



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

House of Commons Debates

Official Report
(Hansard)

Volume 151 No. 331
Thursday, June 13, 2024

Speaker: The Honourable Greg Fergus



CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, June 13, 2024

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayer

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

• (1000)

[*Translation*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS CALENDAR

The Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 28(2)(b), it is my duty to lay upon the table the House of Commons calendar for the year 2025.

* * *

COMMISSIONER OF LOBBYING

The Speaker: It is my duty to lay upon the table, pursuant to section 11 of the Lobbying Act, the report of the Commissioner of Lobbying for the fiscal year ended March 31.

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(3)(h), this report is deemed to have been permanently referred to the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics.

* * *

[*English*]

CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND ETHICS COMMISSIONER

The Speaker: It is my duty to lay upon the table, pursuant to paragraph 90(1)(a) of the Parliament of Canada Act, the annual report of the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner in relation to the Conflict of Interest Code for Members of the House of Commons for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2024.

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(3)(a), this document is deemed to have been permanently referred to the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND ETHICS COMMISSIONER

The Speaker: Pursuant to paragraph 90(1)(b) of the Parliament of Canada Act, it is my duty to lay upon the table the annual report of the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner in relation to the Conflict of Interest Act for the fiscal year ended March 31.

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(3)(h), this document is deemed to have been permanently referred to the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics.

* * *

[*English*]

VETERANS OMBUDSMAN

Mr. Randeep Sarai (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs and Associate Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32, it is my honour to table, in both official languages, the 2023-24 annual report of the Office of the Veterans Ombudsman.

* * *

• (1005)

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mrs. Marie-France Lalonde (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence, 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.

* * *

[*Translation*]

NATURE ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-73, An Act respecting transparency and accountability in relation to certain commitments Canada has made under the Convention on Biological Diversity.

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

Routine Proceedings

[English]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Hon. Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 10th report of the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage, in relation to Bill C-316, an act to amend the Department of Canadian Heritage Act on the court challenges program. The committee studied the bill and decided to report it back to the House with amendments.

* * *

NATIONAL HOUSING STRATEGY ACT

Ms. Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-398, An Act to amend the National Housing Strategy Act.

She said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce my private member's bill to amend the National Housing Strategy Act. I thank my colleague and friend, the member for Hamilton Centre, who is a champion for human rights, for seconding this bill.

While the act states that “the right to adequate housing is a fundamental human right”, in reality, this is not happening. Without access to adequate housing, people are forced to live on the street.

Canada's housing crisis is not just about building more, faster. It needs to take a human rights approach to housing and build housing that people can afford. Otherwise, encampments for the unhoused in communities across the country will only continue to grow. Forced decampments and evictions are not the answer. Often, these things lead to further destabilization, loss of community and safety for encampment residents, and exacerbation of trauma.

The bill aims to amend the National Housing Strategy Act on recommendations of the federal housing advocate to prohibit forced decampments on federal land and to consult with other levels of government so that alternatives to forced decampments are put in place following meaningful engagement with encampment residents. I hope all members of the House will support the bill.

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

* * *

**DEPARTMENT OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION
OMBUD ACT**

Ms. Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-399, An Act to establish the Office of the Ombud for the Department of Citizenship and Immigration and to make related and consequential amendments to other Acts.

She said: Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce a private member's bill to establish an independent ombud's office for Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada, with a mandate to examine the department's policies to ensure the principles of fairness and equity are upheld.

I thank my friend and colleague, the member for Edmonton Griesbach, for seconding the bill. He is a champion for equality and justice.

The bill aims to create a dedicated oversight body to ensure fairness and accountability within IRCC. The ombud's office would serve as an impartial entity to address complaints and concerns by providing an accessible platform for grievances. This office would help in examining concerns with differential treatment and discriminatory practices in IRCC's policies and programs and would be able to look at trends and patterns to identify systemic issues.

The bill would enhance trust in Canada's immigration system by ensuring it operates justly, effectively and equitably for everyone. I hope all members of the House will support the bill.

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

* * *

● (1010)

**FRAMEWORK ON THE ACCESS TO AND USE OF CASH
ACT**

Mr. Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-400, An Act to establish a framework for the continued access to and use of cash in Canada and to make related amendments to other Acts.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is my honour and privilege to rise today to table a bill calling for a framework on the access to and the use of cash. As all economies are, our economy is driven by the exchange of goods and services, or in other words, commerce. Typically, the settlement for that exchange is currency. In a world where commerce is moving at a rapid pace toward plastic, online and digital currencies, many Canadians, including many in my riding of Provencher, are concerned with their ability to access and use cash as currency.

For millions of Canadians, particularly the most vulnerable folks in our population, physical cash is essential to everyday life. Likewise, charities, community organizations and remote communities rely on cash to achieve their worthy goals. Finally, in a world where governments, banks and corporations are increasingly infringing on the privacy rights of Canadians, cash remains the only truly anonymous form of payment.

The bill calls for a national framework to ensure continued access to and use of cash in Canada. It would amend the Currency Act to limit the Minister of Finance's ability to arbitrarily and unilaterally call in bank notes. It would also amend the Bank of Canada Act to ensure that the central bank does not develop or replace hard currency with a digital dollar.

Routine Proceedings

This common-sense legislation would benefit vulnerable Canadians the most, as well as those who work so hard to support them. I hope the House will support the bill.

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

* * *

INCOME TAX ACT

Mr. Brendan Hanley (Yukon, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-401, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act (northern residents deduction).

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to introduce an act to amend the Income Tax Act with a northern residents deduction. This would increase the daily deduction that can be claimed for residing in a certain northern zone, tie that amount to the consumer price index and remove the distinction between the prescribed intermediate and northern zones by merging the two.

[*Translation*]

All of the Yukoners I talk to are deeply concerned about the cost of living, and I am committed to bringing down the cost of living in our territory.

[*English*]

Since its introduction in 1986, the northern residents deduction has helped make life in the north more affordable, but this deduction has not kept pace with the rising costs northerners face. I hope the bill will help carry us towards a goal that many of my constituents and northern residents have advocated for, where the cost of northern life, modern life in the north, can be recognized and adjusted to today's and tomorrow's realities.

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

* * *

MARINE LIABILITY ACT

Ms. Lisa Marie Barron (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-402, An Act to amend the Marine Liability Act (national strategy respecting pollution caused by shipping container spills).

She said: Mr. Speaker, I am thankful to my colleague, the MP for Courtenay—Alberni, for seconding this very important bill. Styrofoam, plastics and toxic chemicals, refrigerators, urinal mats and plastic pink unicorns are not items that one would expect to find in the ocean, yet this is exactly what is being found from cargo container spills. These things pollute marine ecosystems and wash up on Canadian shores.

As extreme weather events become more common and the demand for goods continues to escalate, it is necessary to develop a clear national strategy to not only clean up container spills in a timely, effective manner when they occur but to prevent them from happening in the first place.

We cannot sit by and wait for another disaster to occur. Today, I am tabling the bill to highlight this important issue once again. I call on the government to move forward with necessary solutions through amending the Marine Liability Act, by adding a national strategy respecting pollution caused by shipping containers.

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

* * *

● (1015)

INCOME TAX ACT

Ms. Laurel Collins (Victoria, NDP) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-403, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act and the Canada Pension Plan (deeming provision).

She said: Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to present my private member's bill to amend the Income Tax Act and the Canada pension plan. I want to thank the member for Courtenay—Alberni for seconding the bill, as well as for his continued advocacy for disability justice. The bill aims to make it easier for people living with disabilities to access the benefits they are entitled to. Currently, applicants to provincial and federal disability benefits and the disability pension plan need to finalize two different applications, which require many steps and a lot of bureaucracy. With my bill, people with disabilities would only need to apply to their provincial plan; the federal government would recognize their application immediately.

I am grateful for all the work of the advocates in my riding who have brought this issue forward, including Mark Schuller, Steve Palmer, and people across the country who dedicate their lives to disability justice.

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

* * *

NATIONAL CONVERSION THERAPY AWARENESS DAY ACT

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-404, An Act to establish National Conversion Therapy Awareness Day.

He said: Mr. Speaker, on January 7, 2022, the law banning conversion therapy officially came into force in Canada. Unfortunately, the reality is that a legacy still exists with the effects that were felt by so many people throughout our country who were subjected to conversion therapy.

During the deliberations in the House of Commons, and in committee specifically, two people contributed immensely to the amending of the bill and the final result of it. They were Ben Rodgers, who is from the Kingston area, and Veronica Merryfield from Cape Breton—Canso, the riding of the seconder to this bill. This bill seeks to continue their work. They came together and developed a network to support individuals throughout our country who have been affected by conversion therapy.

Routine Proceedings

This bill would attempt to establish a national day of awareness for conversion therapy on January 7 of each year, which is the date the law came into force in Canada in 2022.

I recognize I do not have precedence, and I do not have an opportunity to necessarily bring this forward for debate. However, I sincerely hope that, in the interests of all Canadians, in the same manner we were able to unanimously adopt a ban on conversion therapy, perhaps, through consultation with other parties, we will be able to do something similar with this bill.

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

* * *

• (1020)

PETITIONS

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise and present a petition signed by the great people from the freedom-loving riding of Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, as well as from Sudbury, Nipissing—Temiskaming and Nickel Belt.

The petitioners call on the Government of Canada to refrain from endorsing the pandemic treaty drafted by the World Health Organization, which has never had a single debate or been voted on in the House of Commons.

The concern is that, by agreeing to this legally binding treaty, Canada would be signing away its own sovereignty, allowing UN bureaucrats, who are unaccountable to Canadians, the power to override our laws, rights and freedoms.

[*Translation*]

JUSTICE

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille (Salaberry—Suroît, BQ): Madam Speaker, it is with emotion today that I table petition e-4915 signed by more than 1,000 people. This petition is the fruit of efforts by the family of Nancy Lefrançois and Loïc Chevalier, who were both victims of a terrible multi-vehicle collision.

The driver, who was the subject of a Canada-wide warrant, has never been brought to justice because he is no longer on Canadian soil. The petition calls on the government to review legal mechanisms so as to retain in Canada any individual, including foreign nationals, under investigation for a criminal offence causing death and that the government propose appropriate legislative amendments.

The petitioners understand that the solutions are not simple, but they remain convinced that it is important for justice to be served. In short, the petition calls on this government to propose tangible measures to prevent such individuals from escaping Canadian justice.

The petitioners hope that the government will take the time to reflect on the possible options, including real solutions to improve Canada's justice system in favour of the victims.

The family of Nancy and Loïc deserve a serious and detailed response from the government.

[*English*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I want to remind members that petitions are being presented, but there are conversations going on, so I would ask members to please be respectful.

[*Translation*]

The hon. member for Salaberry—Suroît is rising on a point of order.

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Madam Speaker, when I was speaking in French, I know that some colleagues on both sides of the House were not wearing their earpiece and therefore did not understand what I was saying. There are people in the gallery who came to listen to what I was saying and noticed that I did not have the respect of the House when I tabled a petition that means so much to them.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): As the member for Salaberry—Suroît knows, I addressed that issue when she finished presenting her petition. I definitely took note of that and took action.

[*English*]

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Ali Ehsassi (Willowdale, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is a great honour to rise to present a petition on behalf of hundreds of Canadians from coast to coast to coast. These individuals are calling upon the House of Commons to do several things.

First, they ask that we place sanctions consistently on foreign nationals who are responsible for gross violations of human rights against Rwandans, Hazaras, Tibetans and Tigrayans, and place further sanctions on foreign nationals who are responsible for gross violations of human rights against Uyghurs and Tamils. They go on to ask that we conduct a comprehensive review of the Crimes Against Humanity and War Crimes Act to assess why it has not been used in over 10 years to prosecute war criminals and criminals against humanity. Finally, they are asking that we make every effort to resettle genocide victims to Canada, including members of the Uyghur, Tigrayan, Hazara, Tibetan, Rwandan and Tamil communities.

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Ms. Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition signed by over a thousand people across the country. They are calling on the government to take immediate action to address the humanitarian crisis faced by refugees from Gaza by treating them equitably and increasing refugee admissions to Canada.

They call on the government to, one, accept applications from within and from outside Gaza, including from refugees who have made it to neighbouring countries; two, extend the same rights and protections to refugees from Gaza as it does to refugees from other conflict-affected regions, which would include providing access to asylum procedures, legal representation, health care and social services to ensure their safety and well-being; and, three, significantly increase the number of refugees admitted from Gaza to at least 10,000 individuals. This increase would be necessary to address the scale of the crisis and to provide for refugees in urgent need of protection and assistance. Finally, they call on the government to allow families in Canada to sponsor their relatives who are impacted by the conflict in Gaza through an expedited process. This would reunite families that have been torn apart by war and provide them with the support and care they need to rebuild their lives in safety.

• (1025)

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mr. Dan Mazier (Dauphin—Swan River—Neepawa, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is always an honour to present a petition on behalf of constituents.

I rise for the 42nd time on behalf of the people of Swan River, Manitoba, to present a petition on the rising rate of crime. The community of Swan River is overwhelmed with the alarming levels of crime because of the Liberal government's soft-on-crime policies, such as Bill C-5 and Bill C-75. Jail has become a revolving door for repeat offenders. Bill C-75 allows violent offenders who are in jail in the morning to be back out on the street in the afternoon. Bill C-5 allows criminals to serve their sentences from home.

The people of Swan River are calling for jail, not bail, for violent repeat offenders. They demand that the Liberal government repeal its soft-on-crime policies, which directly threaten their livelihoods and their community. I support the good people of Swan River.

CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS

Mr. Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon, CPC): Madam Speaker, today I rise on behalf of correctional officers in the Pacific region who are calling for an end to the needle exchange program put in place by the Liberal government.

Correctional officers are calling for an effective strategy to stop drones from dropping drugs onto prison grounds. We need a drone dereliction strategy.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mrs. Marie-France Lalonde (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Business of Supply

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—GOVERNMENT'S ECONOMIC ANALYSIS ON CARBON PRICING

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC) moved:

That an order of the House do issue to the government for a copy of the government's economic analysis on the impact of the federal fuel charge and the output-based pricing system referenced in the response to the Parliamentary Budget Officer's information request IR0776, provided that it shall be laid upon the table, in both official languages and without redaction, no later than Monday, June 17, 2024.

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Today being the last allotted day for the supply period ending June 23, the House will proceed as usual to the consideration and passage of the appropriation bills. In view of recent practices, do hon. members agree that the bills be distributed now?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

[*English*]

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Madam Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the member for Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia—Headingley, the common-sense Conservative.

We just learned, moments ago, that the government has been keeping a \$20-billion secret. Common-sense Conservatives have been demanding that the government release the real cost of the carbon tax, after the Parliamentary Budget Officer revealed that there was a report the government had been covering up and that he was gagged from releasing the report about the actual cost to Canadians. Now, because common-sense Conservatives brought forward this motion before the House, and because of our relentless questioning and the pressure that is weighing heavily on Liberal MPs, the government has finally relented and has released part of the information. It had to be pulled out like a rotten tooth, and rotten it is.

It is \$20 billion per year in lost GDP, as a result of the carbon tax. That works out to \$1,200 per family in extra annual costs for Canadians. Twenty billion dollars for 17 million families is \$1,200 a family in higher costs that the Prime Minister has been covering up. Not once, in any tables that he released, which claimed that Canadians were somehow better off with the carbon tax and rebate, did the Prime Minister include these economic costs that he knew existed, because he wanted to continue to spread the falsehood. He wanted to tell Canadians that paying more for gas, heat and groceries would make them better off, just like he claimed that raising their income tax would make the middle class better off. Ninety per cent of middle-class income taxpayers are paying more now than they were paying nine years ago when he promised to cut their taxes.

Business of Supply

Yesterday, we tested the Liberals' claim that only the \$800,000-a-year investment banker, who is in the top 0.13%, would pay this new job-killing tax on home builders, farmers, small business owners and health care workers. We tested it by simply saying that if that were the case, the Liberals would amend their bill to say that anybody who is part of the 99.87% of the population would be excluded from any new capital gains taxes. The minister refused to do that because we all know that it would be plumbers, electricians, carpenters, farmers, small business owners and restaurant owners who would pay this Liberal tax increase.

What we are coming to understand is that we cannot believe a word the Prime Minister says about money or about taxes because at the end of the day, he has an insatiable appetite for other people's money. He wants to stuff the face of his morbidly obese government with the hard-earned tax dollars of working-class Canadians, and he has the full support of the greedy NDP to do it. The New Democrats believe that the people's money is their money, and they are here for one purpose: to help the Prime Minister vacuum up every single nickel that hard-working Canadians, including entrepreneurs, earn on the ground.

Common-sense Conservatives are exactly the opposite. People will notice that we take delight in the fact that, in this place, we do not fit in. We stand out as the only party that would axe the tax, build the homes, fix the budget and stop the crime.

• (1030)

[*Translation*]

The Bloc Québécois voted in favour of a tax hike for Quebec entrepreneurs, farmers, doctors and home builders. According to the Bloc Québécois, Quebecers should give more of their money to the massive Liberal federal government.

The Liberal Bloc is part of a centralist coalition. We are the only party that wants to allow Quebec entrepreneurs, farmers, doctors and small businesses to keep their money and be masters in their own house.

That is also the case with the Quebec City tramway. This project would cost at least \$11 billion, or \$28,000 per greater Quebec City family. If those families were asked if they wanted \$28,000 or a tramway 10 years from now, I think it would be an easy decision for them. Quebec City residents prefer to have the money in their pocket. They want a third link to connect the two sides of the river.

That is what common sense is all about, and we are the only party that thinks this way. We do not want a white elephant. We want to fix the budget and axe the taxes. That is common sense.

• (1035)

[*English*]

Here we are today with the government again raising taxes and, again, making claims that are demonstrably false when we look at the government's own documents.

When I look at the capital gains issue, first, the government claimed that only 44,000 people would pay. That is a small number. They all live on a hill somewhere. Then, the government admitted that 300,000 separate businesses, most of them small businesses, would pay. Therefore, there are 300,000 businesses, but only

44,000 would pay. I find it hard to believe that each of these 44,000 people own six different businesses. In reality, those 300,000 businesses probably have millions of owners and definitely have millions of employees. All of them would pay the tax.

Then, the government members said that they were very concerned that welders are paying a higher tax rate than investors. We have a National Occupation Classification for a welder. We could say, in the law, that anyone who is a welder, as defined by the National Occupation Classification, is excluded, but the minister would not do that. I said to exclude the NOC for carpenters. She did not want to do that either. Why do we not exclude nurses? Nurses who invest in rental properties or who maybe have a family cottage they may want to sell could be excluded. We could look up the NOC code for nurses, and pop it right into the Income Tax Act. It could say that no nurse would pay that higher tax rate. The government was not willing to do that either.

In fact, we know that, because they want to tax nurses, carpenters, welders and electricians. They want to tax everybody. In fact, I went even further and asked why we do not just exclude everybody who makes less than \$120,000 a year. The government did not want to do that either. It turns out that, if none of these people were affected by the tax, the minister should have said that it was easy and that she could have it drafted up this afternoon and could have it put in the bill with no problem, but of course she did not. She knows exactly what she is doing. She is putting her greedy hands in the pockets of working-class people and she is stealing their money, just like she did with the carbon tax, just like the government did when it raised income tax and just like it did in 2017 when it went after our small business tax creators.

The good news is that we have defenders of the taxpayers in this party. The tax fighters are all on this side of the house: the common-sense Conservatives. If someone out there is working hard, has seen their housing costs double, is worried about losing their home and has two or even three jobs just to avoid eviction, they might feel a loss of hope. The good news is that life was not like this before the current Prime Minister and the NDP, and it will not be like this after they are gone.

