I would like the record to show that we have brought up the matter to the House and expect Journals to have the correct recording of his vote.

The Deputy Speaker: I thank the member for that intervention. Of course, the Table had that listed already, so Journals will reflect that tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

*Adjournment Proceedings**[English]*

NATURAL RESOURCES

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today in Adjournment Proceedings. I have to say the hour is awfully appropriate. I am going to be following up on a question I asked in question period on May 2 related to what are called small modular reactors and their connection to nuclear proliferation, so it certainly is appropriate that the clock is approaching midnight. It reminds me very much that there is something called a doomsday clock, which is kept up to date by the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists. I just checked it and it shows that we are “100 seconds to midnight”, given the combined factors of the increased threats of nuclear war brought on by Russia's invasion of Ukraine and the significant risk to the whole planet brought on by the climate crisis.

These issues are related, and I related them in my question in the House on May 2. The answer from the Minister of Natural Resources was not sufficient and that is why I have brought it forward this evening.

The so-called small modular reactors are not part of any solution to the climate crisis. Moreover, they are untested and essentially experimental. Lastly, I again draw the attention of this place to the risk of nuclear proliferation.

Just to walk through those three points, the Minister of Natural Resources has said frequently in this place that there is no pathway to climate solutions that does not include small modular reactors. That is simply not true. Reducing greenhouse gases involves phasing out fossil fuels, cancelling the TMX pipeline and not pursuing Bay du Nord. These are tangible things that have nothing to do with nuclear. Nuclear is actually in the way. It is highly expensive. Per tonne of carbon reduced, it is about the most expensive way we can go. There is also a long timeline before we see any results from a decision to go with nuclear.

The fact that these reactors are untested and essentially experimental has not had enough attention in this country. I turn to an expert in the area, Professor Allison M. Macfarlane, as a source. She is actually the former chairperson of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission and is currently at the University of British Columbia. She told this to the CBC: “Nobody knows what the numbers are, and anybody who gives you numbers is selling you a bridge to nowhere because they don't know. Nobody has ever set up a molten salt reactor and used it to produce electricity.”

A molten salt reactor is exactly what the Government of Canada and the Government of New Brunswick are throwing tens of millions of dollars at. A private sector operator has proposed this and wants approval to go ahead and build it. It is being reviewed at this moment, but the money is flowing toward a molten salt reactor that will use plutonium from the spent fuel at Point Lepreau in order to create this unproven technology and allegedly produce electricity.

It is all very much in question, except for one thing. There is a huge risk in taking plutonium from spent fuel. It is the kind of risk that existing nuclear non-proliferation treaties are very careful to prevent us from taking. If we are promoting a global plutonium economy, even a tiny, infinitesimal amount of plutonium in the

hands of terrorists could create a dirty bomb. If it is in the hands of other countries around the world, there is the very large risk that they will produce a nuclear weapon.

We had this experience in 1974 when Canada gave India one of its CANDU reactors. It turns out that these new SMRs, which was just recently noted in *The Globe and Mail* this week, produce far more nuclear waste than conventional reactors, that is, two times to 30 times more.

I ask the government to think twice. This is a mistake. This is radioactive snake oil.

● (2335)

Mr. Maninder Sidhu (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will state at the outset that on this matter our government's top priority is to protect the health, safety and security of Canadians and our environment. As the member opposite knows, Canada is recognized for having one of the world's most comprehensive climate plans. We recently updated it with new details and targets to illustrate how we will reach our ambitious 2030 target, which is to cut emissions by at least 40% below 2005 levels.

This update includes \$9.1 billion in new investments to help us strive toward our goal, to create more than a million jobs while making clean growth the cornerstone of our economic future. Our climate plan includes, for instance, measures to spur the development of next-generation technologies to bring more clean power onto our grids, encourage greater use of public transit and zero-emission vehicles, and make homes and businesses more energy-efficient.

We also see great potential for the development of non-emitting hydrogen. In fact, Germany's ambassador to Canada said recently that we have the potential to become a global hydrogen superpower.