Business of Supply

We are going to bring home the Canada that we knew and that we still love, by axing the tax system, building the homes, fixing the budget and stopping the crime. We would once again make this a country where hard work would pay off; where entrepreneurs would be incentivized, rewarded and honoured, not demonized; where we would not turn workers against business owners, but would turn workers into business owners; and where hard work would bring powerful paycheques and pensions that would buy affordable food, gas and homes in safe neighbourhoods.

That is what the common people deserve. The common sense of the common people is united for our common home. It is their home, my home and our home. Let us bring it home.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Madam Speaker, what we are seeing here is nothing more than a desperate attempt by Conservatives to deflect from what is really going on.

The Conservative leader brought forward a motion to the House today, and then he barely even spoke to it because he got the data, moments ago, that he had been asking for: not a report, but data. He got all that data, but the data did not fit his narrative, just like we hear the Conservative leader today go on about his new-found desire to be against a capital gains tax. For two months, Conservatives sat silent and would not say a word about it. Their leader would not say a word about the capital gains tax. Now, after two months, we are expected to believe that he has suddenly come to the realization that this is going to be bad for Canadians. No. He is trying to tap into anxieties and fears of Canadians.

What I want to know about this motion is this: What is his plan for the environment? It cannot be more than slogans about technology.

• (1040)

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Madam Speaker, it is hard to figure out what part of that meandering, rambling rant to focus on.

Let us start with the two months. The two months that went by was the time during which the minister refused to introduce any bill to actually apply her job-killing tax increase on home building, on houses, on health care, on small businesses and on Canadians. She went two months, and it was not because of some brilliant strategy, but because she did not have any clue what she was doing. She did not know how to write the rules that she had blurted out in her budget. Then, she spent months flipping and flopping behind the scenes, telling doctors, high-tech investors and home builders that they might get an exemption if they were very nice and if their lobbyists sucked up enough. Finally, she introduced a bill, and within a day of its introduction, we stated our position on it. We are against this latest job-killing tax on Canadians.

[Translation]

Mrs. Caroline Desbiens (Beauport—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île d'Orléans—Charlevoix, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am always blown away by just how much the Conservative Party leader fancies himself a god who will solve all the problems with his magic wand. I find it fascinating.

First, is the Conservative Party leader able to stop infantilizing Quebecers about the choice they will make on their mobility?

Second, if one day the Conservative Party leader becomes prime minister, would he commit to giving Quebec the money it needs to be able to make its choices and decide about its mobility for itself? Does he pledge to commit these funds without conditions?

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Madam Speaker, I am the only leader who listens to Quebec City residents, 70% of whom oppose the tramway. We know why: It is a big white elephant. It is going to cost \$11 billion. That means \$28,000 per family in the Quebec City area. That means \$28,000 for a project that will not benefit the majority of people.

As far as I am concerned, we should reduce waste, support common-sense projects like a future third link, and fix the budget. This is not magic, as the member suggests, but common sense.

[English]

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Madam Speaker, it is fascinating that all of Canada is asking about foreign interference and about actually having credible leadership on this, yet we have one leader who either cannot get security clearance or refuses to get security clearance, so he is in here doing another gong show on the same issue, again and again, yet he has not explained to Canadians why he cannot get security clearance.

What kind of leader refuses to understand the threats to our country? I would like to hear from the member for Stornoway.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Madam Speaker, I would call him the member for Timmins—James Bay, but I am not sure he has ever actually been to Timmins. He does not live in his riding and never goes to his riding. People in that community think he is in the witness protection program; that is, if they have heard of him at all. When I last said this in the House of Commons, a week later he decided to turn tail and run. He announced that he was not running again, because he knew very well that the common-sense loggers, miners and farmers were going to fire him in the next election and elect a common-sense Conservative government.

• (1045)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order. I want to remind members that they have had an opportunity to ask questions. They should wait until there are other opportunities. I also want to remind all members not to interrupt.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): There are members on both sides of the House who do not seem to want to heed the direction of the Chair. I would ask them to please do so, because it becomes very problematic in the House and it impacts the Orders of the Day.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia—Headingley.

Business of Supply

Mr. Marty Morantz (Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia—Headingley, CPC): Madam Speaker, I think the Liberals think they got ahead of this and cut us off at the pass. However, the fact is that nothing has really changed. The carbon tax cover-up continues, and I will tell everyone why. The Liberals across the aisle have big smiles on their faces, thinking they sure pulled one over on the Conservatives.

I have in my hands the article from the CBC. It says, “CBC filed an access to information request for the unpublished data. [The Minister of the Environment]’s department proactively disclosed the data to CBC and other journalists and posted it online today.” Here is the catch, “CBC’s access to information request has not yet been fulfilled.” What else is it about the carbon tax that the government is continuing to hide? Nothing has changed and the Conservative motion is completely in order and appropriate.

We did learn one thing from this article, and that is that the Liberals are going to tax the GDP by \$20 billion. It says that the carbon tax, by 2030, is going to cause the GDP to fall by \$20 billion, from \$2.68 trillion to \$2.66 trillion. That is about \$1,200 per family across the country.

This is what the Parliamentary Budget Officer said he was really concerned about. This is an exchange from the committee meeting on Monday last week.

I asked him the following question, “Mr. Giroux, in your earlier testimony, you said that you understood that the government had economic analysis on the carbon tax that it has not released. Are you saying that the government has not been transparent with the analysis it has?” His response was, “I mentioned that the government has economic analysis on the impact of the carbon tax itself and the OBPS, the output-based pricing system. We’ve seen that—staff in my office— but we’ve been told explicitly not to disclose it and reference it.”

I then asked, “The government has given you their analysis, but they have put a gag on you, basically, saying you can’t talk about it.” His response was, “That is my understanding.”

Mr. Giroux went on later to say that the government’s analysis confirmed the report that the PBO had already published, and concluded by saying, “That’s why I’m comfortable with what we have already published”. In other words, when he said that Canadians are worse off, the government’s data confirmed that. I will elaborate on that a little more in a moment.

I followed up with him and asked, “Are you saying the report the government did on the carbon tax, the report that they provided to you, confirms the analysis that you have done on the carbon tax?” Then Mr. Matier, from his office, responded:

Mr. Giroux filed a formal information request to Environment and Climate Change Canada [asking for] the underlying economic impacts related to the emissions reductions that the government published related to carbon pricing back in late March or early April. They provided us with their estimates on real GDP, on labour income, on capital income, and they indicated on the response form that these were confidential and that we could not disclose—

That is the exchange, and so began the carbon tax cover-up, which continues to this moment, notwithstanding the incomplete information that the government has decided to give to the CBC. The Conservatives are going to find out what the rest of that infor-

mation is, by the way. We are not going to let this go until Canadians know the complete truth about the carbon tax.

The department gave the data to the PBO. The data confirmed his findings, according to the Parliamentary Budget Officer, that people pay more. The Liberals tried to muzzle him from talking about it. The only reason they released these bits and pieces of data that helped make their case that eight out of 10 people were better off was because the Conservatives put them under relentless pressure and embarrassed them into doing something about it. However, they have made it even worse, because providing part of the truth is, in itself, misleading Canadians. They need to put out the whole story.

When we finally see the report, hopefully after CBC’s access to information request is granted, we will see what the Parliamentary Budget Officer is saying. I have no doubt in the veracity of what he is saying, that the government’s own data confirms his findings that Canadians pay more in carbon tax than they get back. Those were the PBO’s findings.

• (1050)

Fast-forward a year, when the PBO announces that he made a slight error when he prepared his report, but that he does not believe it will change his findings. The Liberals seized on that error, seizing an opportunity to attack his credibility. They attacked the PBO, who is an independent officer of Parliament, which is shameful. In fact, they attacked him in committee, and that is when Mr. Giroux said that he had received government data that confirmed his results.

We do not see that in the CBC article. The government held that information back. It needs to release it. We cannot make this stuff up. On November 4, 2015, the Prime Minister wrote an open letter to Canadians, in which he said that the government needed to be open by default. It is a famous letter and it has been quoted in the House many times. Those were high-sounding words.

The problem is, like most things, that it just was not true. Governments that are open by default do not silence independent officers of Parliament, but that is exactly what the Prime Minister did. The government is still doing it, because the information released does not confirm what the PBO told the committee, which is that Canadians pay more than they get back in rebates. That is the truth, and that is what the government needs to own up to.

Business of Supply

For two years now, the Prime Minister has been misleading Canadians. He has been saying that the PBO found that most Canadians would get back more in carbon taxes than they paid. He said it again, by the way, to the Federation of Canadian Municipalities just a few days ago. It was quite a show. The mayors, the reeves and the councillors were at the FCM when the Prime Minister said that eight out of 10 Canadians would get back more than they paid. They started laughing at him. They booed him off the stage. They know, like Canadians know, it is just not true. He knows it—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. deputy House leader knows full well that if he has questions and comments, he should wait until the end. I would ask other members to not engage him, and it is coming from both sides.

The hon. member for Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia—Headingley has three minutes remaining.

Mr. Marty Morantz: Madam Speaker, the Prime Minister was booed off the stage.

Canadians know it is not true. All they have to do is look at their energy bills. They know that when we tax the farmers who grow the food, the truckers who ship the food and the grocers who sell the food, the food costs more. I like to call it trickle-down taxation.

This debate has been raging for two years. The Prime Minister gets up and says that Canadians get more rebates. The PBO says not so fast. When we consider the trickle-down economic effects, Canadians pay more. That is the truth, but do not take it from me. I know the members opposite will not take it from me. We do not even have to take it from the Parliamentary Budget Officer.

Members should take it from the Prime Minister. His own deputy minister of Environment did the analysis. He crunched the numbers. He sent the numbers to the PBO, and even under the threat of a gag order, the PBO spoke truth to power. He said in committee, “It confirms the report that we have published...That’s why I’m comfortable with what we’ve already published.”

The Prime Minister, who says he is open by default, knows the truth, that Canadians pay more. He has hidden the facts, stonewalled the opposition and gaslit Canadians for too long. It is time to end the carbon tax cover-up, and that brings me to the point of this motion.

We are asking:

That an order of the House do issue to the government for a copy of the government’s economic analysis on the impact of the federal fuel charge and the output-based pricing system referenced in the response to the Parliamentary Budget Officer’s information request...provided that it shall be laid upon the table, in both official languages and without redaction, no later than Monday, June 17, 2024.

We are asking the Prime Minister to live up to his own words and to be open by default. It is time to end the carbon tax cover-up and let the people know the truth.

• (1055)

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Madam Speaker, this is the second day in a row that Conservatives are having a bad day. The reality is that yesterday we saw them fumble all over the place. We saw the Leader of the Opposition take all the

questions away from his backbench so that he could pick a fight with the Deputy Prime Minister—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order, please. Again, I want to remind everyone in the House to please be respectful when somebody else has the floor.

The hon. deputy government House leader has the floor.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, what we have learned, what the member should have learned, although he probably would have just received the information moments ago, is that if we actually look at the data, and the data is holistic and is all the data the PBO received, it tells us two very important things.

The first thing it tells us is that we have reduced emissions by 25 million tonnes per year, and our reduction of emissions is continuing to increase. The second thing it tells us, point blank and very clearly, if we read the data, is that eight out of 10 Canadians get back more than they pay. I have actually done the math on what I pay versus what I get, and I know I get more. I am wondering if the member has done the math on the rebate he receives.

Mr. Marty Morantz: Madam Speaker, I have to say that hearing that that member has done the math does not give me a lot of comfort.

The reality is, I wish he would give us the information he is talking about. The CBC’s access to information request was denied. The Liberal government released pieces of information that supports its narrative. It did not release all of the information.

I maintain that the carbon tax cover-up continues. That report and that data, all of it needs to be tabled in this House now.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Christine Normandin (Saint-Jean, BQ): Madam Speaker, the motion we have been presented with today calls for an economic analysis of the carbon tax. I would submit, however, that what is needed is a far more macroeconomic analysis of the climate change question. This should include, for example, the costs of climate inaction, particularly the increase in insurance premiums and the health costs associated with pollution-related risks. This is nowhere to be found in the Conservatives’ motion, however.

I would like to know whether this is because, according to the Conservatives, there is no cost associated with climate inaction.

[*English*]

Mr. Marty Morantz: Madam Speaker, while I appreciate the question from the member, what we are talking about here today is a very fundamental obligation of a government to the people. That obligation is to always tell them the truth, and this motion is trying to get at the truth.

Business of Supply

It is time for the government to stop stonewalling Canadians, stop gaslighting Canadians and tell us what the data says. The Parliamentary Budget Officer said it confirms his results. Where is that data? Bring it here. Table it right now.

Ms. Leah Gazan (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Madam Speaker, once again, we have an “axe the facts” day.

I want to know some facts. I want to know why the leader of the Conservative Party is avoiding getting security clearance at a time of foreign interference. I want the facts on that, instead of another day where the Conservatives spin and axe those facts.

Mr. Marty Morantz: Madam Speaker, I am sure it says in the Standing Orders somewhere that the question should be about the motion. I will leave that question for another day.

Mr. Pat Kelly (Calgary Rocky Ridge, CPC): Madam Speaker, does the member have any explanation for the reflexive secrecy? How on earth could it possibly come to the Parliamentary Budget Officer having to resort to ATIPing the government to get information from them? Secrecy by default is the Liberal government's M.O.

Does the member agree?

• (1100)

Mr. Marty Morantz: Madam Speaker, I do agree with the member's statement.

The reality is that the truth does not help the Liberals. The Liberal government has been lying to Canadians for two years. It is a tangled web that gets woven when it lies to Canadians for two years, and its own data comes out and shows that it has been lying—

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. He is specifically saying that members of this House are lying. He cannot say that.

Mr. Pat Kelly: Madam Speaker, on this point of order, I listened very carefully to the member, and he did not accuse a member of Parliament of lying, which would be against the rules. He pointed out that the government has not told the truth, and the government has lied in its—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I think I have heard enough on the point of order. I would just remind members not to use the word “lying” in the House. It causes disorder. This has clearly caused disorder. I would ask the hon. member to rephrase his response.

The hon. member for Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia—Headingley.

Mr. Marty Morantz: Madam Speaker, that is all fair, but the truth is that the Liberal government has not been telling the truth to Canadians.

The Prime Minister has misled Canadians for years. The Liberals have data that shows he has been misleading Canadians. That is what this is about. The Liberals need to come clean. They need to give out all the data now so Canadians know the truth about the carbon tax.

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to share my time with the member for Surrey Centre.

This morning, Environment and Climate Change Canada published data provided to the Parliamentary Budget Officer on carbon pollution pricing relative to the national and provincial gross domestic product for the years 2022-30. Pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), I am happy to table this data in the House, along with a Statistics Canada study called “*Aperçu de l'incidence des tendances météorologiques extrêmes au Canada sur la rentabilité de l'assurance des propriétaires et les consommateurs*”; as well as another report, by the Canadian Climate Institute, called “*Damage Control: Reducing the costs of climate impacts for Canada*”. While I am at it, since Canada introduced its first-ever nature accountability act this morning, only the second country in the world to do so, I would also like to table “*Toward a 2030 Biodiversity Strategy for Canada: halting and reversing nature loss*”.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Madam Speaker, I am rising on a point of order. I appreciate the member is tabling documents that we have not had a chance to see, but I will accept them. However, would the member table the documents on how much the toll fees for TMX are going to be and how much taxpayers are expected to cover off?

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The hon. member for Timmins—James Bay's request that the minister table a report is not really a point of order; it is more of a point of debate. The hon. minister knows that he can table reports at any time, so there is not an issue with his tabling reports.

The hon. Minister of Environment and Climate Change.

Hon. Steven Guilbeault: Madam Speaker, it is important to recognize that the data published today does not represent a comprehensive economic overview of the impacts of carbon pricing. Instead, it is background data related to a specific request from the PBO, which was then used to develop some of its analysis.

The Government of Canada has a collaborative relationship with the Parliamentary Budget Officer. It always has collaborated and always will collaborate fully with the PBO's requests, including by providing the PBO with all specific documents and information that respond to its requests.

[*Translation*]

It should be recognized that the Parliamentary Budget Officer plays an important role in our democratic institutions. He assists all parliamentarians, be it in their day-to-day work or in long-term research, in order to enhance the quality of parliamentary debate and to promote greater transparency and budgetary accountability.

• (1105)

[*English*]

Unlike the Conservatives, who have a history of muzzling scientists, on this side of the House we value science.

Business of Supply

Environment and Climate Change Canada estimates that the fuel charge and industrial carbon pricing system together will account for almost 80 million tonnes, Mt, of greenhouse gas pollution reduction in 2030, compared to what would have happened without the carbon pricing. That represents about one-third of the currently projected total emission that will result from various actions being undertaken pursuant to the 2030 emissions reduction plan. If members take the time to look at the data that is being tabled today, that was requested for us by the PBO, they will see that according to the PBO we know that greenhouse gas emissions have already gone down by 25 million tonnes per year because of carbon pricing.

A full economic assessment of carbon pricing cannot be done without considering the benefits of reducing pollution and the cost of not taking action, which is something, unfortunately, that the Conservative Party continues to ignore. Currently, climate change costs Canadian households an average of \$720 a year and is set to rise to at least \$2,000 a year by 2050. Canadians are already feeling the cost of climate change through losses to communities and livelihoods from wildfires, floods and hurricanes.

To estimate the economic benefit of emissions reduction, the Government of Canada uses a value known as the social cost of carbon. It quantifies the damages at \$294 per tonne of carbon dioxide emitted into the atmosphere in 2030. Canada's current social cost of carbon is the same value used by the United States government. Using that metric, the avoided cost for climate change in the year 2030 associated with the projected emissions reduction benefit of carbon pricing is about \$23.1 billion per year. The social cost of carbon analysis is a core part of climate policy assessments used by many countries, as it reflects the reality of the growing impacts of climate change on current and future generations and is a standard methodology internationally recognized for estimating the benefits of reducing emissions.

Abandoning carbon pricing without replacing it with other actions would forgo those benefits, and replacing it with more costly policy measures would significantly and unnecessarily increase the cost to Canadians, which is another thing that the Parliamentary Budget Officer has publicly recognized a number of times. In fact, a report from the Ecofiscal Commission concluded that carbon pricing would grow Canadians' incomes on average by \$3,300 in 2030 relative to an alternative policy approach.

The increased costs of climate change are well documented.

[*Translation*]

For example, the Canadian Climate Institute document I referenced earlier tells us that by 2030, the annual costs of climate change impacts on Canada's GDP will be in the order of \$35 billion. What is more, numerous studies have shown that the cost of inaction is far higher than the cost of implementing measures to combat climate change.

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Madam Speaker, I thank the minister for his commentary and remarks, which I greatly appreciate.

A little later I will get back to the tabling of the documents, but basically, we feel that the documents released this morning are only partial. They are not complete, and they do not get to the bottom of

the matter. That is why we often ask the minister to tell us precisely what the true effect is of the carbon tax in terms of directly reducing greenhouse gas emissions. This is what we would like to know.

As for the real effect and the effectiveness of the carbon tax, I would like to table a document. Since the member tabled a number of documents, I am sure he will not mind if I table in the House a document entitled Climate Change Performance Index, or CCPI. As he knows very well, this document was presented at the last COP, which he attended. According to the CCPI, after nine years of this Liberal government, Canada ranks 62 out of 67 countries for greenhouse gas emissions.

The Liberal policies are not working.

Hon. Steven Guilbeault: Madam Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for his question. I have two things I would like to say.

First, we were asked to table the documents requested by the Parliamentary Budget Officer, and that is precisely what we did this morning. The data we are presenting to the House are those the Parliamentary Budget Officer had asked us for.

Second, while I know why my colleague likes to cite this CCPI report, the next time he talks about it I would like him to let the entire House know the reasons why Canada's performance is not improving. He knows full well what these reasons are, or at least I hope he does, because he often talks about this. I also hope he has read the document.

If Canada's performance is not improving, it is due to fossil fuel production. Consequently, we need to tackle greenhouse gas emissions, and that is how our performance will improve.

• (1110)

Ms. Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the minister for his speech. I listened to it carefully.

I have two questions and observations for him.

First, we saw in the last budget that his government is continuing to invest in the oil industry. Does he really believe that these industries are in genuine need of help, when other people have much more need for government support than they do?

Second, he talked about documents this morning, but the reality is that the following was sent to the Parliamentary Budget Officer: "The data the Department is providing contains unpublished information. As such, I request you to ensure that this information is used for your office's internal purposes only and is not published or further distributed".

Business of Supply

On such a crucial issue, what information was not in the public's interest to know? Why wait until this morning to release the documents?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault: Madam Speaker, my colleague probably already knows this, but Canada is the only G20 country to have eliminated government subsidies for fossil fuels. We did that last year. No other G20 country has done so. In addition, we did so two years ahead of the 2025 deadline. We even committed to doing more and eliminating indirect subsidies that are provided through Crown corporations like Export Development Canada, or EDC, and the Business Development Bank of Canada, or BDC.

As for the second part of her question, she correctly read an excerpt of the letter from the deputy minister of Environment and Climate Change Canada, requesting that the Parliamentary Budget Officer simply be careful. We needed to make sure that we did not violate any privacy laws by providing this information. We checked, and the information is now public.

[English]

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Madam Speaker, the fundamental problem with the Liberals' carbon pricing schemes is that the government, under the present minister, gave \$34 billion for the TMX pipeline. We now have record production taking place at Imperial. Cenovus is going to increase from 150,000 barrels a day. We are expecting a 500,000-barrels-a-day increase from the bitumen sands, which cause the highest greenhouse gas emissions on the planet.

How is the minister telling consumers that they should pay more when they go to the pumps when he is giving free money to big oil to continue the emissions that have risen in the oil sector year in, year out, and are now being subsidized by the government's pipeline?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault: Madam Speaker, I said it in French, but I will say it again in English and remind the member that Canada is the only G20 country to have eliminated fossil fuel subsidies last year. The numbers he is referring to precede 2023. That is the first thing.

Second, we need to tackle climate change pollution coming from all of the sectors, including the oil and gas sector in Canada. That is why we have already put in place regulations to reduce methane emissions in the oil and gas sector by at least 45% by 2025, next year. We will ramp those up to at least 70% by 2030. That is also why we are putting in place a cap on oil and gas emissions.

Mr. Randeep Sarai (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs and Associate Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Madam Speaker, Canadians are at the front lines of the climate crisis. Climate change manifests itself in our lives on a daily basis. It has already forced and will continue to force us to adapt and to change how we manage our businesses, organize our lives and interact with nature. With warmer temperatures comes more intense and frequent weather events everywhere on earth and here at home. At the global level, it has been estimated that, between 2000 and 2019, extreme events caused damages averaging around \$143 billion, or around \$16 million per hour.

Here at home, Canadians have first-hand experience with severe weather events such as hurricanes, storms, flooding, extreme heat

and wildfires, which are now more common, more severe and more disastrous than ever. These kinds of weather events have major impacts on property and infrastructure, cause environmental damage and threaten lives and basic food security and water security. The impact of extreme weather events on Canadian communities is not limited to one given place. There are changes across our country and severe weather from coast to coast to coast.

When looking at the financial impacts of extreme weather, we see that six of the 10 costliest years on record in Canada were in the last decade. With 24 catastrophes, double the yearly average, the total insured losses for 2023 alone due to extreme weather were the fourth-highest in Canadian history at \$3.1 billion. For example, 2023 was the most severe wildfire season Canada has seen to date, and for certain periods of time, smoke from Canadian fires blanketed much of the country and most of the northern and northeastern United States, exceeding air quality health standards. We all remember pictures of the New York City sky that was bright orange because of the smoke travelling from fires near our homes to south of the border.

A study has estimated the health costs of last year's wildfires for a single week in Ontario to be \$1.28 billion due to changes in ambient air quality resulting in adverse health effects. In B.C., I am assuming it would be very similar after what we saw in the Okanagan and the interior. Sadly, 2024 could be a repeat of last summer. Current forecasts and conditions indicate that the coming wildfire season has the potential to be above average once again. Pre-existing dry conditions from the fall of 2023 and winter of 2024, combined with a high probability of warmer-than-normal conditions across the country this summer, contribute to predictions of above-average fire severity this summer, especially in the west.

Aside from the forecasts and the broader seasonal outlook, we can see that the 2024 wildfire season has already begun. As of May 27, there were 81 active fires across the country, with 14 of them out of control. Some people will say that the real season has not even started yet. In the east, the Atlantic is bracing for the upcoming hurricane season. Predictions for the upcoming hurricane season are for 17 to 25 major storms, category 3 or higher, eight to 13 of which could become hurricanes, and four to seven of them could become major hurricanes.

Business of Supply

There is a high confidence in these forecasts generated for this year. Warmer weather in the Atlantic tends to increase the number of hurricanes in a particular season. Current water temperature in the Atlantic is very warm in the tropical zone, which will be a major contributor to this year's hurricane season.

As we all remember, hurricane Fiona in 2022 turned out to be one of the most significant and impactful tropical storms to affect Canada in many decades. It was particularly large, resulting in damage across all four Atlantic provinces and in parts of Quebec around the Gulf of St. Lawrence, including Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine. Many Canadians are asking, "Is that what climate change looks like?"

It is not as simple as attributing a single weather event to human-caused climate change. The evidence is clear that Canada is experiencing more frequent and more intense storms. Climate change is leading to intense disasters not only here at home but also around the world. We know climate change brings the possibility of more frequent exceptional weather. Canadians are clearly seeing that stable climate they used to experience is over.

• (1115)

Strong weather prediction and environmental services, as well as systems that provide early warning of potential impacts, will continue to be critical going forward as Canada is to face more frequent unprecedented weather. Such measures are critical for robust emergency preparedness and responses to events like hurricane Fiona and Canada's historic 2023 wildfire season.

They also complement the significant steps the government has taken already to adapt to a future climate. For example, Canada's national adaptation strategy presents a comprehensive blueprint to strategically reduce the risks that come with climate change impacts. We need to adapt better, be prepared for severe weather events, transform our infrastructure and economy in a changing climate, and enable Canadians to prepare for future risks.

What does adapting to climate change involve at home? First, it is about informing people. Canada's world-class weather and environmental prediction services are becoming more important than ever in the face of unprecedented weather. They support decision-making at all levels of society, including for provincial emergency management and response efforts, and they increase climate resilience.

We have learned many hard lessons in recent years due to historic, costly weather events. In the wake of these experiences, we must show that, by working together, governments, organizations and citizens can build climate resilience. Together we must do more. We must do it faster. We must invest in transforming our infrastructure, our economy and our relationship with nature. We must do these things to fight climate change and to enhance our abilities to prepare and adapt to unprecedented weather. The Government of Canada will always be there to help Canadians in need.

• (1120)

Mr. Dan Mazier (Dauphin—Swan River—Neepawa, CPC): Madam Speaker, I was just wondering, and maybe the member knows, maybe the government has shown him, how many emissions have been reduced by the carbon tax directly.

Mr. Randeep Sarai: Madam Speaker, I believe that 25 million tonnes have been reduced per year, which has been the biggest reduction with a carbon tax since, I believe, the 1990s. I think it was the Oilers' last win, if I am right. However, this has been the biggest contribution to the reduction of carbon from our atmosphere that has ever happened in the history of this country. It is definitely more than what happened under the Harper government.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Christine Normandin (Saint-Jean, BQ): Madam Speaker, the Liberals keep harping on the fact that they abolished subsidies to the oil companies. However, former minister Catherine McKenna said that the carbon capture tax credit "should never have happened, but clearly the oil and gas lobbyists pushed for that.... We are giving special access to companies that are making historic profits".

I will spare my colleagues the rest of the quote, but I would like someone to explain to me how the carbon capture tax credit is so different from the subsidies the Liberals are supposed to have abolished.

[*English*]

Mr. Randeep Sarai: Madam Speaker, it is very clear how they are different. One is subsidizing the production of oil, which emits carbon, especially in the process of production and also when it is burnt.

The other is a subsidy in order to capture any carbon that is used in the process and store it so that it does not get into the atmosphere but goes back into the ground or some other place where it will not harm the atmosphere. I think it is a very important subsidy; it is counterintuitive to say that it is not important. It is equally important as doing a lot of the other ones to reduce the production of carbon. We also need to sequester carbon from production, away from the atmosphere.

Ms. Leah Gazan (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Madam Speaker, we know that the government has a lousy record in terms of dealing with the climate emergency. The Liberals did buy a pipeline, if we want to talk about wasting taxpayer dollars, but they have tabled the report, which is what the whole opposition day motion by the Conservative Party is about.

I am wondering if my hon. colleague agrees that because the government has done what has been asked, if instead of spending another whole day axing the facts, on climate denialism, and spreading misinformation, we can get to talking about some important things, like the housing crisis in the country and like murdered and missing indigenous women and girls. With all the days the Conservatives spend axing the facts, could we actually talk about something else if we really are serious about helping Canadians?

Business of Supply

● (1125)

Mr. Randeep Sarai: Madam Speaker, that is exactly what we would like to do on this side of the House, but I would like to remind the member that the motion is an opposition day motion, and it seems like the Conservatives' only priority is to fight on how we can produce more carbon and how we can release more carbon into the air.

We are fighting for Canadians and will continue to fight for Canadians. Fighting the important matters on the housing crisis, on inflation or on the cost of living is our priority. We will continue to do that, and I thank my hon. colleague for hoping for the same.

Mr. Dan Mazier: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

I asked a very direct question about the motion before us today. This is all about a cover-up. I asked the member—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I am sorry; that is a point of debate.

[*Translation*]

The hon. member for Jonquière.

Mr. Mario Simard (Jonquière, BQ): Madam Speaker, I'll be sharing my time with my friend and associate, the member for Terrebonne.

This is the umpteenth version of an opposition motion on the carbon tax. When I read the motion, I was kind of confused about my Conservative colleagues' intentions. A careful read of the motion eventually reveals that its mover is seeking access to the government's economic analysis of carbon pricing, which was produced by the Parliamentary Budget Officer.

In my opinion, the role of a public policy maker, of a lawmaker, is to collect as much information as possible for the purpose of making rational decisions. Despite my reservations, I do not see how the Bloc Québécois could vote against a motion that calls for information, that makes data in the government's possession more transparent, and that promotes clarity and access to information of interest to the public.

I have reservations because I feel that we can distinguish between two types of politicians in the House. There are politicians who are rational and there are politicians who are irrational. That is what I would like to talk to my colleagues about today. In my opinion, an irrational politician is one who takes positions and formulates their remarks not on the basis of facts, truth or science, but often on the basis of simplistic propositions, simplistic observations to complex problems. This is eerily similar to populism and to some of the Conservatives ways of doing things.

To put a face to my remarks, I would like to return to the member for Carleton. I am not the teasing type, like my friend from Timmins—James Bay. I would not take the liberty to say that the member for Carleton spent his life working at Dairy Queen. I find that a bit vulgar, so I will not go there. What I do know, though, is that the member for Carleton has been a member for 20 years. I think it will be 20 years this year. My colleague, the transport minister, is wont to say that we are here for our pensions. I feel that the member for Carleton will have a really nice pension, since he has

been here for 20 years. We are talking about a seasoned parliamentarian here.

Although he is a seasoned parliamentarian, I feel that he does not understand how a bill is supposed to work. We saw him yesterday during question period reacting strongly to the Bloc Québécois's questions on the capital gains bill. I saw the opposition leader react strongly while making some disjointed proposals. One can be in favour of a bill, one can want to send it to committee for improvements and at the same time criticize the details and implications of that bill. That is what my Bloc Québécois colleague did yesterday during question period. Surprisingly, the leader of the official opposition does not seem to get this.

During question period yesterday, he reiterated over and over again that if this bill moves forward, the Bloc Québécois will support it. He said that Quebec physicians will flee. I do not know where they will flee to. I do not know if Quebec doctors will go to Ontario. During his remarks in English, he said the opposite. He said that Ontario's doctors would flee. Will Ontario's doctors flee to Quebec? He did not seem to understand that the capital gains thing would apply to everyone. That is the perverse logic of the member for Carleton, who often indulges in fallacious reasoning.

Earlier, in his presentation on opposition day, he said that Quebec wanted to invest \$11 billion in a tramway. He said that \$11 billion for a tramway represents \$28,000 for each and every family. He said he preferred to give \$28,000 to every family rather than invest in a tramway. Duller minds might conclude that if they are against the tramway and they live in Quebec City, they will receive \$28,000. It is easy to see that this has a perverse effect. The Leader of the Official Opposition does this all the time, associating opposition during question period with decisions made by the government. It is as if, speaking of the \$83 billion the government will be investing in the oil industry between now and 2035, I made a flawed calculation like the leader of the official opposition did and asked Canadians whether they preferred to receive that much money rather than invest \$83 billion in the oil industry.

● (1130)

I am not in favour of fossil fuels, but I am not stupid enough to get caught up in this type of perverse rhetoric. It makes me think of my philosophy courses in CEGEP. In Philosophy 101, students learn logic. I get the feeling that the member for Carleton did not take that course, and I will explain why. In CEGEP, people learn what a logical fallacy is. I will give an example. The Minister of Transportation has a white beard, Santa Claus has a white beard, therefore the Minister of Transportation is Santa Claus. That is a fallacy, and that is what the Leader of the Opposition constantly resorts to. Why not give him a dose of his own medicine?

Business of Supply

Let us look at some of the political events where we could associate untruths with the leader of the official opposition. To keep things simple and to ensure my Conservative friends can understand, we could quickly refer to a saying in Quebec that goes, “you are what you eat”. The member for Carleton eats apples, therefore the member for Carleton is an apple. That is the type of logic the Leader of the Opposition uses. I will give members another example. In Quebec, woke people are against Bill 21. The leader of the official opposition is against Bill 21, therefore the leader of the official opposition is woke. We could do the same thing with the statement he made about the mayor of Montreal. He said that the mayor of Montreal had not built enough housing units and that she was incompetent. I checked. During this period, she built nearly 12,000 housing units in Montreal. The leader of the official opposition, when he was in government, built six housing units. Therefore, if the mayor of Montreal is incompetent because of the number of housing units she built, and if the member for Carleton built six housing units, does that mean that he is incompetent? That is the same simplistic logic.

Then there is the leader of the official opposition's position in light of statements from the member for Peace River—Westlock. The MP for Peace River—Westlock, a proponent of social conservatism within the Conservative Party, was on a podcast where he let people know the true nature of Bernadette. That is an expression we use back home about someone's political views on a woman's right to control her own body. Of all the things the member for Peace River—Westlock said, what interested me most was what he said about cannabis. He said he was against legalizing cannabis. I invite members to follow my reasoning, because it will take us to a very interesting place. In a written statement sent to the *Journal de Montréal*, the leader of the official opposition said, “To be clear, there will also be no change to the legal status of marijuana under a future Conservative government.” This means that marijuana will be legal under a Conservative government. Hear me out. Marijuana is a drug, so the leader of the official opposition is in favour of decriminalizing drugs. The leader of the official opposition supports wacko and extremist government policies. We are learning something today. It is rather surprising.

The same could be said of Ukraine. We know that the entire Conservative caucus voted against the Canada-Ukraine free trade agreement. If the Conservative caucus opposes free trade with Ukraine, then it must be pro-Russian. That means the Conservative caucus is pro-Russian. Obviously, the Conservative caucus is pro-Russian and it supports the legalization of drugs. The scales are starting to tip. Honestly, I find it hard to see conservatism in the leader of the official opposition. Things go even further than that. Let me give an example of this lack of even basic logic and the outrageous use of fallacious reasoning, like the leader of the official opposition is doing. Some time ago—

• (1135)

[English]

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

Mr. Pat Kelly: Madam Speaker, I would ask you, as the Chair, if you could direct the member to address the motion before the House.

[Translation]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I want to remind members that, when they are giving their speeches, they have quite a bit of latitude, but they must speak to the motion. I am sure the hon. member will circle back to the motion before the House.

The hon. member for Jonquière.

Mr. Mario Simard: Madam Speaker, let us be patient. I am getting there.

Getting back to carbon pricing, Derek Evans, the former CEO of MEG Energy, is now the executive chair of Pathways Alliance, the largest representative of the oil sands industry. What did Mr. Evans say? He said that the advice he would give to the opposition leader is that the carbon policy will be absolutely essential for maintaining our position on the world stage.

We cannot make this stuff up. The representative of the oil industry is giving lessons to the leader of the official opposition on climate change. He tells him that if we want to reduce our carbon footprint, then pricing is essential. Canada will not be competitive if we do not move forward with carbon pricing in the global economy. The oil industry's representative is giving lessons to the leader of the official opposition. I am not making this up.

My mischievous colleague from Rivière-du-Nord asked the leader of the official opposition a question about Derek Evans. I want to read the response of the leader of the official opposition. He said, “he sounds like another useless lobbyist saying stupid things.”

That is what the leader of the official opposition said about Derek Evans, the same person his party invited to the Standing Committee on Natural Resources.

I can elaborate on this during questions and comments.

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Madam Speaker, I have a lot of respect for my colleague.

Today's discussion is very strange. When it comes to the climate crisis, the Conservatives are a bunch of conspiracy theorists. That being said, I am concerned about the Liberal Party's position. The government invested a lot of money in the construction of the Trans Mountain pipeline. This will result in a massive increase in greenhouse gases.

Why is the government supporting the expansion of the Trans Mountain pipeline and promoting the tar sands during a climate crisis?

Mr. Mario Simard: Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Timmins—James Bay. I have the pleasure of working with him on the Standing Committee on Natural Resources. He is absolutely right.

Business of Supply

When it comes to oil and gas, I find the Liberals are just Conservatives with a complex. They are trying to hide things. Earlier, the Minister of Environment was saying that we were the first country to eliminate subsidies for fossil fuels. The devil is in the details. What the government wanted to do was eliminate inefficient funding for fossil fuels. When you ask the government what inefficient support for fossil fuels is, they do not know.

We have a long way to go. My colleague is absolutely right.

[*English*]

Mr. Pat Kelly (Calgary Rocky Ridge, CPC): Madam Speaker, on the motion itself, literally minutes, maybe even seconds, before the opposition leader moved the motion to compel the production of documents, the government reluctantly, at the very last second, dropped an 80-page report. The Parliamentary Budget Officer has had to resort to the broken and completely chaotic ATIP system to try to get basic information from the government to do his job.

Does the member support the government's penchant for secrecy? Does he not support parliamentarians using the tools available to them to compel honesty from a government that promised to be the most open and transparent government in Canadian history?

• (1140)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Simard: Madam Speaker, that is precisely it.

I want members of Parliament to have access to as much information as possible before making decisions. The gist of my speech earlier was that this information has to be used in a rational manner, which the Conservative Party is not doing right now.

When a leader says that people are requesting medical assistance in dying because they have no food to eat, that is not rational. When a leader says that we can catch lightning to light up a room, that is not rational. When an opposition leader says that you can weld two pieces of metal together with your hands, that is not rational.

What I have this to say to my Conservative colleagues is that, yes, we need information, but we need to interpret it rationally.

Ms. Andr anne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Madam Speaker, at the end of his speech, my colleague asked us to give him an opportunity to address the Leader of the Opposition's comments on the Liberal-paid lobbyist who was invited to a Conservative event. I would like to hear more about that.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I will give the hon. member the opportunity to ask her question, but I would like to remind everyone that questions and debates should really be pertinent to the motion itself. I am certain that the hon. member for Jonquiere will take that into consideration in his answer.

The hon. member for Jonquiere.