Yes, nuclear also plays a role in our plan. Why do I say that? It is because nuclear already plays a big role. It is the second-largest source of non-emitting electricity in Canada after hydro, generating roughly 60% of Ontario's electricity and close to 40% of New Brunswick's.

The fact is that the International Energy Agency has repeatedly made it clear that getting to net zero will require an acceleration in nuclear energy generation around the world, so Canada is among a number of nations supporting research into small modular reactors, also known as SMRs. We are also working with interested provincial governments that are responsible for making decisions on electricity generation projects.

Adjournment Proceedings

Our support is reflected in our SMR action plan, unveiled in late 2020, and most recently in budget 2022, which included \$69.9 million over five years to advance the development of this technology. This also included the provision of \$50.7 million, and an ongoing \$500,000 annually after that, to help the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission develop the capacity to regulate this emerging sector.

As for the company the member opposite cited, we are supporting the Moltex plan to use recycled CANDU reactor fuel. This would give us the chance to further extract energy from a used resource.

The member and all Canadians should be confident that safety and security remain paramount. Canada remains a signatory to and a strong advocate of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. This means we implement all the safeguards set by the International Atomic Energy Agency to ensure that nuclear materials are used solely for peaceful purposes in Canada.

Most Canadians know that the member opposite has long urged Canadians to take the climate crisis seriously. We on this side hope the hon. member will soon see, as other environmentalists have, that solar and wind power alone will never get us to net zero. To succeed, we must explore all possible solutions.

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry the hon. parliamentary secretary continues to spout the sorts of things that Liberals alone could possibly believe, such as that Canada has a climate plan that is admired in the rest of the world.

When I go to international conferences, Canada is known as a laggard country. We have the worst record in the G7, and by hitching our wagon to net zero by 2050, we are threatening our very own children with an unlivable world, because the targets that must be met occur in the next 30 months, and not in the next three decades.

I will never close my mind to any solution to the climate crisis, but SMRs are not a solution. They are in the way, with the opportunity cost of putting millions of dollars into an unproven technology with existing risks of exacerbating our nuclear waste problem. It is an absolutely bogus notion that we are going to recycle nuclear waste and it is going to be good for all of us. It creates more waste, and it threatens our safety in terms of proliferation.

• (2340)

Mr. Maninder Sidhu: Mr. Speaker, Canada is a leading producer of uranium and a globally recognized pioneer in the safe development of nuclear technology for peaceful purposes. Our industry has been a catalyst for Nobel award-winning science, and with our planet facing a climate crisis, this is not a time to turn our backs on this proud industry.

The fact is that to reach our targets we need to explore all options, including nuclear. Commercially viable SMRs could play a role in cutting emissions. They could also help remote, northern and indigenous communities reduce their dependence on diesel.

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Ms. Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to enter into the adjournment debate on a question that I raised with the government on March 4 related to Afghans who

were fleeing Putin's war and other minorities who are trying to get to safety.

I ask members to imagine this: We have an individual who fled the Taliban and made it safely to Russia. They were in the refugee camp when the war broke out. It is an unprovoked war, initiated by Putin, and as a result, people there are frantic. This individual had been pregnant and had just given birth.

She is fleeing again to try to get to safety. She treks for miles, carrying her baby, trying to get to a border, only to be rejected and not be able to get through. This happens over and over again. This is what has happened to this particular individual and her family. They could not get to safety.

The government said that we would welcome individuals who are being persecuted and people who are fleeing the war, yet we have not extended immigration measures to them. They actually tried to apply under the special immigration measures that the government announced for Afghans and they were not accepted. They were rejected.

I have to ask how it is possible for someone who has fled the Taliban and made it to another country, only to be fleeing again with nothing on her back, and with a new baby. They have all the hopes and all dreams, and want to get to safety, but when they look to Canada to see if that could happen, lo and behold, the Canadian government rejects them.

This is what people are struggling with. I am calling on the government to do the right thing, to support this family and accept them as refugees under the special immigration measure. I would also call on the government to extend those special immigration measures to other minorities who are in similar situations.

In fact, as the days pass and as these numbers get filled up for the 40,000 Afghans who are fleeing persecution, who are fleeing the Taliban and who are trying to get to safety, there are so many people who have been left behind. They are people who served the country, who were referred by the Department of National Defence or by GAC, and the women and girls who have been fighting and advocating for women's rights and democracy in Afghanistan. We need to make sure that we do everything we can to bring them to safety.

In addition, I would also say the government needs to do everything it can to bring the family members of those who served Canada to safety as well. I hope the government will act because people's lives depend on it.

Adjournment Proceedings

Mrs. Marie-France Lalonde (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, following the humanitarian crisis in Afghanistan last summer, the government initially committed to resettling 20,000 vulnerable Afghan refugees, and we have now increased that commitment to bringing at least 40,000 Afghans to Canada.

On July 23, 2001, the Government of Canada announced special immigration measures for individuals with a significant and enduring relationship with the Government of Canada, along with their accompanying family members. On August 13, we announced a special humanitarian program focused on resettling Afghan nationals who were outside of Afghanistan and who do not have a durable solution in a third country.

This program focuses on women leaders, human rights defenders, LGBTQ2 individuals, journalists and people who assisted Canadian journalists. We have also created a permanent resident pathway for extended family members of former Afghan interpreters who previously immigrated to Canada under the 2009 and 2012 public policies.

IRCC has mobilized its global network and all available resources are being devoted to this effort. IRCC also prioritized the processing of privately sponsored Afghan refugees. The department is harnessing the generosity of Canadians, including through sponsorship agreement holders, as well as individuals and corporate donations to private sponsorship.

Today, we marked an important milestone by welcoming more than 15,000 Afghan refugees to Canada, and hundreds more are arriving each week, including 300 privately sponsored refugees arriving on a chartered flight tomorrow.

I also think it is important to put Canada's commitment to Afghans in a global context. Per capita, our goal of bringing at least 40,000 Afghan nationals to Canada places us among the top countries in the world when it comes to resettlement, second only to the United States on numbers alone. In terms of broad numbers, our commitment of 40,000 is larger than the United Kingdom and Australia, and the same as the one being pursued by a European nation that has 10 times the population of Canada.

We remain firm in our commitment to settle at least 40,000 Afghan nationals in safety to Canada as quickly and safely as possible. We will not stop until the work is done.

● (2345)

Ms. Jenny Kwan: Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary secretary knows as well as I do that the reality is that the Department of National Defence had referred 3,800 applications to IRCC and only 900 of them have been confirmed. The rest of the 2,900 applications files are lost somewhere in the system. The same applies to the GAC referrals. IRCC cannot seem to find these files. As much as the parliamentary secretary and the government would like to say they are doing a great job, I am sorry to say they are not. Too many people have been left behind. They cannot even find their files. How is that even possible?

I would say to the Liberals that, if they think they are doing a good job, they had better look harder. They need to find those files

and bring those family members here to Canada. We need to honour them. We need to make sure that they get to safety.

Mrs. Marie-France Lalonde: Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned, we are one of the only countries in the world to have implemented a humanitarian stream to welcome even more Afghan refugees based on their particular vulnerability, including women leaders, LGBTQ2 people, human rights defenders, journalists and members of religious and ethnic minorities.

With our standard refugee program, the humanitarian stream works through a referral system and individuals do not apply directly. Individuals are referred by designated partners trained and experienced at assessing vulnerability and operating a situation of mass displacement and humanitarian hardship.

Our referral partners include the United Nations Refugee Agency, Front Line Defenders, ProtectDefenders.eu and Canadian private sponsors. In light of the current situation in Afghanistan, we will waive the requirement for a refugee status determination to some private sponsorship applications, broadening sponsors' access to the program.

In addition to all these pathways, we are going to work with partners to utilize the economic mobility pathways pilot, an innovative program designed to help skilled refugees resettle in Canada to welcome even more Afghan refugees. We are committed to resettle at least—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound.