Mr. Mario Simard: Madam Speaker, at the close of my remarks I was simply pointing out that the Conservatives' motivations when it comes to carbon pricing are to support the oil and gas industry. It was surprising, therefore, to see the leader of the official opposition rise and say that the chief representative of the oil and gas industry

is, in fact, a useless lobbyist who says stupid things. I have to wonder whether the Conservative Party is changing its tune.

Have its members had an epiphany? Will they suddenly believe in climate warming and realize that the oil and gas sector is responsible for much of it? That is how I wanted to close my remarks.

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagn  (Terrebonne, BQ): Madam Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague from Jonquiere for having gone before me and raised so many examples of the sophistry exhibited recently by the Conservative Party. It was magnificent. I would just point out that he spoke about the motion more than did the member for Carleton, who is after all the motion's sponsor.

The motion seeks to make public certain documents. Something rather comical took place at the Standing Committee on Public Accounts this week. The Conservative Party asked the deputy minister of Environment and Climate Change Canada to provide the documents that Environment Canada had provided to the Parliamentary Budget Officer.

Let us just say that there was a kerfuffle between the Privy Council representative, who was in attendance, and the Environment Canada representatives who had said at the start that these were confidential Cabinet documents that could not be made public. Then they walked this back, because these documents had not been sent to cabinet and were therefore not confidential cabinet documents. This excuse did not hold water. Then they hemmed and hawed, claiming that the figures had not been vetted. It was all very wishy-washy. Clearly, they had been instructed not to release these figures, which is a problem in itself. We are in agreement on that.

Something else I found funny was that right before the member for Carleton began to speak, the government decided to release these figures, at the request of journalists, so that they could be accessed. It is nice to finally be able to speak today about what is contained in these figures. In all likelihood, the Conservatives were expecting to find an economic disaster and to be able to say that the carbon tax would create an economic disaster and that Canada's economy would crumble, just like the economy of all the countries that have put a price on pollution. Quebec's economy has completely crumbled, right?

No, on the contrary, putting a price on pollution is a useful tool for those who believe in climate change. The question we must ask is, does the Conservative Party believe in climate change? That is another story.

According to the numbers released, by 2030, greenhouse gas emissions should be down by 80 million tonnes. This means that we will be able to prevent emitting 11% of the greenhouse gases that Canada is expected to emit by 2030. The trade-off is that GDP is expected to fall by about \$20 billion. However, this \$20-billion drop in GDP does not include the positive side of a carbon tax, in other words, the new jobs created, the businesses encouraged to develop green technologies and the clean economic growth that would occur. That is the goal of transforming an economy into a green economy. That is what these numbers show.

Business of Supply

The reason the member for Carleton did not refer to the numbers he so desperately wanted to see is that they do not substantiate what the Conservative Party has been trying to show for ages now, which is that implementing the carbon tax will lead to some sort of terrible disaster. Quite the opposite is true.

I will give another little lesson in economics, and I will do so as long as the Conservatives continue to dilly-dally and spread disinformation in the House. The economic and societal costs of climate change can easily be quantified.

Let us start with the cost of climate change on the health of Quebecers and Canadians. Obviously, we are seeing more and more heat waves, which will impact the mortality rate. That is a cost. Climate change will also impact allergies because of a major increase in pollen. We are seeing it. The season is longer and there is more pollen. That is going to bother people. That is a cost because it will be harder for people to go to work and they will not feel like working as much. There will be an economic cost to this drop in productivity over the long spring and summer season. These are direct costs of climate change. One last cost is the cost of zoonotic diseases, which are diseases that are transmitted through a vector, such as ticks. Lyme disease is a good example, as is the West Nile virus.

As a result of climate change, species like the ticks that transmit Lyme disease and the mosquitoes that transmit the West Nile Virus are increasingly migrating north to Canada, so there are going to be a lot more cases of zoonotic diseases. If Lyme disease is not treated quickly, it can produce a wide range of symptoms and even lead to death. These are the impacts of climate change.

• (1145)

Let us talk about another sector: infrastructure. Do I need to remind the House of Commons once again that forest fires and floods will have a huge impact on society and the economy? I could also talk about permafrost. We know that housing is a huge problem for indigenous people. Climate change is making it even worse, because the ground is changing and thawing, degrading the structural integrity of homes. This means more repairs, which means higher costs. The federal government is totally incapable of providing housing on reserves. We know this because the Auditor General identified it as a major problem. Climate change has many consequences. I will give a final example. Obviously, I could spend my entire 10 minutes listing examples. Let us talk about erosion. Rising water levels are causing more and more shoreline erosion. There are companies in the Magdalen Islands that will literally fall into the water unless something is done. They need to be moved. Sometimes, an entire factory needs to be moved. That costs money.

If everyone could accept the premise that climate change exists, that would be a good start. We need to do something, to put a price on pollution in order to counter climate change. That is something the Conservatives were in agreement with barely two and a half years ago, during the 2021 campaign. Now, suddenly, they no longer agree. It is a shift that may have something to do with the populism of the current leader. They could at least agree that we need to do something using existing economic tools. There are tools that already exist, such as the carbon tax and Quebec's emissions cap-and-trade system.

Let us take it one step at a time. First, can we all agree that we need to do something using existing economic tools? Then there are the incentives and disincentives that can be created. The carbon tax is a disincentive, meaning it taxes polluters. The cap-and-trade system is an incentive, where emissions are exchanged between different stakeholders, particularly those with different types of economies. Let me take two minutes to explain how the cap-and-trade system between Quebec and California works. It works because it is easier for California to reduce GHG emissions. Industries in California have lower abatement costs. That is an economics term. It means that, for the same amount of money, it costs less to reduce GHGs in California than in Quebec.

I am disappointed that my colleague from Louis-Saint-Laurent cannot hear my speech today. I hope he is listening. It is not true that the cap-and-trade system is causing a flight of capital. All it means is that, if we believe in the need to reduce GHGs, it cost less to do so by investing that money in reducing GHGs in California than it would to reduce GHGs in Quebec. It is a quid pro quo. That is a basic economic principle. The economic tools are working. Quebec's GHG emission cap-and-trade system is working. GHG emissions are lower than expected in Quebec. Moreover, Quebec's economy has obviously not collapsed. It is working.

By moving this motion, the Conservatives were likely trying to spread disinformation again. That is a real problem. It prevents us from having a reasonable debate on reasonable issues like the carbon tax, which is an idea that should normally work. The Liberal Party has unfortunately mismanaged the issue, but the Conservatives are spreading outright disinformation, which is bad for the public. Instead of focusing on the tramway in Quebec City, why does the Leader of the Opposition not talk a bit more about what the carbon tax really is? Why does he not simply state the facts, the truth, about what the carbon tax actually does for people?

As a final point, I have a message for the public servants who were so reluctant to share these figures with the public. I believe the public servants when they say that they are working hard, that they want to do a good job when they go to work. However, they are caught between the Liberal Party, which does not necessarily believe in transparency, and the Conservative Party, which is spreading disinformation. Public servants need to remember that they do not work for the Liberal Party. They work for the public. Public servants work for Quebecers and Canadians. It is important that they grasp the important principle of transparency in a democracy and live according to that principle.

Privilege

• (1150)

Public servants who live in Quebec are lucky, because they have a third option, the responsible option. They can vote for the Bloc Québécois in the next election.

[*English*]

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the member spoke about misinformation that Conservatives were spreading and seemed to question why, but the answer to that question is quite obvious. The Leader of the Opposition likes to spread misinformation because he sees political opportunity from it, but what he cannot debate is the data that was released today. The data that was released today categorically shows that the price on pollution, the carbon tax, is now lowering emissions by 25 million tonnes per year and that eight out of 10 Canadians are better off as a result of the rebate that they receive as opposed to what they pay.

Would the member agree with that factual information?

[*Translation*]

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné: Madam Speaker, it is nice to get a question and an answer at the same time.

I am just going to qualify what my colleague said. Those figures are one of the reasons provided by Environment and Climate Change Canada. These figures should be taken with a grain of salt. Saying that 25 million tonnes of greenhouse gases will be prevented is just a projection. Projections are not necessarily facts. This kind of information needs to be taken with a grain of salt.

This applies to both sides of the House. On the one hand, the Conservatives should accept that the carbon tax has a cost associated with it, but that the benefits ultimately outweigh that cost. A simple cost-benefit analysis would demonstrate that.

On the other hand, the Liberal Party should not want to hide these numbers because it is afraid of how they might be interpreted, nor should it be claiming victory now, when only a few hours ago it did not want this information to be public.

• (1155)

[*English*]

Mr. Eric Melillo (Kenora, CPC): Madam Speaker, the member spoke a bit about contrasting the government's carbon tax with the cap-and-trade system and which is a more efficient policy. On this side of the House, Conservatives believe in technology and working with industry and innovators to help ensure that green technology and green alternatives can be improved to a point where they are more accessible, affordable and attainable for people across the country, including in northern and rural remote areas.

Would the member not agree that focusing on technology would be a more efficient way to find green alternatives than the current government's carbon tax approach that is just making everything more expensive and punishing people for heating their homes, putting gas in their tanks or just trying to feed their families?

[*Translation*]

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné: Madam Speaker, technology and green technologies are obviously the way of the future. That

said, how are these technologies going to be funded? The whole purpose of a carbon tax or a cap-and-trade system is to collect money to be able to fund these future technologies.

It is amazing to me that the Conservative Party talks about new technologies but does not realize that money is not going to fall from the sky to pay for them.

How do the Conservatives plan to do that, especially if they vote against progressive principles such as raising the capital gains tax? Where are they going to find that money?

[*English*]

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Madam Speaker, the government gave \$34 billion to the TMX pipeline, but what it does not talk about is that it is so over-budget that no oil company can use it because of the toll charges that have to be charged per barrel of oil. The Canada Energy Regulator had capped the toll charges at 22¢ on every dollar so that 78¢ was going to be paid by taxpayers. Now Liberals are saying they are going to increase it to just under 50¢ per dollar.

In what credible world is it that the taxpayers of Canada will have to pay at least 50¢ on every dollar to ship raw bitumen to the coast on behalf of companies that are making record profits? This is the biggest scam and subsidy that I have ever heard of in promoting the burning of our planet, and yet the Minister of Environment is going along with it. I wonder what the member thinks of this.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Nathalie Sinclair-Desgagné: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for the question because it gives me the opportunity to demonstrate how the Liberal government is like Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. On the one hand, it is acting in good faith, it is making amazing plans for the transition and it wants to tax carbon, but on the other hand, it is still giving tens of billions of dollars to the most polluting industry in Canada. That is a serious problem.

Is this greenwashing? We are not sure.

* * *

[*English*]

PRIVILEGE

RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Mike Morrice (Kitchener Centre, GP): Madam Speaker, I am rising to speak to the question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg Centre regarding the recent comments made by the hon. member for Saskatoon West.

I understand you are currently considering this. I would like to urge you to give this question strong consideration. While the member for Saskatoon West has appropriately apologized for his original statement, I believe the member for Winnipeg Centre has raised an important, unresolved issue with respect to how the record is modified in this place.

Specifically, when speaking of an indigenous person, the record was changed from “because of his racial background” to “regardless of his racial background.” This fundamentally alters the meaning of what was said. As the Speaker recently stated, “it is understood that the revisions should not alter the substance and the meaning of the members’ statements in this House.”

As the member for Winnipeg Centre has noted already, from time to time members seek unanimous consent of the House to correct the record. This was not the case here. It would seem to me that this would be an appropriate option that would actually follow the practices of the House. For this reason, I hope you give this question of privilege appropriate consideration.

• (1200)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I thank the hon. member for the additional information, and it certainly will be taken into consideration as we deliberate on this matter.

The hon. member for Winnipeg Centre is rising on a point of order.

Ms. Leah Gazan (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the member across the way for his intervention, as I have given. This is a very significant, serious matter in the House. The member for Saskatoon West has made similar comments in the past. However, I will not go into those comments.

It is important we have trust in the blues and have trust in Hansard, and that members cannot just alter the record to avoid accountability and responsibility, particularly when making blatantly racist comments in the House.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I thank the member for the additional information. Again, the hon. member’s comments will be taken into consideration as we deliberate on this matter and bring this matter back before the House with a response.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Timmins—James Bay.

* * *

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—GOVERNMENT’S ECONOMIC ANALYSIS ON CARBON PRICING

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am always proud to rise in this House and proud as well to share my time with the member for Vancouver East.

There are moments when I have a hard time justifying what people watch on television, when it comes to the House of Commons. Many of them think that our democracy is deteriorating into this ridiculous Punch and Judy show between the Liberals and Conservatives of refusing to deal with the issues at hand. Today is a really

Business of Supply

strong example of this, where the Conservatives have lit their hair on fire over an internal debate between the Parliamentary Budget Officer’s numbers and the government’s numbers over a report that we have access to.

There are so many things we could be taking the time to debate, like, for example, the issue of foreign interference, which everyone is concerned with, but we know that the Conservatives will not go to the foreign interference file because the leader, who lives in Stornoway, will not or cannot get security clearance. I have never imagined a situation where a would-be prime minister is unable or unwilling to actually know if there are threats to this country, because ignorance is not bliss in politics; it is dereliction of duty.

We could be talking about what is happening on the global stage with the frightening rise of the right in Europe and the threat that it poses to the defence of Ukraine as we see Putin’s war machine moving continually against the Ukrainian people, but we do not see the Conservatives wanting to stand up on that, and they have voted against Ukraine a number of times.

We could talk about the war crimes findings of the United Nations this week, which I find very disturbing. We find the UN has reported that Hamas’s crimes against civilians, sexual violence and kidnapping were extremely horrific on October 7, and of course we know that Hamas is a terrorist organization that has been widely condemned, and justly so. However, it is the findings on Israel in the UN reports that say that “The frequency, prevalence and severity of sexual and gender-based [violence]... against Palestinians” have become part of the normal “operating procedures” of the Israeli Security Forces. It is a frightening finding by the United Nations about a close ally of ours, that it is using widespread sexual violence against civilians.

The other finding that the UN raised serious concerns about is starvation as a method of warfare. The reality is, of course, that starvation is not a method of warfare. It is not a military aim; it is an attempt to destroy a people. When one cuts off food to children and families, they are trying to destroy a people, and that meets the test of genocide, yet the Conservatives do not want to talk about that.

Canada once had a bright light on the international stage on social justice. We are tiptoeing around the horrific violence being perpetrated against defenceless people in Palestine. The Conservatives will not speak about that, so they would rather we spend our time on this internal bickering about some numbers. The rest of the world is looking at Canada and saying, “Where are they? Where is their voice? Why are they not standing strong for the International Criminal Court and for justice, like so many of our allies, like our friends in Ireland who are not afraid to speak up?”

Business of Supply

We have come to one more day of a long-going battle between the climate-denying Conservatives, who believe that the burning of the planet by big oil should be made free, and the Liberals, who have continually failed to explain a credible plan for dealing with rising carbon emissions. The fact is that carbon emissions from the oil and gas sector have risen every single year. They continue to rise. They rise under the current government dramatically.

There is government talk about how carbon pricing, when I fill up at the gas station or when I travel, is having this great benefit. Canadians are paying their share, and Canadians are willing to do their share to deal with the climate crisis, but big oil has no intention. Then, we have industrial carbon pricing that allows planet burners, like Suncor, to pay one-fourteenth in comparison to what an average person would pay.

• (1205)

Canadians know that is not right. The real issue on carbon pricing with the government is that the Prime Minister went to COP26 and announced an emissions cap that he had not consulted with anybody about and he was going to put an emissions cap on big oil, but at the same time he put aside \$34 billion to build a pipeline for which there was no business case.

Compare that to the government's work on clean energy. How long has it been since the Deputy Prime Minister announced investment tax credits to kick-start our clean energy economy? We are still waiting. We are still waiting for justice in indigenous communities for housing. We get those promises. In my region, the Prime Minister wrote a letter to the Weeneebayko Area Health Authority saying the government supports getting rid of what is really an apartheid-era hospital, yet none of that has flowed. However, when it came to giving money to big oil, the taps turned on: \$34 billion.

What does that mean in terms of the credibility of carbon pricing? Right now, in the oil patch, they are talking about a year of record production. Imperial Oil is breaking production records. Why? It is thanks to TMX. Cenovus is going to increase from 800,000 barrels a day to 950,000 barrels a day. Heavy bitumen is going to increase 500,000 barrels a day, thanks to the free gift of taxpayers' money to an industry that has not been serious at any point about reducing emissions. We are going to have an increase of 500,000 barrels a day of raw bitumen, which has the highest greenhouse gas emissions of any fuel on the planet out of the oil and gas sector.

Taxpayers are expected to pay for that, but they are not just paying for that. The Trans Mountain pipeline is such a boondoggle that even super-rich companies like Suncor and Imperial and Cenovus could not run the bitumen through it, because it would be too expensive to pay for the toll fees. The toll fees are how we get the money back for the investment in the pipeline. As it stands now, 78¢ on every dollar is going to be paid by the Canadian people as a subsidy to companies that made \$68 billion in profit. The government is now saying that it is going to make it a little fairer. It wants the taxpayer to pay maybe 55¢ or 60¢ on every dollar. That is Liberal mathematics.

When the Liberals come out and say that the Prime Minister has a Haida tattoo and that the Prime Minister has said that Canada is back on the international stage, what they should have been saying

all along is that they were adamant that they were going to massively increase what is the dirtiest oil on the planet. That is not a personal statement. That is a fact. Bitumen has the highest GHG emissions in the world.

There is a reason the Liberals had to scramble to spend that money. Certainly we know from the IPCC and the warnings by António Guterres that we are beyond the red line now in terms of a climate catastrophe unfolding, and the United Nations has actually called out world leaders for "lying" about their promises on the international stage while massively increasing fossil fuel production at a time when the planet is on fire. That is what the UN said, but then the International Energy Agency, hardly a hangout for left-wing thought, has been warning consistently against putting more infrastructure into oil and gas because it will result in stranded assets. In fact, the IEA says we are seeing a massive glut that is going to appear in the next three years that will completely undermine the economics of oil and gas production. Since bitumen is the highest cost going, the government had to scramble with our money to expand that, so we could be locked in for decades to come.

Under Canada's scenario on oil production, Liberals expect that we will still be burning the same amount of bitumen in 2050 as we are today. They were never serious about dealing with the climate crisis. They were never serious about lowering emissions. They expect the ordinary taxpayers, who are more than willing to do their part to help the planet, to do that, and it is all on their shoulders, while the government is giving gifts to companies that made billions. This is what the government will be remembered for on the climate crisis.

• (1210)

Mr. Marc Dalton (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge, CPC): Madam Speaker, the OECD, which is the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, has projected that Canada will be among the worst of 40 advanced nations for the next three decades, that we are just going in a totally wrong direction.

There has been a war on Canadian industry, on the resource sector, which we hear time and again from the previous speaker. The NDP members are just supporting and are joined hand in hand and joined at the hip with the Liberals.

Does the member recognize that they have abandoned working-class Canadians?

Business of Supply

Mr. Charlie Angus: Madam Speaker, that was pretty hilarious. I feel like I am being stoned to death with popcorn, with the insincerity coming from my colleagues. Let us talk about the abandonment of working-class people, when the member for Kelowna—Lake Country was bragging about making carbon and pollution free while her city was on fire during a climate crisis.

Let us talk about how the member who lives in Stornoway, who has never actually had a job that we have been able to figure out, was flying up to Yukon to say that they are going to make pollution burning free while people were fleeing from their homes.

As for the working class, the working class has a right to sustainable living, sustainable jobs and a sustainable future for their children. The Conservatives would burn that in a second if they could, if it meant giving Suncor some more money.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the member started his speech today by talking about other things that we could have been talking about, other things that Conservatives could have brought forward in their opposition day motion. He acknowledged, and I think we all know, that this is just a reoccurring theme. Conservatives always want to talk about the same thing, about the price on pollution, and they want to continue to instill distrust in Canadians, when more than eight out of 10 get back more than they put in.

The reality is that we are seeing this time and time again with Conservatives. They are basing their information on misinformation to try to mislead Canadians. For two months, they sat silent on the capital gains tax, to only suddenly, two days ago, push the rage farm button to activate all the trolls to do all of their dirty work for them.

What does the member think about the position that the Leader of the Opposition has taken?

Mr. Charlie Angus: Madam Speaker, I feel like I am being asked to make commentary on something that was going on inside the member's head. I do not know really what the question was, but then I never quite do.

Let us talk about getting out more than what one puts in. Let us talk about Pathways Alliance and what they get out of Canada with putting less in. That is the question, I think, we should be asking the Liberals. Why do they continue to give Pathways Alliance such a free pass, when it is making \$68 billion in profits and it has made it clear that it has no intention of lessening its emissions unless we pay for it? It wants us to pay 70% of the costs of this carbon capture scheme, which even it admits does not work. That is it. We put in a lot more and we get out a lot less from those guys.

• (1215)

[Translation]

Mr. Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ): Madam Speaker, we saw in the motion that the Liberals seemed to be trying to prevent the release of the report. Earlier, we heard the Minister of Environment and Climate Change say that he had stopped subsidizing oil when in fact he continues to subsidize the oil companies in all manner of ways, including the pipeline and so-called carbon capture.

What does my colleague make of this doublespeak?

Mr. Charlie Angus: Madam Speaker, it is clear that the Liberal government has no credibility when it comes to subsidies for the oil companies. Let us not forget that the public investment in developing the Trans Mountain pipeline was enormous. There were a lot of subsidies for helping with the expansion and the development of the oil companies, which led to an increase in GHG emissions in Alberta, without any plan to lower them.

The question is: what about the GHG target? Mr. Trudeau made a promise, but where is the plan?

[English]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): We cannot use other members' names, as the hon. member knows.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Vancouver East.

Ms. Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Madam Speaker, it is an honour for me to rise in this House to enter into this debate. However, I must say that the debate before us is really a colossal waste of the House of Commons resources and the valuable time that we have in this chamber to debate urgent issues and situations.

Why do I say that? The motion the Conservatives tabled is effectively calling for the government to table a set of data by June 17, 2024. What we do know is that the government did table a set of data. In fact, the Liberals tabled it today, albeit they should have made the information available right from the outset and should have been transparent with it. Notwithstanding that, that information is now before us. It begs the question why we are here debating a motion that is, frankly, not relevant anymore. It has already been addressed.

In the meantime, what is happening in our communities? We have a situation in our communities, which is a housing crisis from coast to coast to coast. In fact, just today, I tabled a private member's bill to call on the government to use a human rights-based lens in addressing the housing crisis, something that the Liberals say they will honour under the National Housing Strategy Act. However, in reality, we know that is not being done. In fact, there are encampments all across the country where people cannot access the housing they need, adequate housing that they need.

My private member's bill calls for the government to incorporate into the National Housing Strategy Act provisions that would disallow decampment on federal lands and to work collaboratively with other orders of government, other levels of government, to properly address the housing crisis. That is perhaps what we should be doing: focusing on how we can truly address the housing crisis, instead of having the Conservatives putting forward motions that are moot and have been made irrelevant already.

Business of Supply

I would also say that we have a situation with the immigration system, where there are a lot of issues. The government decided that it would bring in a cap on international students very suddenly, impacting international students who are now caught out in a very bad way. They would not be able to renew their work permit or their study permit because of the cap. Some of them are being exploited and taken advantage of.

I just got an email from someone who told me that they were advised to go and marry someone, engage in marriage fraud, in order to find a path to stay here in Canada. That is not the path forward. We know that international students are struggling. They contribute, by the way, to Canada's economy, to our economic, social, cultural and educational communities. They should be valued instead of being blamed for the housing crisis that both the Liberals and the Conservatives have caused.

It was the Conservatives who cancelled Canada's national co-op housing program in 1992. It was the Conservative leader who sat at the table and saw the Harper government lose 800,000 units of affordable housing for Canadians. Then it was the Liberals, in 1993, following the Conservatives, who cancelled the national affordable housing program. They also added to the loss of affordable housing in our communities.

● (1220)

Therefore, instead of talking about a motion that is no longer relevant, we should be talking about how we are going to earnestly address the housing crisis, how we are going to ensure that those who are unhoused can live in dignity and how we can ensure that Canada will not only build more housing faster, but also build the kind of housing that Canadians can afford and can live in with dignity. We should be talking about how we should not allow decampment to take place, to further displace people who are unhoused in our communities, to marginalize them and to further put them at greater risks.

If we want to, and we should, talk about the climate crisis, we should not talk about how we can enable the climate crisis to further escalate. I do not know if the Conservatives are blind to the fact that we have a climate crisis. They cannot continue to stick their heads in the sand and to deny this reality. In my community, in British Columbia, we had a weather-related crisis that happened in the heat wave that killed over 600 people. We had a fire that burned down an entire town, a flood that followed and a mudslide that continued to further escalate the climate crisis. We cannot pretend that this is not happening and that somehow the carbon tax is to blame.

Let us just be clear about who is to blame and what action we need to take. Big oil needs to take responsibility, and those companies need to be held to account. The government, the Liberals, refuse to take the action that is necessary to deal with the climate crisis. The Liberals refuse to ensure that big oil pays its fair share. The Liberals refuse to stop subsidizing the oil and gas industry. Why are they doing that when the oil and gas industry is actually making record profit. It is to the detriment of everyday Canadians, to our collective detriment.

When the earth is burning, and it literally is with the wildfires and the forest fires that are taking place, we cannot just sit in the House and blame the carbon tax. What planet are we from? If we

continue to go down this track, we are not going to address the climate crisis, which is desperately in need of action. We should be saying to Suncor that we are sorry, but it has made over \$2.8 billion in the fourth quarter of 2023, and enough is enough; we are going to make sure that we stop the subsidies for the oil and gas industry and that the industry is made to do its part to address the climate crisis.

Madam Speaker, let me say this. We also have a responsibility in the international community to address the climate crisis because there are more people being displaced as a result of weather-related situations. Therefore, we have a collective responsibility to do what is right. There are many issues we need to debate, and debate seriously, but not a motion to which the very data that the Conservatives want has already been tabled. With that, I welcome questions.

● (1225)

Mrs. Tracy Gray (Kelowna—Lake Country, CPC): Madam Speaker, I know that housing is important to the member, and she spoke about it during her intervention. At the housing committee, just a few hours ago, we heard that higher capital gains taxes will have a negative effect on home building. This was a statement made by the chief economist of Canada's largest construction association.

Why would the member, along with the rest of her NDP colleagues, continue to prop up the Liberal government and vote, just yesterday, for tax increases that would hurt home building in Canada during a crisis of home affordability?

Ms. Jenny Kwan: Madam Speaker, let us be very clear about the housing crisis and what has caused it. Successive Liberal governments and Conservative governments have helped to create the housing crisis we are in by allowing for the financialization of housing and for big developers to use renovations to displace people so that they lose their homes.

Under the Conservatives, we already know that Canada has lost more than 800,000 units of housing. The Conservative leader called community housing “Soviet-style” housing. That is shameful.

The government could address the housing crisis by building housing that Canadians need and can afford.

Mr. Chad Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I agree with my colleague that today's motion is nonsensical. It is just a regurgitation of the motions we have seen over the last number of months when we could be and should be debating more important issues, like housing and the environment.

The Leader of the Opposition was in Hamilton recently as part of his “make Canada great again tour”. He made no reference to, or had no ideas about, how to get out of the housing crisis. He provided no plan as it relates to combatting climate change.

I wonder if the member can speak to why it is so important that we provide options and alternatives for Canadians as it relates to those two very important issues.

Ms. Jenny Kwan: Madam Speaker, the truth is that Conservatives are only focused on slogans. They somehow think that the slogan “axe the tax” will actually fix the housing crisis. It will not.

What we need, to address the housing crisis, is for Canada to be, at the very minimum, on par with the G7 countries with respect to our community housing stock. Right now, at 3.5%, it is less than half of where they are. We will not address the housing crisis if we continue to go down this track. Significant investments need to be made. The kind of housing that needs to be built is the kind that Canadians can afford. That is at the core of the issue.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Desilets (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, BQ): Madam Speaker, I would like to ask my colleague, who is quite worked up today, what she thinks about the motion before us.

It is basically a request for information, so I find it rather odd that we are spending a full day debating it. What does my colleague think?

• (1230)

[*English*]

Ms. Jenny Kwan: Madam Speaker, today's debate on this motion is an entire waste of time for members of Parliament and a waste of the resources required to keep the House running, because the information the Conservatives say that they want has already been tabled. It makes the entire motion completely irrelevant to this debate today.

Ms. Leah Gazan (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the member for Vancouver East, who is a tremendous advocate. I would have to say that I agree with her that this is a totally irrelevant motion because the information has already been tabled. I find that it is another opportunity for Conservatives to axe the facts, including the fact that we are in a climate emergency. Their party is still arguing about whether the world is round or flat.

I wonder if the member could speak specifically to how the climate emergency is impacting the folks who are currently unsheltered. I know the Conservative leader talks a lot about tent cities, which he regularly demeans. I wonder if she could comment on that.

Ms. Jenny Kwan: Madam Speaker, first of all, I want to thank my colleague for her tremendous advocacy and for using a human rights-based lens with respect to everything she does.

On addressing the situation of the housing crisis and how climate relates to it, people are being displaced. We had a heat wave in my community of Vancouver East, in British Columbia, and 600 people died. There are people who are unhoused or are living in tent cities because they do not have access to adequate—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Resuming debate, the hon. member for Louis-Saint-Laurent.

Business of Supply

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Madam Speaker, I will be sharing my time with my colleague from Calgary Rocky Ridge.

I am very pleased to participate in this debate, and I thank my colleagues.

We are gathered here today because Canadians have a right to know, and it is our duty, as the official opposition, to hold the government to account. We want to know the real impact that the Liberal carbon tax is having on Canadians' wallets and on the Canadian economy.

We are holding this debate today to get to the bottom of things, so that people can form an opinion based on the facts, facts that the government wanted to hide.

The government did not just want to hide this information from the public. We are holding this debate today because of what the Parliamentary Budget Officer said about his requests.

I would remind the House that, last week in committee, my colleague from Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia—Headingley questioned the Parliamentary Budget Officer.

[*English*]

My colleague from Manitoba had a very good conversation with the PBO a few days ago in the committee.

[*Translation*]

I will summarize the exchange that took place at the Standing Committee on Finance.

My colleague said, “Mr. Giroux, in your earlier testimony, you said that you understood that the government had economic analysis on the carbon tax that it has not released. Are you saying that the government has not been transparent with the analysis it has?”

The Parliamentary Budget Officer replied, “I mentioned that the government has economic analysis on the impact of the carbon tax itself and the OBPS, the output-based pricing system. We've seen that—staff in my office—but we've been told explicitly not to disclose it and reference it.”

That last bit is important. That is what the Parliamentary Budget Officer told the committee.

My colleague from Manitoba went on, “The government has given you their analysis, but they have put a gag on you, basically, saying you can't talk about it.” The PBO replied, “That is my understanding.”

A government is muzzling the Parliamentary Budget Officer. If that is not keeping an iron grip on information to conceal matters that directly affect Canadians, I do not know what is.

Business of Supply

That is why we deliberately moved this motion to hold this debate and force the government to do what it did not want to do. It wanted to hide information. The government even told the Parliamentary Budget Officer to shut up. That is what it said. The government told the Parliamentary Budget Officer not to reference it.

Unfortunately, this brings back very sad memories of a time long ago when one Quebec politician could tell another to shut up. Sadly, we are seeing the same thing happening again today, in 2024, under this Liberal government.

What did we find out next? This morning, just a few minutes before the House started, the government stated that it had released the documents in question. What does this partial documentation tell us? The news for Canadians is very bad. It says in black and white that the carbon tax's true impact on the economy is minus \$30.5 billion until 2030.

If I were in government, I might not be very proud of these numbers either, but numbers and facts are stubborn. We Conservatives have been pushing for months to get the real numbers. We are adding even more pressure with today's debate. With a bit of theatrics, the government tabled the documents a few minutes before the House began sitting.

As the Leader of the Opposition said, painting a somewhat graphic and rather gross picture, it was as painful for them as having a tooth pulled, and for good reason, because the tooth was rotten.

Canada's gross domestic product, or GDP, will drop by \$30.5 billion by 2030. That is the real effect of the Liberal carbon tax. This was not the first time the Parliamentary Budget Officer highlighted the fact that the carbon tax is going to cost Canadians a lot of money, much more than the government claimed when it said it was going to put the money back into their pockets.

It is pretty amazing. These people keep telling us that there is a price on pollution but they are putting money back into people's pockets.

That is because they collect the money, take out a little bit and put the rest back in the taxpayers' pockets. Do they think people are stupid?

• (1235)

In any case, I can say one thing: Canada's mayors did not find it funny. A few days ago, the Prime Minister was invited to the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, or FCM. Once again, he repeated his famous line about Canadians getting more money back than they pay. Canada's mayors did not find it funny and started heckling him.

The Prime Minister responded, "Ha ha". That was his response. His arrogance is unfortunate. It is insulting to Canadians.

On May 5, in an interview on CTV's *Power Play*, the Parliamentary Budget Officer had this to say:

[English]

"A vast majority of people will be worse off under a carbon pricing regime than without, and we don't expect that to change."

[Translation]

In the same interview, he went on to say the following:

[English]

"The overall conclusions that the vast majority of households are worse off with the carbon pricing regime than without, that I'm confident will still remain. That is based on our own preliminary analysis but also on discussion we've had on discussions with government officials and also stakeholders."

[Translation]

This is not the first time the Parliamentary Budget Officer has said that the Liberal carbon tax is having a negative impact on taxpayers' wallets. He costed the negative impact on the Canadian economy and estimates that Canada's GDP will take a \$30.5-billion hit by 2030.

Earlier a minister tabled a series of documents and I asked him some questions about those documents. It reminded me that there is another document that I have been trying to table in the House for months, specifically the report presented to COP28 in December entitled "Climate Change Performance Index 2024". It shows the results of 67 countries around the world and their actual effectiveness in the fight against climate change. Where does Canada rank after nine years under the Liberal government? On a list of 67 countries, after nine years of a Liberal government, Canada's Liberal effectiveness, as analyzed by scientists around the world, ranks 62nd out of 67 countries. Meanwhile, the Liberals are lecturing everyone else. They say that we are not nice, but they are good. They are so good that Canada ranks 62nd after nine years of this government's management. For months I have been calling for this document to be tabled. The Liberals keep refusing. That is not nice.

What did the minister say in answer to my question about that? He said that the member, referring to me, knows very well that oil development in Alberta is hurting our track record. The cat is out of the bag. That is the minister's problem. In his ideal world, there would be no more oil anywhere. I do not know what planet he is living on, but that is not the reality. Perhaps his ultimate dream is to completely shut down Canada's oil industry, but what will happen if we do that? Oil development will happen elsewhere. Shutting down Canada's industry tomorrow morning will not change much. That is the problem. We need oil.

I am a Quebecker and I keep an eye on what is happening in my province. According to HEC Montréal's numbers, last year, Quebeckers consumed 19 billion litres of oil, which represents an increase of 7%. That is not good news or bad news, it is a fact. The numbers are there. Everyone can draw their own conclusions.

Business of Supply

If oil production in Canada were to be shut down tomorrow morning, other places would produce it. Who stands to gain if the Liberal government's dream, the minister's dream, comes true? Unfortunately, the Canadian economy does not figure heavily in the minister's dreams. The planet does not stand to gain, but Qatar, Saudi Arabia and other countries do. That is the big problem with Liberal dogmatism, in contrast to the Conservatives' pragmatism.

When the Liberals say that the carbon tax will reduce emissions, that is not true. What it will reduce is the amount of money in taxpayers' pockets. The Canadian economy will suffer because of this.

• (1240)

[*English*]

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Madam Speaker, on the last point that the member made, he is factually incorrect. He has said that there will be no impact in terms of reduction of GHG emissions. However, the data that the Conservatives begged and pleaded for to be released, data they claimed there was a gag order for it not to be released, the data that the member now has in his hands shows that the total reduction so far in GHG emissions is 80 million tonnes and projected to be 25 million tonnes per year. Therefore, for the member to get up in the House moments ago and completely disregard the data that his party begged to get for weeks, which he now has in his hands, is complete misinformation and false.

Mr. Gérard Deltell: Madam Speaker, it is very sad to hear the member say that. The truth is that the real impact on the economy is terrible, minus \$30.5 billion until 2030. There will be a direct impact on family households of \$1,800. If everything were perfect with the Liberal carbon tax, we may have seen the real impact of it. However, based on the evaluation made, not by the Conservative Party, the Fraser Institute or L'institut économique de Montréal but by the United Nations, especially scientists around the world, after nine years of the government, Canada is 62 out of 67. I am sorry folks, but it does not work.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Madam Speaker, I was very interested in what my colleague had to say. He even made a historical reference to Maurice Duplessis, which is always nice. That is kind of like what he experienced this morning, is it not? By providing the data, it is almost as though the government told the Conservatives to zip it.

Now, here we are talking about this motion. Ever since this morning, people have been talking about whatever they please. We are not making much progress, but at least I can ask my colleague from the Quebec City region a fairly relevant question.

What does he think of his leader's assertion that he will not invest a penny in the Quebec City tramway?

Mr. Gérard Deltell: Madam Speaker, indeed, I do enjoy referencing history. Why not reference history again, but this time, very, very recent history?

Our leader is speaking to various media outlets and made a stop at Radio-Canada. We in the Conservative Party are consistent and logical. Allow me to quote what our leader said in an interview this morning: The tramway, no, busses, yes. Some of the bus proposals

would work really well, and I would be open to those kinds of proposals. The City of Quebec and the greater Quebec City area will get their fair share of federal investments.

[*English*]

Ms. Lisa Marie Barron (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Madam Speaker, we are debating a motion put forward by the axe-the-facts Conservatives, which is beside the point at this time. However, I am never going to lose an opportunity to ask the Conservatives why they are continuing to prop up and protect the profits of big oil and gas at a time when we need to be lowering our greenhouse gas emissions.

If the member does not want to listen to me, perhaps he will listen to Amara Possian from Canada team lead, 350.org. She says:

It's criminal that oil and gas companies are raking in record profits while the rest of us struggle. People across Canada are facing a worsening housing crisis, skyrocketing bills, and climate-driven disasters that threaten our health, homes, and communities. It's time for the government to stand with the majority of the public, who support taxing Big Oil's excess profits tax. If our leaders make polluters pay their fair share, we can fund the bold climate action this moment demands.

What does the member say to this person who is advocating for change?

• (1245)

Mr. Gérard Deltell: Madam Speaker, I would ask the member where she was three days ago when the six top guns of the petroleum industry appeared at the environment committee, "top guns" meaning CEOs. I do not want to insult anybody. The key people were at committee, thanks to the Conservatives inviting them, and we asked questions of the those people running the oil and gas industry in Canada.

The Conservatives asked questions about reducing emissions, investing in protections for our environment and in new technologies to ensure we reduce emissions, which is, by the way, the first pillar of our policy on the environment and climate change. We want to reduce emissions by investing in new technologies with fiscal incentives. We want to shine the light on green energy. We want to give all the advantages of our natural resources to Canadians. We want to work hand in hand with first nations.

This is where we stand when we talk about the future of our country based on climate change challenges.

Mr. Pat Kelly (Calgary Rocky Ridge, CPC): Madam Speaker, today's motion is one for the production of documents, arising from the refusal of the government to allow the PBO to release information he had seen that supported the conclusions he had drawn, and that is that the overwhelming majority of Canadians are worse off under the carbon tax when the economic impacts of the carbon tax are taken into effect. This was the latest in the series over time of the carbon tax cover-up.