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Mr. Alex Ruff (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound, CPC): Mr. Speaker, first off, I want to express my disappointment for having to be here tonight to re-address a simple question. It is a question of transparency and openness from the government on lessons learned from the fall of Kabul last year.

The first thing I want to do is read into the record the mandate of the Special Committee on Afghanistan. It reads:

to conduct hearings to examine and review the events related to the fall of Afghanistan to the Taliban, including, but not limited to, the government's contingency planning for that event and the subsequent efforts to evacuate, or otherwise authorize entry to Canada of, Canadian citizens, and interpreters, contractors and other Afghans who had assisted the Canadian Armed Forces or other Canadian organizations

Adjournment Proceedings

That was our mandate. I am going to read the definition, from the defence terminus database, of what an after-action review is. It is “A professional discussion of...[an] operational event that focuses on identifying what happened, why it happened, and how it can be improved.” In reality, we are asking for the same thing. It is just to get those after-action reviews.

I put a motion forward at the Special Committee on Afghanistan for the government. We brought it up during testimony, and we had Global Affairs Canada officials admit that they had conducted an after-action review or a review of what happened last summer in Kabul.

After that, we had defence officials there, including the chief of the defence staff. They admitted that they went through the Canadian Armed Forces after-action review process or post-operational review and conducted that. In fact, they fed into a PCO-led interdepartmental review of what went right, what went wrong and what we needed to improve going forward from last summer, all great stuff that made sense. Considering the mandate of the Special Committee on Afghanistan, would that information not be invaluable to our hard-working analysts and committee members so they can put together the report?

I therefore put a motion forward. I asked the officials about this, but unfortunately we did not get the information. I put it forward at committee. Unfortunately, the Liberal members of the committee decided to filibuster. It never got to a vote before we ran out of time, because the Special Committee on Afghanistan is wrapping up. In fact, the chair will table the report tomorrow.

I have gone down every possible avenue. I submitted an Order Paper question, a written question, to see if I could get the information that way. Then I stood up during question period, which brings me here tonight to ask for the information.

Again, I am just looking to get all of the reports, including any of the draft reports, to committee so we can move forward. We are lacking them, and it was obvious, based on testimony, that the interdepartmental coordination between the three departments involved in this, particularly with respect to immigration, was weak, if not non-existent. The committee was unable to get all of the reports to provide an effective response going forward.

This is really the key point that I want to hit. In the end, this is all about setting the conditions for the future. If Canada ever commits, whether it is militarily or diplomatically, to another mission around the globe, we need to rely upon the cultural advisers, interpreters and linguists who are willing to step forward. If they are unwilling to do so and do not trust us to have their backs if things go sideways, as they did in Afghanistan, we are the ones who will lose out.

We are likely going to hear from the parliamentary secretary. I am glad he is here to answer my question. However, I think he is going to use national security as an excuse, which is not the case. Ultimately, the sad reality is that the Afghans who should be coming here are the losers in this whole circumstance.

• (2350)

Mr. Maninder Sidhu (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague and fellow member of the Special Committee on

Afghanistan for the opportunity to speak to this important topic. I also want to thank him for his service to Canada and say that his contributions at committee are always insightful.

Canada's response to the collapse of the Afghan government and the Taliban's seizure of power in August 2021 was one of the largest, most challenging and complex international crisis operations in recent decades. It involved the first Canadian-led non-combatant evacuation operations since the 2006 operation in Lebanon.

Through close co-operation with our international partners, we supported and continue to support eligible individuals wanting to leave Afghanistan. Following the signing of the Doha agreement in February 2020, Canada began to prepare for a worsening security situation. We closely monitored events on the ground, informed by intelligence agencies and partners.

Coordinated contingency planning for a potential closure of the embassy of Canada in Afghanistan and an evacuation of Canadians began early between Global Affairs Canada and the Department of National Defence. The security of Canadians in Afghanistan was one of the utmost priority. As testimony from officials made clear at committee, even with the best efforts on assessments from the field, the Taliban overtook Kabul far more quickly than anticipated.