Business of Supply

I think the Liberal member for Whitby thought he had a gotcha moment at committee with the PBO, that he would get the PBO to admit that when we took into account the economic impacts, that somehow the carbon tax was not harmful to Canadians. That was when the PBO, who was having none of it, revealed he had seen the government's data and that this data had supported his conclusions.

When the member for Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia—Headingley asked the PBO if we could we see this information, the PBO affirmed at committee that he had been gagged. The government was preventing an officer of Parliament from releasing the government's own data.

This is the latest in a pattern that the government has exhibited for nine years now of secrecy, of secrecy by default, of obfuscation and of cover-up, and we have seen this over and over again in a whole series of files. I would like to remind the members of the Liberal caucus who were elected in 2015 that they went door-to-door with their “Real Change Open and Transparent Government” platform. They took it to Canadians in 2015 and said:

It is time to shine more light on government and ensure that it remains focused on the people it is meant to serve. Government and its information should be open by default. Data paid for by Canadians belongs to Canadians. We will restore trust in our democracy, and that begins with trusting Canadians.

What a sick joke after nine years of secrecy, cover-up and an absolute contempt for Canadians and their access to information. In my time here, I have spent quite a bit of time on the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics and have studied access to information a couple of times. It is appalling the level of secrecy the government continues to insist on.

We saw this with the Winnipeg labs, when the Liberals spent years suppressing information. They actually named the former Speaker of the House in a lawsuit. They went that far as to sue the former Speaker to stop the release of documents, in contempt of Parliament. Kicking and screaming in that episode, they eventually tabled a document and then sought the extraordinary credit for their supposed commitment to access to information.

We have seen this in the ATIP system, which I have also studied at both the defence committee and access to information, privacy and ethics committee. The government, when it was elected, brought in an access to information bill that it claimed was in furtherance of that election promise, which I read earlier. The Information Commissioner of the day said that it was a step backward, that the Liberals actually proactively changed the law to make access to information worse in our country.

Here we are on the morning of an opposition day, where the Conservatives have put forward a production order to ensure that Canadians can get the truth about the government's own information it possesses, as it misleadingly tells Canadians that the carbon tax is somehow good for them, and the Liberals dumped the documents literally moments before the opposition leader moved our opposition motion and spoke to it. Again, in debate, the government wants extraordinary credit, “Why are we debating this motion? We gave them this information.”

• (1250)

Of course, the Liberals gave the information, but only because the motion was on notice and was going to be debated, possibly

even supported, by the House, and, if it were supported by the House, it would have held them in contempt if they were to not comply with a production order. That is the MO of the government. It has the idea that it can suppress and hold on to information and conceal the cost of the carbon tax from Canadians.

The document dump we had right before the motion began to be debated in the House revealed that, yes, the carbon tax is a significant drain on GDP. The carbon tax makes Canadians poorer. We are in a moment when Canada has the lowest GDP growth per capita in the G7. It is not growth at all. It is negative growth. It is shrinking. The per capita GDP in Canada is shrinking. Canadians are getting poorer. This is not an opinion of mine. This is a fact. This is per capita GDP. The wealth of the country, divided by its people, is shrinking. That is Canada in 2024, and we need to get off that track.

The carbon tax is not helping. It is a drain on GDP. This is a crisis of our economy, wherein the OECD predicts, in the decades to come, that Canada will be at the bottom of its peer countries. The carbon tax contributes to this. The carbon tax harms the economy and makes Canadians poorer. We know it. The PBO has said this. The data that the government has released supports the PBO's conclusions. The PBO was clear that this data would support his conclusions when he testified before the finance committee a couple of weeks ago.

There are enormous problems facing this country, some of which have been raised by members of all sides in this debate so far today. We have a housing crisis. We have a crisis in the Canadian Armed Forces in recruitment and retention, and in non-availability of equipment and munitions. All of these things are going to require a strong economy. We need a growing economy where people are getting wealthier, not poorer, where people will be able to afford to buy a decent home in a safe neighbourhood, and where we will have the financial and economic capacity to fund a health care system that people can depend upon.

We need a strong economy to be able to fund the desperately needed upgrades and enhancements to our national defence and our armed forces. All of these things are threatened by the government's lack of care for the state of our economy. Liberals are insisting that the carbon tax system that they have created is somehow good for Canadians, even though it is suppressing GDP and making Canadians poorer. They are determined to stick to this, despite the officer of Parliament who told us otherwise.

Business of Supply

For a government that claimed and campaigned to be the most open and transparent in Canadian history, in what scenario would an officer of Parliament have to resort to an ATIP to get information from the government, that they would have to formally file an ATIP and, just like other journalists, politicians, researchers and academics, be denied their ATIP?

This morning, the government wants extraordinary credit for the documents it dumped. I took a quick look at the CBC story that came out about this. The CBC's ATIP has not even been complied with. The full disclosure has not been made, yet the government is claiming that it is some sort of hero of openness because, faced with a production order being debated and voted on in this chamber, it came out minutes ahead of it with a document dump. The cover-up continues. The culture of cover-up continues, and it needs to stop.

• (1255)

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Madam Speaker, that member just quoted the CBC. He better be careful, or he might get kicked out of his caucus. Conservatives can say whatever they want about being pro-life, but that member had better be very careful, or he might get himself kicked out of caucus for quoting the CBC.

I find it fascinating how he is willing to accept, in the data that was released this morning, the GDP information, but he will not accept the fact that it categorically proves that eight out of 10 Canadians are better off and that the carbon tax has reduced emissions by 80 million tonnes of GHG emissions to date. If he accepts the GDP information, he has to accept the other information. More importantly, when he does talk about GDP, the one thing the document does not have any data on is the cost of doing nothing.

The cost of doing nothing is greater than that \$30 billion in GDP that the member references. The cost of doing nothing is about \$35 billion in 2030. Why will that member not talk about the cost of doing nothing? Is it not just because the Conservatives do not want to do anything?

Mr. Pat Kelly: Madam Speaker, the member is continuing to mislead people about what the report says and what the carbon tax does to Canadians. This whole discussion is about the economic impact of the carbon tax, and eight out of 10 Canadians are not better off when we measure the economic impact. They are poorer. The GDP reduction proves that this is harmful to the economy, and the PBO has been clear all along that the economic cost of the carbon tax does not make Canadians wealthier.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Desilets (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, BQ): Madam Speaker, the Conservatives just will not stop talking about the carbon tax. In their own way, they are tearing it apart. However, a lot of economists say that this measure will help reduce GHG emissions.

Can the Conservatives be even a tiny bit positive or constructive and tell us how, without a carbon tax, they would reduce greenhouse gases? All I am asking for is a teeny tiny practical example of what they would do to reduce greenhouse gases.

[*English*]

Mr. Pat Kelly: Madam Speaker, my colleague, our shadow minister of environment, talked about that in his speech, but I want to say to my colleague from the Bloc that his colleagues seemed to think that this motion is unworthy of debate or concern in the House. Do they think that it is okay for the Government of Canada to ignore requests for information with impunity, to gag the Parliamentary Budget Officer and to promise to Canadians openness and transparency but deliver secrecy, obfuscation and cover-ups?

• (1300)

Ms. Lisa Marie Barron (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Madam Speaker, I cannot help but think about how incredibly short-sighted it is for us to be talking about the economic impacts on Canadians today without looking at the costs of us doing nothing, as was brought up by my colleague. We know that the climate crisis has incredible economic costs. We know that the economic cost is likely to reduce national GDP by \$25 billion by 2025. That is equivalent to \$630 per person in lost income, with people earning low incomes being affected the most. We know this. Also, fighting increasingly destructive wildfires costs \$1 billion a year, and these costs will only continue to rise.

Does the member agree that the costs of the climate crisis need to be prioritized and that we cannot ignore that the climate crisis is happening as we speak?

Mr. Pat Kelly: Madam Speaker, I do not accept the premise of the member. It seems to be implied that the carbon tax is somehow making a significant impact on climate change. We heard from the member for Louis-Saint-Laurent earlier that Canada ranks very poorly in its performance on emissions, so I do not accept the premise that the carbon tax is a solution to the problems that she has outlined.

I would also say to her and her colleagues that there was a time when NDP members were actually quite serious about transparency in government and about the functioning of Parliament. They seem to have abandoned that while they support the Liberals, who will suppress information from an officer of Parliament and refuse to disclose information that is the property of Canadians.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Madam Speaker, everything we heard from the member for Calgary Rocky Ridge was quite literally false. Let us just recap what has happened to get us to where we are today.

Conservatives have been asking for data, not a report. It is not as though they were asking for some secret report that the government had that the PBO wanted to see. What they are asking for is data, and they not asking for anything that is really compiled in a way that is presentable. They were asking for Excel spreadsheets, and not even that.

Business of Supply

Notwithstanding the fact that the member for Calgary Rocky Ridge, amongst others, will go on about how Liberals are being secretive and not supplying information, this is exactly what we have done. I am sorry if it was not in a timely fashion to suit their needs.

I will be sharing my time with the member for Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill.

Notwithstanding the fact it does not suit their needs at this particular time, they received the data. I heard the member for Calgary Rocky Ridge get up to talk about the data and how the data says it is going to affect our GDP. Just so Canadians who are watching can fully understand the impact of this, we are talking about a GDP that was previously projected at \$2.68 trillion now being projected at \$2.66 trillion. That is what we are talking about.

That is what the member for Calgary Rocky Ridge is basing his entire premise on, on the data. If he is willing to accept the data as it relates to GDP, notwithstanding the fact that he has not even begun to consider the cost of climate change, as pointed out to him by me and an NDP colleague, then he must also accept the data, which was produced for Conservatives today, that clearly says that eight out of 10 Canadians are better off as a result of the rebate they receive and that the carbon tax has contributed to 80 million tonnes of GHG emission reductions to date, which is projected to continue and exceed 25 million tonnes per year.

That is the truth. Conservatives asked for the data. Conservatives got the data. Conservatives, such as the member for Calgary Rocky Ridge, are now using the data, and specifying it as fact, and quoting CBC articles as fact. Then they have to, by any reasonable logic, also be able to accept the data as it relates to what the impact is on Canadians, how much money they get back, and what the overall impact is of the carbon tax.

It is a bad day for Conservatives. The reality is that they have now found themselves in a position where they just do not know what to do. They got proof this morning that people are better off. They got proof this morning that the carbon tax is actually reducing GHG emissions. They are fumbling around, trying to talk about people that are being prevented from getting the information they were requesting.

The Conservatives are just trying to divert and figure out what their next strategy is. Their strategy has always been the same. The strategy has been built on tapping into the fears and anxieties of Canadians and trying to put the blame on the federal government. Their strategy has been very clear on the carbon tax. It is a communications success, from my perspective.

They have done a really good job at communicating a false narrative to Canadians. That false narrative being that the carbon tax does not work and it affects everybody in a negative way. They have done a good job. I will give them that.

We have done a bad job on communicating how good the policy is. The reality is that we could have done a better job. However, I prefer to be on the side of good policy and bad communication rather than literally telling people falsehoods to try to capitalize off them for political gain, which is exactly what Conservatives are doing. They are doing it again.

The Leader of the Opposition barely spoke about the motion this morning. He decided to talk about capital gains. Here is another perfect example of how Conservatives are attempting to mislead Canadians. For two months, we told Canadians, Conservatives and the House that we would be introducing legislation to bring in a capital gains increase for people who are making over \$250,000. Conservatives were silent on it. They were—

● (1305)

Some hon. members: Where's the bill?

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: I will get to the bill in a second.

Madam Speaker, the Conservatives were silent on it. They did not say a word about it. The Liberals tried to get them to comment on it, and they would not do it. All of a sudden, at 1:30 p.m. two days ago, the Leader of the Opposition came out to speak. He had more Conservatives than normal sitting behind him. He gave this speech about how this was going to be a tax-killing initiative that would wipe everybody out and spoke all about how the Conservatives were against it.

At the same time, the Conservatives blasted all over social media. This is the reality of the situation. After two months of silence, they pushed the rage-farm button that activated all their trolls, who started blasting emails to everybody about it. When I challenged the Conservative members today on that and asked why they waited two months, the response I got was that the bill had not been introduced. Do they actually think that a single Canadian believes that the Conservatives would silence themselves until a bill was introduced?

The Conservatives do nothing but rail on about misinformation. If they saw an ounce of political opportunity, they would pounce on it like a drop of blood in the ocean with sharks swimming around it. That is the reality of the situation. The Conservatives are all about feeding a false narrative to Canadians so that they can tap into fears and anxiety. They are now attempting to do, with the capital gains tax, exactly what they did with the carbon tax.

For those who are just tuning in, when do they think this discussion about the carbon tax started to pop up in our national discussion? Most people probably think it was sometime last fall or maybe at the end of the summer. That is funny because we have had a price on pollution, a carbon tax, since 2018. Does anybody find it interesting that no Conservative said much about it before? Does anybody find it interesting that every single Conservative who sits on that side of the House ran on pricing pollution? They all ran on the concept of it in 2021.

A number of Conservative members will get up to say they did not run on that and that was their former leader. That is for them to sort out with their leaders, in terms of which parts of the policy they are not willing to stand on. I guess that explains a lot about why certain Conservatives are getting up and talking about being pro-choice and how they want to reintroduce a debate about abortion. That is what we are seeing come from Conservatives now. If they actually believe—

• (1310)

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

Mr. Charlie Angus: Madam Speaker, I think it is very unfair for the member to make a habit of this, when we know that there are certain members missing from the backbench who have been put in the doghouse permanently for speaking of abortion.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, I take the bait from the member for Timmins—James Bay a lot easier than he takes it from me. However, I would agree. It is very interesting that somebody has gone into hiding or has been put in protective custody, and that is the member for Peace River—Westlock, who is suddenly missing in action ever since he made his comments about all Conservatives being pro-life.

In any event, with the tax on capital gains, we find ourselves back at the same place as we did before with the carbon tax. Conservatives are deliberately spreading misinformation for the purpose of creating anxiety and fear. Conservatives have no interest in helping anybody other than the one per cent, other than their rich buddies. They do not care about the impacts.

The Conservatives do not realize or they do not want to accept the fact that the data they begged and pleaded for, the data that was released to them today, shows that eight out of 10 Canadians are better off, that the carbon price is actually working and that it has contributed to reducing GHG emissions. Although there is a portion that talks about the gross domestic product impact, they are not even starting to consider the fact that doing nothing is going to cost a lot more, as the minister indicated today.

Mr. Dan Mazier (Dauphin—Swan River—Neepawa, CPC): Madam Speaker, I really liked the theatrics from the member opposite. I am really confused, though. He made several statements about misinformation. He talked about how the documents proved that greenhouse gas emissions were actually reduced. The member can agree with me on that one. However, I am quite confused here, because we asked an Order Paper question back in November: “[D]oes the government measure the annual amount of emissions directly reduced from the federal carbon price...?” I do not even know how the member would know this. The response was that the “government does not measure the annual amount of emissions that are directly reduced by the federal carbon pricing.” I will repeat that in case the member did not get it. It says the “government does not measure the annual amount of emissions that are directly reduced by the federal carbon pricing”, more affectionately known as the carbon tax.

Can the member respond to that?

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, this is exactly what I was talking about when I said that the Conservatives will mislead and create false narratives. I said very clearly in the beginning that what they were asking for was not a report. This was not a report that was produced with a glossy cover and everything. This is the data. These are literally the Excel spreadsheets that have the data on them. Was that information compiled from those data sheets up until this point? Apparently, according to the member, it was not.

Business of Supply

However, if he were to actually take the data that is in there and look at it, he should come to that conclusion.

If the member is willing to accept the fact that GDP is affected by this, then he also needs to accept the fact that the data shows that eight out of 10 Canadians are better off and that greenhouse gas emissions have reduced by 80 million tonnes to date.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ): Madam Speaker, it seems that the Conservatives moved this motion because the Liberals wanted to censor the report. Now the report has been released.

The Liberals keep saying that they have stopped funding oil, although they continue to fund oil companies in many ways, from building pipelines to subsidizing new carbon capture processes.

Could my colleague comment on the fact that the Liberals keep saying they will stop subsidizing oil but, in fact, they are still funding oil companies?

• (1315)

[*English*]

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, the member said that a report was tabled. Once again, this is not a report. This is data. It is literally data sheets, Excel spreadsheets.

The member asked a question about funding big oil. We do not have fossil fuel subsidies anymore. We do have initiatives to help with things like carbon capture. Do I think that carbon capture is the long-term solution? Absolutely not. Do I support the idea of carbon capture in the interim? I know how much fossil fuel we need and depend on right now; if there is an interim solution to get us to another place, then I support carbon capture.

However, I reject the premise of the question. It suggests that we are continuing to subsidize the fossil fuel industry, but we are not. We phased it out earlier than in the original timeline we had.

Ms. Lisa Marie Barron (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Madam Speaker, since the axe-the-facts Conservatives have brought forward another motion that is moot at this point, I am going to ask the member another question that is very important to constituents in my riding, particularly around the greener homes program. We know the greener homes program was—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I have to interrupt the hon. member. I have a point of order from the hon. member for the Dauphin—Swan River—Neepawa.

Mr. Dan Mazier: Madam Speaker, we are debating a motion. Just on a point of relevance, the member admitted that she is not going to ask a question related to the motion.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): That has been pretty much the norm since I have been sitting in this Chair.

The hon. member for Nanaimo—Ladysmith.

Business of Supply

Ms. Lisa Marie Barron: Madam Speaker, it is really challenging to speak to a motion that is moot at this point. Related to the motion, and more important to my constituents, is the greener homes program. It was abruptly cancelled, leaving out many people who were relying on this program to build more resilient homes, to adapt to the climate emergency and to save money. We have seen small businesses in my riding of Nanaimo—Ladysmith having to lay off staff members as a result of the abrupt end to this program.

Could the member share with constituents in my riding why there was an abrupt closure of this program, although inefficient? What are the Liberals going to do to help people across Canada to build more efficient homes?

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, I do not have the answer to that question. When we debate the budget bill, I would be happy to get an answer specifically to give to the member.

However, I will agree with the member on one thing. She started her question by saying that we could have been talking about a lot of other things. I found it really interesting that the member for Calgary Rocky Ridge basically said the same thing. Meanwhile, Conservatives have only been talking about the carbon tax in every opposition motion they have moved since this Parliament began.

Ms. Leah Taylor Roy (Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have been listening to this with great amusement, as well as to the members' references as to why we have not actually been addressing the motion. As the member opposite said, the motion is actually quite irrelevant at this point. I want to talk a bit about what the Conservatives have been doing recently in terms of actually wasting the time and resources of the House; the current motion is another example of that.

I sit on the environment committee, and we repeatedly get these motions from the Conservative Party asking to produce this, to produce that and to produce all the information on the model. I am not quite sure what they do with the information when we produce it. However, it is incredibly costly for the government to produce all these documents, in both official languages, solely to be used for political purposes.

The Conservatives talk about the price on pollution program. First, they spread misinformation in calling it a carbon tax. We know that it is a levy. As reaffirmed today by the parliamentary budget office, the rebate associated with the levy benefits eight out of 10 households across the country. However, the Conservatives repeat time and time again that it is impacting affordability for Canadians. The Conservatives like to scare people and say it is part of the problem and not the solution. They never, ever talk about the real problem that we are facing with climate change.

Liberals know there is an affordability issue. We have been working very hard to introduce measures to help Canadians with the affordability crisis, which was largely the result of the postpandemic economy combined with supply chain disruptions from the war in Ukraine and the war in the Middle East. We acknowledge that there is an affordability crisis, and we have been addressing it. However, the Conservatives vote against every program we introduce to address the affordability crisis. They then introduce scare tactics and motions that say the price on pollution program is the problem, and it is causing all the problems in Canada.