I can tell my colleague that departments and ministers worked closely together across government for a coordinated response, starting in July 2021. Daily interdepartmental task force calls took place to ensure collaboration between departments. From the Global Affairs Canada perspective, our consular team went into high gear to provide robust consular support to Canadians, permanent residents and their family members in Afghanistan to facilitate their safe passage to Canada.

This effort required coordinated support from the embassy in Kabul as they themselves prepared to close down operations in a precarious security situation, as well as from Ottawa and from eight of our missions across the globe. From the onset of this crisis, surge capacity responders worked around the clock to manage an unprecedented volume of answering calls and emails from Canadians, permanent residents, members of Parliament and family members outside of Afghanistan, as well as vulnerable people in Afghanistan seeking help and advice.

Across the government, hundreds of employees worked together on the coordinated response efforts. Partner departments were embedded in Global Affairs Canada's operation centre, enabling close collaboration amongst departments. At the same time, support was provided to Immigration, Refugee and Citizenship Canada to enable them to carry out their mandate in resettling Afghan nationals in Canada.

Adjournment Proceedings

While the response to the crisis in Afghanistan remains ongoing, we always review our efforts in order to identify and capture lessons learned and best practices to improve future emergency management capabilities. We are committed to continuing to work together to implement the lessons learned in order to better serve Canadians' interests abroad.

• (2355)

Mr. Alex Ruff: Mr. Speaker, I thank the parliamentary secretary for recognizing my service. I do think a lot of the information we found at the Special Committee on Afghanistan was beneficial. I will not thank him for the history lesson, although I think maybe it was beneficial to some for learning what we studied over the last number of months at the committee.

Why would the government not release the reports that would have made our jobs so much easier on committee, especially for the great analysts?

My question is simple. Would the parliamentary secretary not agree that it would have made the analysts' job so much easier if they had had the benefit of seeing all the work that had been done already? He does not have to trust me. I actually asked them this yesterday, and they agreed with me that it would have made their job a lot easier.

Why would the government not release the reports?

Mr. Maninder Sidhu: Mr. Speaker, Canada has supported and continues to support the people of Afghanistan.

Through the coordinated efforts of our government, more than 1,460 Canadian permanent residents and their family members were able to safely return to Canada. Emergency consular services continue to be offered to Canadians 24-7, through the emergency watch and response centre at Global Affairs Canada.

In addition, Canada continues to work closely with neighbouring countries to ensure the safe travels of Afghans to Canada under resettlement programs. To date, more than 14,600 Afghan nationals have arrived as a result of these efforts. As we continue to support those in need, it is clear that there is always room for improvement when it comes to collaboration across government departments.

I know that our work on the Special Committee on Afghanistan will help contribute to this process, and I can assure my colleagues and all Canadians that the government will be providing a complete response to the report.

The Deputy Speaker: The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 11:59 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Tuesday, June 7, 2022