Well, I have said it before and I will say it again: The Conservatives not only need lessons in basic math, but they also need lessons in causality and correlation. Just because things happen at the same time does not mean they are caused by the same thing. The Conservatives do this over and over again. We can look at the price on pollution program, and we can see that when the carbon levy was increased, inflation came down. Do the Conservatives ever discuss that? How do they explain that if, in fact, it is the price on pollution that is causing inflation?

We can look beyond our borders to other countries and see that inflation has been worse in those countries. Some do not have the same kind of price on pollution program we have; they have different programs to address climate change. How does that work, if the price on pollution program is causing inflation and our affordability crisis? Is our price on pollution program here in Canada causing global inflation? Are we that powerful? Does it make that big a difference? I do not think so, and I do not think the Conservatives think that either. I think that they believe it is to their political advantage to continue to say that this is what is causing the problem.

However, let us look at this in terms of what it is doing. Once again, today, the parliamentary budget office reconfirmed that eight out of 10 Canadian households receive more back in the carbon rebate than they pay through the levy. The only households that may not do better through this program, for which it does not address affordability, are those making over \$250,000 a year; yesterday, we heard the Leader of the Opposition say the same households were the poor, the ones who needed help. The Leader of the Opposition was arguing that households that realized capital gains of over \$250,000 a year somehow needed a tax break. I do not know where the Conservatives have been looking at Canadians and Canadians' wages and their livings, but those people I know who realize capital gains of more than \$250,000 a year or who make more than \$250,000 a year are generally not the ones lining up at food banks. They are generally not the ones having problems paying for dental care or child care.

• (1320)

When we talk about the Canadians whom the government is helping, we are talking about the Canadians who do need help, not the wealthy and the corporate elites who are making more than \$250,000 a year, either in earned income or in capital gains. For the people who earn less than \$250,000 a year, who have capital gains of less than \$250,000 a year or who perhaps do not have a corporation they are putting their income into at a lower tax rate so they do not pay the normal earned income tax rate, the programs we have put in place over the past year, and I would say since 2015, have benefited them.

The price on pollution will not only address the affordability crisis; it also addresses the climate crisis. Unlike those of us who agree that there is an affordability crisis and a climate crisis, it seems that many members on the opposite side, in fact some of the members who sit on the environment committee with me, do not acknowledge there is a climate crisis.

Some of the questions that are asked in committee and some of the witnesses that they bring are so astounding that I want to fall off my chair. Some of the other witnesses who know the science, know the facts, actually look like they are going to have a problem in committee, and I worry about them because of some of the things that are being said.

We need to have a government whose members all understand that the climate crisis is real and that not taking action is not a possibility; it is not an option. We have to take action, and we know from experts around the world, from experience in other countries and from experience here in Canada, in British Columbia, that a price on pollution program works. In fact, we have been told again that 30% of the reduction in emissions we are putting out will be from the price on pollution program. We have already seen the reduction in carbon emissions due to the price on pollution program, and the data has been presented again and again.

All the Conservatives can do to address that is to say, "Let's see every detail of the model." In fact, they wanted a spreadsheet. The modelling that is used to look at what the economy would do under a price on pollution scenario or without a price on pollution scenario is so complex and so great that we were told that a mainframe would have to be brought in. The data could not be given to the Conservatives, and they could not start to analyze it themselves.

Nonetheless, they demanded that from ECCC, which has a lot of very important work to do on things like the biodiversity legislation that is being advanced to protect 30% of Canada's nature, and the really important work to do in helping Canadians adapt to climate change. That work is being supplanted by producing more and more documents, in both official languages, and that is irresponsible. For members of the House, a party, to be trying to set us back in that way is completely irresponsible.

I hope that Canadians listening to the debate today will understand that yet another Conservative motion means time being used in the House of Commons, time being used in committee, and time when we would be asking departments to produce documents so the Conservatives can nitpick and try to find little things that they think are not exactly correct. They do this rather than listening to 300 experts from around the world and rather than looking at the science, the facts and the data to see the evidence that not only is there a climate crisis but also that a price on pollution program will help address that crisis and benefit their constituents as well as mine.

We need to support Canadians through the affordability crisis, and we need to support Canadians now and in the future by fighting the climate crisis. That is exactly what our government is doing, and I really wish the Conservatives would get on board and move forward instead of moving backwards.

Business of Supply

• (1325)

Mr. Glen Motz (Medicine Hat—Cardston—Warner, CPC): Madam Speaker, I listened to the member's speech with amusement, and it brings several questions to mind. First, can the member tell us how much carbon tax she pays on her mansion in Cohasset, Massachusetts? How much capital gains has she paid on the flipping of multiple properties in the Cape Cod area? Did the Liberal luxury tax apply to her—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I would ask the hon. member to stick to questions of Canadian policy.

Mr. Glen Motz: Madam Speaker, it is about policy. It is about the Liberal policy.

Did the Liberal luxury tax apply to your million-dollar yacht? It is pretty hypocritical that you talk about the carbon—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I do not talk about any such stuff. The hon. member is speaking to the member directly and not through the Chair.

Mr. Glen Motz: Madam Speaker, it is pretty hypocritical that the member talks about the carbon tax and the climate emergency, and yet we realize that her husband made his fortune from the oil and gas industry.

Does the member have any comments on that?

Ms. Leah Taylor Roy: Madam Speaker, sure I do. I do not own a mansion in Cohasset, and we have never flipped properties in Cape Cod.

When we were in the energy business, we were one of the most efficient providers of energy in the region, through what was called cogeneration, which was one of the most efficient ways to provide energy. This was in the 1990s before renewable energy sources. Yes, I worked in the industry. I am aware of the industry. I actually have a background in it as well as a degree in finance.

If you would like to talk about my personal life, I can tell you a lot—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): No, I would not.

The hon. member for Timmins—James Bay is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Madam Speaker, it is important, for the record, that the member just accused the Speaker of asking questions about her personal life. I do not think the Speaker is interested in questions like that.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Precisely, which is why I rose. I thank the hon. member for Timmins—James Bay.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Winnipeg Centre.

Business of Supply

Ms. Leah Gazan (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Madam Speaker, we know, even in the banter back and forth in the House, how serious Conservatives and Liberals are about the climate emergency. I am wondering how my hon. colleague feels about her government's buying a pipeline that is costing over \$30 billion. I know that there is banter about who cares about climate more. Many of the Conservatives are climate denialists, are axing the facts and are still debating whether the world is flat.

I would ask what my hon. colleague thinks about her government's buying a pipeline.

• (1330)

Ms. Leah Taylor Roy: Madam Speaker, I agree that the Conservatives are still arguing about whether the world is flat and whether climate change exists. We clearly know it does, and we are taking steps to transition our economy from an oil and gas economy to an economy based on green energy. That transition takes time. We have put in many policies and programs, from electric vehicles to clean energy, capping methane and capping emissions in the oil and gas industry, which is working towards that.

We know that currently Canadians and others around the world are using oil and gas. Our objective is to transition as quickly as possible and continue to move forward to fight climate change.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ): Madam Speaker, as everyone knows, the Liberals say they have stopped subsidizing oil, but they continue to do so indirectly.

They are subsidizing big oil through the pipeline project, as well as through all the subsidies to help carbon capture and, basically, to help make tar sands oil cleaner.

Does my colleague think that oil companies really need these tax credits? Will this not just lead to even more greenhouse gases?

[*English*]

Ms. Leah Taylor Roy: Madam Speaker, there has been a lot of debate around the subject. In fact, the environment committee right now is talking about sustainable finance, the transition and categorizing investments as transition or green.

As I said earlier, we are an economy in transition. Oil and gas has been a major part of our economy. Anything oil and gas companies can do now to reduce emissions helps us reach our goals. Ultimately we want zero emissions. We want a cap on emissions and to get to net zero in every sector of our economy. That is what we are working toward, but there is a transition period and CCUS is part of that transition.

Mr. Michael Kram (Regina—Wascana, CPC): Madam Speaker, I will start by saying that I will be sharing my time today with the hon. member for Portage—Lisgar.

I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak in favour today of a very reasonable motion that I believe members of Parliament from all parties should support, moved today by the leader of the official opposition.

When making any major decision, it is important to weigh the costs and the benefits. That is true in the private sector, true in life

in general and especially true for politicians when we are deciding on government policy. That includes environmental policy, and the Liberals' carbon tax, their hallmark policy meant to address global warming and climate change, should be no exception.

When the Liberals introduced their carbon tax in 2019, it was set at \$20 per tonne of CO₂ equivalents, a little over 4¢ on a litre of gas. Since then, the Liberals have increased the carbon tax every year so that it now stands at \$80 per tonne, about 18¢ per litre. The Liberals say that they will continue to increase the carbon tax every year for the rest of the decade until it reaches \$170 per tonne, about 40¢ on a litre of gas.

To look at it another way, if the gas tank of a typical car holds about 50 litres of gas, that means that in 2030, the average Canadian will pay an extra \$20 on a tank of gas each and every time he or she fills up the car at the gas station.

However, the carbon tax applies to so much more than just filling up one's tank with gas. It applies to home heating. It applies to heating of commercial businesses. It applies to heating of schools, hospitals and municipal buildings. It applies to farmers who have to heat their barns and dry their grain, which is why the Conservatives have been advocating for the passage of Bill C-234 to exempt farmers' grain drying and barn heating from the carbon tax so that these costs would not be passed on to consumers.

In fact last winter, Environment and Climate Change Canada was even going so far as to contact pizzeria and bagel shop owners about their wood-burning ovens, to see whether they should be subject to the carbon tax. Fortunately, it did not go through with the measure, but it shows just how wide-ranging and sweeping the Liberals' carbon tax has been on every aspect of Canadians' lives.

It seemed perfectly reasonable that, last April, the Parliamentary Budget Officer requested from Environment and Climate Change Canada its internal analysis of the economic impacts of the carbon tax. When Environment and Climate Change Canada responded last month, there was one sentence in the reply letter that was very troubling. It read, "The data the Department is providing contains unpublished information. As such, I request you to ensure that this information is used for your office's internal purposes only and is not published or further distributed".

I see no good reason for the government's analysis of the economic impacts of the carbon tax to be withheld from members of Parliament or from Canadians at large. If we as elected officials are responsible for making the best decisions possible for Canadians, if we are responsible for weighing the costs and the benefits of the policy, then it makes no sense for the costing analysis to be withheld.

Business of Supply

This morning, because of today's motion, the Liberal government released at least part of the information. We now know, according to the government, that the carbon tax is costing the Canadian economy \$20 billion per year, roughly \$1,200 per household. I have to say that it is extremely frustrating that a government that once claimed to be transparent by default is still playing games and blocking access to important information.

Now that I have outlined some of the costs of the carbon tax, I think that it is fair for Canadians to ask, "What are the benefits?" The stated objective of the carbon tax is to prevent global warming and climate change, so this question has to be asked: "By how many degrees Celsius has global warming decreased as a result of Canada's carbon tax?" That question is fundamental to the whole issue. Is it half a degree Celsius? Is it 0.1°C? Is it 0.01°C? Canadians deserve to know what we are getting for that extra \$20 on a tank of gas.

• (1335)

I would like to read a quote from the government's report entitled "How Pollution Pricing Reduces Emissions", which was referred to in the department's response to the Parliamentary Budget Officer. The first line of the report reads, "Every day, we see the increasing impacts of climate change and they're costing Canadians more and more."

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Order, please.

The member for Timmins—James Bay is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Madam Speaker, I would sincerely like to apologize. I was just so gobsmacked by the idiocy—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The apology is accepted.

The hon. member for Dauphin—Swan River—Neepawa has the floor.

Mr. Dan Mazier: Madam Speaker, I wonder what he was apologizing for. Was it for insulting my colleague or not?

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I accepted the apology, and we are done.

The hon. member for Regina—Wascana has the floor.

Mr. Michael Kram: Madam Speaker, let me reiterate the quote from the department's report. It reads, "Every day, we see the increasing impacts of climate change". Right off the bat, one has to infer that the carbon tax must not be working very well if the department's own report is telling us that every day, we are seeing increasing impacts of climate change.

The report continues, "A price on pollution is widely recognized as the most efficient means to reduce the greenhouse gas emissions that are contributing to the more intense wildfires, droughts, and floods caused by climate change." That is fair enough. If that is the position the government wants to take, then that is fine. All we are asking on this side of the House is if the government could please

show its work, all of its work, not just what the minister grudgingly released this morning.

It should not take a full day of parliamentary debate to drag the government, kicking and screaming, into being transparent. The report mentions wildfires, so that raises this question: how many fewer wildfires have we had as a result of the carbon tax? The report also mentions droughts. How many fewer droughts have we had as a result of the carbon tax? The report mentions floods. How many fewer floods have we had as a result of the carbon tax? I do not know the answer to these questions, but I strongly suspect that the effect of Canada's carbon tax on all of these things is infinitesimally insignificant.

However, if Environment and Climate Change Canada has done some analysis and some studies to shed light on these subjects, I, as a member of Parliament, would certainly like to read them, without having to resort to a full day of parliamentary debate.

It is very reasonable for Canadians to ask if there is a better way. I believe there is: technology, not taxes. Canada has tremendous potential for the development and application of new environmentally friendly technologies. At the environment committee, experts shared research with committee members about the benefits of irrigation and how increased agriculture production can sequester more carbon out of the atmosphere with improved irrigation.

In the southeast corner of my home province of Saskatchewan, there is a major carbon capture and storage facility at a coal-burning power plant, which allows for the existing infrastructure to remain in place while storing carbon under the ground instead of releasing it into the air. In northern Saskatchewan, there are massive reserves of uranium, which can be used in nuclear reactors to generate electricity without any emissions.

However, if we are going to plot the best way forward and make good public policy decisions, then we need to have good information on which to base our decisions. That means the government must be transparent by default, as it promised to do years ago. Therefore, I support the motion that would require the government to produce all of these relevant documents.

• (1340)

Mr. Dan Mazier (Dauphin—Swan River—Neepawa, CPC): Madam Speaker, I know there was some harassment going on by the NDP, but I came to the member's defence. It was a wonderful speech.

Business of Supply

There has been a statement made around here all morning about getting facts out, and the Liberals are now claiming they can prove that they have supplied the documents showing that emissions are actually being reduced by the carbon tax. Meanwhile, we have an answer. We asked a direct question of the government, of the environment minister. We asked, “does the government measure the annual amount of emissions that are directly reduced from...carbon pricing”, carbon levy, or whatever they want to call it. “Carbon tax” is what we more affectionately call it. Here is their answer, and I think the Speaker would find this very interesting: “the government does not measure the annual amount of emissions that are directly reduced by federal carbon pricing.”

How does the math work? How does the science work? What is the rationale of any Canadian expecting that this carbon tax would have any impact on reducing emissions?

Mr. Michael Kram: Madam Speaker, I enjoy working with my hon. colleague on the environment committee.

I think it is important for people to understand that today's debate is about just one small piece of the puzzle we are trying to put together. We have requested some particular documents, and the government grudgingly provided them this morning, but this is a regular occurrence at the environment committee. We are constantly asking the minister and the department to show their work, to show how the carbon tax has been increasing and to show what effect it is having on emissions. They keep stonewalling. We can never seem to get a straight answer out of the government, and it is extremely frustrating for members of Parliament who are trying to do their jobs.

• (1345)

Ms. Leah Taylor Roy (Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the member opposite made a speech that referred to the fact that we have not seen an immediate impact from the price on pollution program. He mentioned that he and his colleague, who asked the other question, are both on the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development.

I was wondering if perhaps the member could explain a little to us about his knowledge of how we got to this climate crisis, how long it took for the inventory to build up and what the impacts of climate change are. I am sure that he has done a lot of reading about this issue, since he is on the environment committee. I would really be interested to hear his perspective on why he believes that a crisis that took decades to build, with emissions that Canada, as well as the rest of the world, has been putting into the air, would be solved in a matter of years.

Mr. Michael Kram: Madam Speaker, I never said that I believed that the carbon tax would solve this problem in a matter of years. It seems that this argument has been very strongly implied by the Liberals on the other side of the House. What Conservatives have been saying for years is that man-made CO₂ emissions have been happening for a couple of centuries now. This is a very long-term problem that should be solved with long-term solutions, in particular the development and the application of new technologies. However, what the Liberals have been doing over the last few years is increasing the carbon tax, year after year, and I think it is very reasonable for Canadians to ask what they are getting for all of the pain and suffering.

Ms. Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Madam Speaker, the Conservatives say that they want to support Canadians on the question around affordability of oil and gas, yet the Conservatives voted against the NDP's motion to take the GST off home heating. Why?

Mr. Michael Kram: Madam Speaker, I cannot recall the particulars of that particular motion, but I think it is safe to say that Conservatives are in favour of making life more affordable for Canadians. That includes reducing and eliminating the carbon tax and not jacking up the capital gains tax, as the government announced earlier this week.

Mr. Branden Leslie (Portage—Lisgar, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is a privilege to rise today. I thought I would start with a bit of a recap as to how we got to this place

I am a proud member of the environment committee, one of the few on our side that brings a heavy dose of common sense and rationality to a committee that is generally full of activists who care more about reducing emissions at all costs than about economic growth.

We have, for months, been pushing to have the Liberal government release the economic and emissions reduction modelling to the committee and to Canadians. We have been stonewalled. On occasion, we have been able to make breakthroughs with our opposition partners. However, at the end of the day, the government has provided us with nothing that we have asked for.

In fact, as it relates to today's motion, I happened to have a meeting with the PBO's office just hours after he appeared at the finance committee to discuss the change in the data that he was using for his economic modelling. The Liberal government was freaking out about a so-called mistake, but the reality was that their data aligned completely with the government's. In fact, it was a secret, hidden report that had been handed over to the PBO, but he was gagged. He was not allowed to hand over that Excel document that showed, on a province-by-province, sector-by-sector basis, what the financial implications to the Canadian economy were.

Therefore, we move forward to today, when we are bringing forward this important motion. The Liberal government decided that today is the day. I do not think, without today's motion, that it was going to release this dataset that we have long been asking for. This dataset is raw data. It is not convoluted, watered down and confused by Liberal talking points. It shows, just as we have been saying, that the carbon tax is severely inhibiting our economic growth and is making Canadians poorer.

The PBO has repeatedly stated that he is confident in the analysis, which they have presented in the most recent report, that shows that Canadians are worse off under the carbon tax, because it aligns with this document. We have been proven right today by the government finally relinquishing this data.

It is absurd on so many levels. I have only been here just under a year and have seen the culture of secrecy and the hiding of any pieces of information that do not fit the narrative of the Liberal government. Its hypocrisy knows no bounds. Let us recall that this was the government that was going to be “open by default”. It was going to usher in this new era of transparency in government. It was going to do things differently.

However, time and time again, it has failed to live up to that, and in fact, it is getting worse. It seems as though every time there is a new scandal or a new cover-up, Liberals say, “Hold my beer. I have a better one.” Then today, the Liberals come out and want credit as heroes for releasing the information, which was gathered and put together by taxpayer-funded bureaucrats, that shows that our economy is in fact worse off under their policy. They have the gall to come out and say, “Look at us. We are transparent”, but it is only because Conservatives brought forward today's motion.

The report's data shows that over \$25 billion of our economic GDP will be lost by 2030 under the Liberal plan. Of course, this does not include all of the other job-killing, radical policy ideas that the Liberal government has cooked up over the past nine years, which have destroyed economic growth in Canada. Our GDP per capita has declined in four consecutive quarters, and Statistics Canada just revealed that Canada's unemployment rate has also increased. In fact, for jobs to keep up with the population growth, Canada would have needed an additional 33,000 jobs in May, and we came nowhere near it. Meanwhile, the United States created 272,000 jobs within its economy, and our economy continues to fall behind.