Business of the House		Ms. Idlout	6184
Mr. Holland	6177	Ms. Bendayan	6184
		Mr. Baldinelli	6186
		Mr. Perron	6186
ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS		Ms. Mathysen	6187
Chief Electoral Officer of Canada		Mr. Sorbara	6187
The Speaker	6177	Mr. Barlow	6189
International Trade		Mr. Simard	6189
Mr. Sidhu (Brampton East)	6177	Mr. Johns	6189
Government Response to Petitions		Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	6189
Mr. Lamoureux	6177	Mr. Savard-Tremblay	6189
Historic Places of Canada Act		Mr. Lehoux	6191
Mr. Guilbeault	6178	Ms. Bendayan	6191
Bill C-23. Introduction and first reading	6178	Ms. Ashton	6191
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	6178	Mr. Garon	6191
Interparliamentary Delegations		Mr. Ellis	6193
Mr. McGuinty	6178	Ms. Bendayan	6193
Petitions		Mr. Blaikie	6193
Electoral Reform		Mr. Blaikie	6194
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	6178	Mr. Steinley	6195
Charitable Organizations		Mr. Lamoureux	6196
Mrs. Block	6178	Mr. Savard-Tremblay	6196
Medical Assistance in Dying		Mr. Garrison	6196
Mrs. Block	6178	Mr. Caputo	6198
Electoral Reform		Mr. Lamoureux	6199
Mr. Johns	6178	Ms. Larouche	6199
Pharmacare		Mr. Albas	6199
Mr. Julian	6178	Mr. Lamoureux	6201
Climate Change		Mr. Perron	6201
Mr. McGuinty	6178	Mr. Johns	6201
Questions on the Order Paper		Mr. Maguire	6201
Mr. Lamoureux	6179	Mr. Lamoureux	6203
		Mr. Perron	6203
		Ms. Idlout	6203
		Ms. Dzerowicz	6204
		Mr. Steinley	6205
		Mr. Simard	6205
		Ms. Mathysen	6206
		Mr. Lamoureux	6206
		Mr. Kelly	6207
		Mr. Perron	6207
		Ms. Ashton	6208
		Mr. Barlow	6208
		Mr. Drouin	6210
		Ms. Larouche	6210
		Mr. Johns	6210
		Mr. Chambers	6210
		Mr. Gerretsen	6212
		Mr. Perron	6212
		Ms. Idlout	6212
		Mr. Drouin	6213
GOVERNMENT ORDERS			
Business of Supply			
Opposition Motion—Measures for Immediate Financial Relief			
Ms. Bergen	6179		
Motion	6179		
Mr. Lamoureux	6181		
Mr. Simard	6181		
Mr. Johns	6182		
Mr. Berthold	6182		
Mr. Lamoureux	6183		
Ms. Larouche	6184		

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Islamophobia	
Mr. Morrice	6213
Islamophobia	
Ms. Kayabaga	6214
The Economy	
Mr. Falk (Provencher)	6214
Peel Medical Officer of Health	
Ms. Sidhu (Brampton South)	6214
Pride Month	
Ms. Larouche	6214
Lawyers Without Borders Canada	
Mr. Lightbound	6214
COVID-19 Mandates	
Ms. Ferreri	6215
World Hakka Conference	
Mr. Chen	6215
Persons with Disabilities	
Ms. Taylor Roy	6215
World Sailing Championships	
Mr. Perkins	6215
St. John's East	
Ms. Thompson	6215
Christopher Pratt	
Mr. Small	6216
Governor General's Foot Guards	
Mr. Lloyd	6216
Aerotechnical School Awards Gala	
Mrs. Romanado	6216
Events in Elmwood—Transcona	
Mr. Blaikie	6216
Kidney Disease	
Ms. Puzé	6217
Owo Church Attack	
Mr. Barrett	6217
Edward Laba	
Ms. Diab	6217

ORAL QUESTIONS

Health	
Ms. Bergen	6217
Mr. van Koeverden	6217
The Economy	
Ms. Bergen	6218
Ms. Freeland	6218
Ms. Bergen	6218
Ms. Freeland	6218

Mr. Berthold	6218
Ms. Freeland	6218
Mr. Berthold	6218
Ms. Freeland	6218
Passports	
Mr. Therrien	6218
Ms. Gould	6218
Mr. Therrien	6219
Ms. Gould	6219
Taxation	
Mr. Singh	6219
Ms. Freeland	6219
Mr. Singh	6219
Ms. Freeland	6219
Mr. Albas	6219
Ms. Freeland	6219
Mr. Albas	6220
Mr. Wilkinson	6220
Mr. Deltell	6220
Mr. Guilbeault	6220
Mr. Deltell	6220
Ms. Freeland	6220
Mrs. Goodridge	6220
Mr. Wilkinson	6220
Mrs. Block	6220
Mr. Guilbeault	6221
Public Safety	
Ms. Michaud	6221
Mr. Mendicino	6221
Ms. Michaud	6221
Mr. Mendicino	6221
Mr. Fortin	6221
Mr. Mendicino	6221
Justice	
Mr. Moore	6221
Mr. Lametti	6221
Mr. Moore	6221
Mr. Lametti	6222
Ms. Findlay	6222
Mr. Mendicino	6222
Ms. Findlay	6222
Mr. Mendicino	6222
Airline Industry	
Mr. Bachrach	6222
Mr. Alghabra	6222
Foreign Affairs	
Ms. McPherson	6223
Mr. Oliphant	6223
Housing	
Ms. Bradford	6223
Ms. Freeland	6223
Health	
Mr. Ellis	6223
Mr. van Koeverden	6223

Mr. Ellis	6223
Mr. van Koeverden	6223
Mr. Barrett	6224
Mr. van Koeverden	6224
Mr. Barrett	6224
Mr. van Koeverden	6224

Official Languages

Mr. Beaulieu	6224
Ms. Petitpas Taylor	6224
Mr. Beaulieu	6224
Ms. Petitpas Taylor	6225

Justice

Mr. Généreux	6225
Mr. Lametti	6225
Mr. Paul-Hus	6225
Mr. Lametti	6225
Mr. Paul-Hus	6225
Mr. Mendicino	6225

Agriculture and Agri-food

Mr. Iacono	6225
Ms. Bibeau	6226

Ethics

Mr. Bezan	6226
Ms. Ng	6226
Mr. Bezan	6226
Ms. Ng	6226
Mr. McCauley	6226
Mrs. Fortier	6226

Indigenous Affairs

Mr. Aldag	6226
Mr. Guilbeault	6227

Health

Mr. Davies	6227
Mr. Sajjan	6227

The Environment

Mr. Masse	6227
Mr. Guilbeault	6227

Church Attack in Nigeria

The Speaker	6227
-------------------	------

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Budget Implementation Act, 2022, No. 1

Bill C-19. Report Stage	6228
Motion No. 1 negatived	6229

Points of Order

Decorum

Mr. Nater	6229
Mr. Lamoureux	6229
Mr. Miller	6229
Mr. Masse	6230

Budget Implementation Act, 2022, No. 1

Bill C-19. Report Stage	6230
Motion No. 3 negatived	6231
Motion No. 4 agreed to	6233
Motion No. 44 negatived	6234
Hon. Jonathan Wilkinson (for the Minister of Finance) ..	6234
Motion for concurrence	6234
Motion agreed to	6236

Business of Supply

Opposition Motion—Measures for Immediate Financial Relief

Motion	6236
Mr. Drouin	6236
Mrs. Gallant	6237
Ms. Zarrillo	6237
Mr. Kurek	6237
Mr. McKay	6237
Mr. Chambers	6239
Mr. Thériault	6239
Ms. Zarrillo	6239
Ms. Lantsman	6239
Mr. Blois	6241
Mr. Bachrach	6241
Ms. Bérubé	6241
Mr. Lehoux	6242
Mr. Blois	6243
Mr. Lehoux	6243
Mr. Thériault	6243
Mr. Boulerice	6243
Mr. Lamoureux	6244
Mr. Blois	6244
Mrs. Wagantall	6245
Ms. Gaudreau	6245
Mr. Bachrach	6246
Mr. Gerretsen	6246
Ms. Gladu	6247
Mr. Thériault	6247
Mr. Bachrach	6248
Mrs. Kramp-Neuman	6248
Mr. Longfield	6249
Ms. Zarrillo	6249
Mr. Thériault	6249
Mr. Morrice	6250
Ms. Gladu	6250
Mr. Blois	6251
Ms. Kwan	6251
Mr. Thériault	6252
Mrs. Gallant	6252
Ms. Michaud	6252
Mr. Blois	6254
Mr. Rayes	6254
Mr. Boulerice	6254
Mr. Lemire	6254
Mr. Gerretsen	6256
Ms. Zarrillo	6256
Mr. Lamoureux	6257
Mr. Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	6257

Main Estimates, 2022-23**Concurrence in Vote 1—Department of Justice**

Mrs. Fortier	6257
Motion No. 1	6257
Mr. Lamoureux	6257
Mr. Falk (Provencher)	6260
Ms. Collins (Victoria)	6260
Mr. Morrice	6260
Mr. Longfield	6260
Mrs. Roberts	6261
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	6261
Mr. Moore	6261
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	6263
Mr. Longfield	6263
Mr. Bragdon	6264
Mrs. Vecchio	6264
Ms. Collins (Victoria)	6265
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	6266
Mrs. Gray	6266
Ms. Pauzé	6266
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	6268
Ms. Kwan	6268
Mrs. Gray	6268
Mr. Barsalou-Duval	6268
Mr. Gerretsen	6270
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	6270
Mr. Blaikie	6271
Mr. Gerretsen	6273
Mr. Lake	6274
Mr. Morrice	6274
Mr. Lake	6275
Mr. Gerretsen	6275
Mr. Lake	6276
Mr. Barsalou-Duval	6277
Mr. Longfield	6277
Mr. Blois	6277
Mrs. Gray	6279
Mr. Barsalou-Duval	6279
Mr. Longfield	6279
Mr. Deltell	6279
Mr. Caputo	6281
Mr. Gerretsen	6282
Mr. Moore	6282
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	6282
Mr. Berthold	6283
Ms. Khalid	6283
Mr. Caputo	6284
Ms. Collins (Victoria)	6284
Mr. Fraser	6285
Mr. Noormohamed	6285
Mr. Vis	6287
Ms. Collins (Victoria)	6287
Mr. McKinnon	6287

Business of Supply**Opposition Motion—Measures for Immediate Financial Relief**

Motion	6287
Motion negatived	6288

Main Estimates, 2022-23**Concurrence in Vote 1—Justice**

Motion No. 1	6288
Motion No. 1 agreed to	6290
Mrs. Fortier	6290
Motion for concurrence	6290
Motion agreed to	6291
Bill C-24. First reading	6291
(Motion deemed adopted and bill read the first time)	6291
Second reading	6291
Motion agreed to	6293
(Bill read the second time and the House went into committee of the whole thereon, Mrs. Carol Hughes in the chair)	6293
(On clause 2)	6293
Mr. McCauley	6293
Mrs. Fortier	6293
(Clause 2 agreed to)	6293
(Clause 3 agreed to)	6293
(Clause 4 agreed to)	6293
(Clause 5 agreed to)	6293
(Schedule 1 agreed to)	6293
(Schedule 2 agreed to)	6293
(Clause 1 agreed to)	6293
(Preamble agreed to)	6293
(Title agreed to)	6294
(Bill agreed to)	6294
(Bill reported)	6294
Motion for concurrence	6294
Motion agreed to	6295
Third reading	6295
Motion agreed to	6297
(Bill read the third time and passed)	6297
Mrs. Fortier	6297
Motion for concurrence	6297
Motion agreed to	6298
Bill C-25. First reading	6298
(Motion deemed adopted, bill read the first time)	6298
Second reading	6298
Motion agreed to	6300
(Bill read the second time and the House went into committee of the whole thereon, Mrs. Carol Hughes in the chair)	6300
(On clause 2)	6300
Mr. McCauley	6300
Mrs. Fortier	6300
(Clause 2 agreed to)	6300
(Clause 3 agreed to)	6300
(Clause 4 agreed to)	6300
(Clause 5 agreed to)	6300
(Schedule agreed to)	6300

(Clause 1 agreed to)	6300
(Preamble agreed to)	6300
(Title agreed to)	6300
(Bill agreed to)	6300
(Bill reported)	6300
Motion for concurrence	6300
Motion agreed to	6302
Third reading	6302
Motion agreed to	6303
(Bill read the third time and passed)	6303

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Natural Resources

Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	6304
Mr. Sidhu (Brampton East)	6304

Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship

Ms. Kwan	6305
Mrs. Lalonde	6306

Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship

Mr. Ruff	6306
Mr. Sidhu (Brampton East)	6307

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>