There are warning signs all over the place, as long as people are willing to not stick their heads in the ground and ignore them. It is obvious that Canadians are struggling and that our economy is sluggish, if growing at all. This is according to the Statistic Canada and the International Monetary Fund reports that show just how perilous our falling GDP per capita numbers and problems truly are.

We are experiencing the worst per person income drop in the G7 over the last five years. The Americans' GDP per person has grown by more than 8% since 2019, while we have fallen. If we compare ourselves on a state-by-state basis, Canada ranks among the poorest states, including places like Alabama.

Simply put, our economy is vastly underperforming our greatest competitor, our greatest neighbour, but most importantly, our most integrated trading partner. I wish I could show the chart that shows that growth here in the House because it truly is staggering, and it is not surprising to see when that separation of GDP per person began.

• (1350)

If our economy had simply grown at the average rate, Canadians would be \$4,200 richer than the costly coalition has left them. I think I and all of my colleagues know this, but my friends know this too. They recognize that, despite having good jobs, they are struggling. They are certainly not saving. They are simply falling behind. It is one of the steepest falls in the standard of living in the history of our country.

Business of Supply

We are in a cost of living crisis. We can look at the cost of groceries. I assume all of us go to the grocery store; we see the same thing. We can put ourselves in the shoes of people who are trying to support a family and understand the challenges that they are going through when they are choosing products, whether they are healthy or not, for their children in the grocery store each and every week. The Liberal-NDP government's record deficits have driven interest rates sky-high.

The dream of home ownership is simply dead for so many Canadians. Canadians are struggling to stay afloat. What do the Prime Minister and his coalition partners do? They give us a 23% carbon tax hike. That is the anvil the Liberals are going to throw Canadians; they can sink or swim, and good luck to them. Of course, there are the increases on the prices of gas, groceries, home heating and everything else. It all adds up. Millions of people in this country are using food banks each and every month. It is hardly the country that many of us recognize and certainly not the one I grew up in.

In what crazy world does it make sense to raise taxes, yet again, on our job creators, on our students, on our families and on our seniors? There is a growing, and rightfully so, groundswell of support to scrap the carbon tax once and for all. It comes from provincial Liberals, provincial NDP members, provincial Conservatives and the federal Conservatives. We all recognize, as Canadians do, that a 23% carbon tax hike at a time of economic stagnation and, for many, devastation, simply makes no sense. It lacks common sense.

Let us not forget that, as it relates to the carbon tax, there are over 130 first nations in Ontario taking the Prime Minister and the government to court over that carbon tax.

It is obvious that, in this chamber, we are the only party that will axe the tax, and, after the next carbon tax election, I cannot wait for us to fulfill that promise. Every day, in the meantime, I am hearing from constituents. I think all of my colleagues undoubtedly are. If members opposite are willing to say that their constituents are not saying that they are frustrated, that they are tired, that they are feeling poorer and that they are divided, I simply do not believe them.

The government needs to focus on job creation and growth, putting criminals behind bars and reducing the wasteful government spending that is driving up the debt in this nation and keeping our interest rates higher for longer. The reality is it has never been clearer, at least to me and I think to most Canadians, that we are in desperate need of a new government. Canada has had the worst growth in the G7, the worst in Canada's history since the Great Depression. Housing costs have doubled, rising faster than in any other G7 nation. About 76% of youth believe they will never own a home, and millions of people are going to food banks.

Statements by Members

The government has been sabotaging our economy by taxing farmers during a food crisis, by taxing home builders during a housing crisis, by taxing doctors away from our country during a health care crisis, and by taxing small businesses, the backbone of our economy, and our job creators, during an economic growth crisis.

In fact, it was recently reported that over 120,000 people have left this country. They emigrated to the United States, because they saw a better opportunity there. They saw a government that respects individual freedom and respects their ability to drive prosperity for themselves, their families and their communities. I hate to say it, but right now it seems tough to be a proud Canadian.

However, I am not giving up. I am a proud Canadian. It was not like this nine years ago, and it will not be like this after the carbon tax election, because it is time to bring home the Canada we remember, the Canada we recognize, the Canada we want and the Canada we deserve.

• (1355)

Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I think it is very important to clarify something for the people at home. When we talk about requesting data from the government, we are not talking about hypersensitive data or national state secrets. We are talking about bits and bytes. We are basically talking about computer code. It is not even an Excel spreadsheet, as the member for Kingston and the Islands has said.

The headline in the *Globe* about an hour ago was, “Household wealth jumps to record on stock rally”. We have record household wealth and we have a price on carbon, and we know the Conservatives love correlations.

What does the member have to say about that correlation?

Mr. Branden Leslie: Madam Speaker, first, in reference to the comments of my colleague, the chair of our committee, regarding data, the file that was given to the PBO was an Excel document. At that committee, we have been frustrated time and time again by a level of secrecy that is unheard of and a desire to hide every piece of evidence that does not fit with Liberal priorities.

My colleague is right. There are people who have become a heck of a lot richer in this country. Their friends, the Liberal insiders, have got richer while the people across this country who are working hard and playing by the rules are the ones who are suffering each and every day. That is who we are going to fight for on this side of the aisle.

Ms. Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Madam Speaker, Conservatives, of course, say that they are against the carbon tax. Last week, the NDP called on the big oil CEOs at committee to answer to Canadians for their corporate greed. Those CEOs told the committee that they support carbon pricing.

The Conservatives spend so much time defending the oil and gas industry, so why are they fighting against a policy that even the CEOs say is good for Canada?

• (1400)

Mr. Branden Leslie: Madam Speaker, I am happy to fight against crazy, radical policy ideas that will diminish our economic

growth in this country. The fact is that the NDP view wealth creation as a bad thing and jobs as a bad thing, but I will stand up against that proudly every day in this chamber.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

SENATOR JOSEPH DAY

Mr. Wayne Long (Saint John—Rothesay, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is an honour to rise today to recognize one of southern New Brunswick's best: Senator Joseph Day. Joe grew up in Hampton, New Brunswick. He attended CMR in Saint-Jean and then went on to RMC, where he graduated in engineering. He then pursued law at Queen's University and a master's degree at Osgoode Hall Law School. Joe spent his entire career largely in law, which included roles at JDI, as chair of the New Brunswick Forest Products Commission, and in the practice of intellectual property law.

In 2001, Joe got the call to serve in the Senate. For 19 years, Senator Day proudly represented New Brunswick. Always working with all sides in a strong commitment to southern New Brunswick, Joe led positive change at every level.

I am proud to have called him a friend, as I know many in the House did. To Joe's family and friends, in particular his wife Georgie and his children Emilie and Fraser, I want to extend deepest condolences on behalf of everyone in the House of Commons.

* * *

BILL C-41

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, Liberal government incompetence is undermining the ability of Canadian development organizations to support the world's most vulnerable people. Afghanistan and other terrorist-controlled areas in the world are often among the poorest. Canadian tax dollars go to large UN-affiliated multilateral organizations present in these areas, but private Canadian organizations are generally barred from working in the same areas.

Recognizing this problem, MPs from all parties came together more than a year ago to negotiate, amend and then adopt Bill C-41. It was not perfect, but the bill created an authorization regime to allow private organizations to go to work in these hard-hit areas. We understood the urgency of getting assistance to Afghanistan before another winter.

Statements by Members

Unbelievably, the Liberals have failed to implement the bill for over a year. There are no authorizations and no applications, and there is no help. What a disgrace. The bill had a one-year review deadline, but after a year there is literally nothing to review. This probably will not make the headlines, but people on the other side of the world will die because Liberal government incompetence blocked private development assistance from getting to them.

* * *

MAYOR OF MISSISSAUGA

Mr. Peter Fonseca (Mississauga East—Cooksville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let the House of Commons congratulate Carolyn Parrish as our newly elected Mayor of Mississauga. Mayor Parrish's election is a testament to her unwavering dedication, passion and tireless efforts to serve our community. Throughout Mayor Parrish's career, she has demonstrated deep commitment to the people of Mississauga, always striving to improve the lives of residents and make our city a better place for everyone. Mayor Parrish's vision for Mississauga is one that resonates with all of us: a city that is inclusive, innovative and forward-thinking. We have seen her dedication in action, from her advocacy for housing to her efforts in fostering community engagement and addressing the needs of all citizens.

Our Mississauga colleagues and I look forward to our continued collaboration as we build an even brighter future for Mississauga. We are excited to see all that we can accomplish together and the positive impact that Mayor Parrish and council will make on our great city.

Congratulations once again to Mayor Carolyn Parrish.

* * *

[*Translation*]

YANNICK LE MOUËL

Ms. Christine Normandin (Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to highlight the successes of an outstanding homegrown athlete. An athletics enthusiast from a very young age, Yannick Le Mouël has racked up a whole host of titles, including world champion in the 60-metre hurdles, which he won at the 2023 masters championship in Torun.

Just as important as his individual achievements, if not more so, are his involvement in the community and the way he spreads his love of sport. He shares his enthusiasm with Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu athletes aged seven to 78, whom he coaches on a regular basis. He mentors young hopefuls at École secondaire du Triolet and the Université de Sherbrooke. Finally, he supports children with multiple disabilities at École Marie-Rivier and organizes Olympic games for them.

Despite his busy schedule, Mr. Le Mouël still finds time to train and will be taking part in the Pan-American Masters Games in Cleveland in July and the world championships in Gothenburg, Sweden, in August.

I wish Mr. Le Mouël every success in his upcoming competitions.

• (1405)

[*English*]

LONG-TERM CARE

Mrs. Marie-France Lalonde (Orléans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure of rising to acknowledge the vital role long-term care institutions hold in our communities and to recognize the incredible leaders, staff and families who support the thousands of Canadians who live in long-term care homes.

[*Translation*]

I had the privilege of working in the retirement home sector for over 20 years, and I saw at first hand the remarkable work that caregivers do to ensure residents receive quality care and have a good quality of life.

[*English*]

It is my hope that one day soon we will be able to mark June 13 as national long-term care day in Canada.

I especially thank the Canadian Association for Long-Term Care for its important work, advocacy and its support as we begin the process of creating a national long-term care day in Canada.

* * *

SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. Philip Lawrence (Northumberland—Peterborough South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years of the NDP-Liberal government, business owners across the country are facing unprecedented challenges, including the most anti-business government seen in a generation. The good news is that it was not like this before the Prime Minister, and it will not be like it after.

The Conservatives recognize what small business owners are, economic heroes. They start with a dream, a dream to make their communities a little better by sharing their gift with the world. To start their businesses, they often risk everything, putting their life savings, even their family home, up for grabs. They will work 60, 70, even 80 hours a week, all just to turn around and do it all over again. When times are tough like now, they will often do without so that their employees do not have to.

Canada will emerge from our lost decade of nearly zero GDP per capita growth and Canada will again become a land of prosperity, as Conservatives recognize business owners for what they are, our economic heroes.

* * *

2024 SUMMER OLYMPICS

Mr. Maninder Sidhu (Brampton East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as you may be aware, the 2024 summer Olympics are next month in Paris. Our Team Canada athletes are a beacon of inspiration for our country, and they bring us so much pride and unity.

Statements by Members

This year, I want to recognize some of our very talented athletes from Brampton who have shown excellence in sports while representing Canada, athletes like Michael Ciepiela, who competed in last year's Santiago games in rowing; Scarlett Delgado, a champion boxer; Khamica Bingham, a 100-metre sprinter. Who can forget Brampton native Cassie Campbell, a two-time gold medallist and first female athlete to be inducted into Canada's Sports Hall of Fame. Their dedication and hard work have made our community proud.

I know we are all looking forward to watching our incredible athletes from across Canada compete in the Paris Olympics. Please join me in wishing all our Team Canada athletes the best of luck.

Go Canada, go.

* * *

PERFORMING ARTS

Hon. Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Vancouver has a vibrant and innovative cultural scene known for its firsts in Canada.

Ballet BC ranks number three in North America. The VSO, the Vancouver Symphony Orchestra, featured students playing solos and complex pieces alongside the professional orchestra on the Day of Music last weekend, with five free venues across the city. Now they plan to merge performances of dance, symphony and opera to excite and titillate.

Whether it is student dancers from Arts Umbrella on stage with Ballet BC or Bard on the Beach bringing Shakespeare in modern pop format to audiences, whatever the performing art, Vancouver is bringing a growing awareness of the arts to young and diverse viewers.

We have full houses for live performances in my city. Vancouver is no hick town, colleagues. It rocks the Canadian art scene.

* * *

[Translation]

THIRD LINK

Mr. Jacques Gourde (Lévis—Lotbinière, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the tramway would cost every family in the greater Quebec City area \$28,000. The cost of this \$11-billion expense is absolutely supported by the Bloc. This is another example among many, including the \$500 billion in centralist and inflationary spending for a massive Liberal government in Ottawa. The Bloc Québécois is not a party for the regions and it supports the war on cars with this Prime Minister ignoring the real needs of Canadians.

The leader of the Conservative Party of Canada understands and respects the people in the suburbs and in the regions. He said yes to the absolutely necessary third link just as the previous Conservative government said yes to the construction of the new Samuel De Champlain Bridge. Common-sense Conservatives will continue to respect Quebec drivers by supporting a third link for cars.

The Quebec City area and the Chaudière-Appalaches region, including all of eastern Quebec, deserves this link to connect the two shores for the economic security of half of Quebec. Let us save our

economy and support those who work in the goods and services sector, those who are building Quebec.

* * *

● (1410)

[English]

GRADUATING CLASS OF 2024

Mr. Ryan Turnbull (Whitby, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give a shout-out to Whitby's graduating class of 2024. These students are the generation that is going to change the game. They should not just dream big, they should dream bold. They should dream like they are the only ones who can change the game, because they can. They should think about how they can make a difference, how they can leave their mark.

They are the ones who will disrupt the status quo, who will innovate, who will create and who will lead with passion and purpose. They are the one who will make a difference, who will make some noise and who will make it happen.

As they close this chapter and embark on their next adventures, they should remember to chase their dreams, embrace new experiences and never stop learning. Their voices are powerful. They should not be afraid to speak up, to speak out and to be loud. Canada needs change makers like them, and their time is now.

Therefore, they should make their mark, make a difference and make us proud.

* * *

CARBON PRICING

Mrs. Anna Roberts (King—Vaughan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, pasta e fagioli is an Italian meal served for centuries. Today, with the increase in the price of tomatoes by 63%, it is now a delicacy that is very expensive to make.

The Parliamentary Budget Officer told Canadians that the Prime Minister had placed a gag order on his office, blocking the release of the economic impact of the carbon tax. As a result of pressure from the common-sense Conservatives, the Liberal government was finally forced to reveal the fact that the carbon tax would cost Canadians \$30.5 billion by 2030.

The Liberals have been hiding this report for years. It is time to come clean and release the report. Italian lovers of pasta e fagioli want to know so they can continue that tradition.

Viva a tutti le italian .

TAXATION

Mr. Brad Redekopp (Saskatoon West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years, the costly coalition simply is not worth the cost. The incompetent finance minister is wriggling and squirming to find money to pay for her uncontrolled inflationary spending. What is her latest idea? It is raising taxes on doctors, home builders, entrepreneurs and farmers. Taxing doctors means it is harder to find one. Taxing home builders means fewer homes. Taxing small business means fewer paycheques. Taxing farmers drives up food costs.

Canada's food professor said, "to suggest that this change affects only a minimal number of Canadians...is misleading...it actually affects a lot of businesses, including in the agri-food sector...start[ing] with farmers." Businesses, jobs, doctors and food production will leave Canada. Everyone left behind will pay the price with fewer jobs and higher costs for everything. This is the opposite of fair. This is a unfair.

Conservatives will restore Canada to a country where hard work earns powerful paycheques that buys affordable food, gas and homes in safe neighbourhoods. It is time for a change. Let us bring it home.

* * *

HAROLD HERBERT

Mr. Peter Schiefke (Vaudreuil—Soulanges, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, any list of great Canadians should include the late Harold Thomas Herbert. Born in England in 1922, Hal served at the Royal Canadian Air Force as a fighter pilot during the Second World War, service that earned him the Distinguished Flying Cross.

[*Translation*]

In 1948, he moved to Canada and settled in the town of Hudson with the love of his life, Madeleine Lemieux-Herbert. He ran in the federal election and, in 1972, he won a seat in the House of Commons, representing the same riding I proudly represent today.

[*English*]

Adding to his legacy was this. In 1982, he tabled a private member's bill that received royal assent to formally name July 1 Canada Day. The change from Dominion Day, he felt, would serve to bring Canadians together, anglophones and francophones in his riding of Vaudreuil—Soulanges alike.

To honour his achievements, this July 1, the town of Hudson will add Hal Herbert's image to the Canada 150 Mural and honour him in a ceremony, a fitting tribute to a good man who devoted his life to serving those around him.

I wish Hal a happy Canada Day.

* * *

PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Ms. Lisa Marie Barron (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Mr. Speaker, living with a disability should not mean being legislated into poverty, yet this is exactly the reality for too many.

In my riding of Nanaimo—Ladysmith, I hear the heartbreaking stories of people choosing between life-saving medication or food

Statements by Members

on the table, between a roof over their heads or covering the cost of transportation.

Over one million Canadians live with disabilities. Because of the advocacy of many and the NDP along their side, there was a glimmer of hope, yet short-lived, because despite the Liberals' promise to lift Canadians with disabilities out of poverty, they most definitely have not. Six dollars a day does not even scratch the surface of what is needed. People living with disabilities deserve to live with dignity and respect. We have an opportunity to lift Canadians out of poverty.

I will continue to work day in and day out to represent my constituents, but I am not alone. The NDP will work for people living with disabilities to make sure no more people living with disabilities are living in poverty.

* * *

● (1415)

[*Translation*]

PAUL ARCAND

Mr. Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is strange to think that on Monday, we are going to have to get up and go about our day as though nothing has changed.

Our mornings will never be the same again. After 30 years of morning shows and 20 years at the helm of the most-listened-to program in Quebec and all of Canada, Paul Arcand is leaving *Puisqu'il faut se lever*, the now legendary show on 98.5. However, there is no need to panic, because he is only leaving radio so he can take on new challenges.

Paul Arcand has always been connected to his listeners, always in tune with Quebeckers. All the politicians who appeared on his show, many of whom are right here, decision-makers, leaders of all stripes, knew that they had better watch their step and choose every word carefully.

There was no room for double-talk, intellectual shortcuts or half-truths with Paul Arcand. He was all about getting to the bottom of things. What a band leader he was. What a team he led that succeeded in captivating us day after day for 20 years.

I want to thank Paul Arcand for all these incredible years. I thank him for always being there with us and for us. I hope his future is bright and full of new projects. We are looking forward to them.

*Oral Questions**[English]***TAXATION**

Mr. Scot Davidson (York—Simcoe, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years, Canadians can be forgiven for thinking it cannot get much worse than this. However, the NDP-Liberal government has proven them wrong again, this time with a job-killing tax hike on small businesses, farmers, health care and home building. Experts have called it misleading to suggest that this change only affects a minimal number of Canadians, when it actually affects countless small businesses, including farmers.

This tax hike puts the family farm across Canada at risk, jeopardizing the backbone of our agricultural sector. It will result in even higher grocery costs. This economic vandalism is the last thing our country needs.

Instead, the Conservatives will restore the promise of Canada by making our taxes lower, simpler and fairer for farmers and all Canadians.

* * *

ST. ANNE'S ANGLICAN CHURCH

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz (Davenport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Davenport residents are heartbroken. At around 8 a.m. on Sunday, June 9, our beloved St. Anne's Anglican Church was tragically destroyed in a fire, the cause of which has not yet been determined.

Built in 1907, St. Anne's Church was one of the oldest Anglican churches in Toronto. It was not only an architectural triumph, but also a rebel of its time.

Modelled after the Hagia Sophia, it was built in the Byzantine style, when the accepted style at the time was Gothic. In addition, the interior of St. Anne's was decorated by members of the famed Canadian Group of Seven artists.

St. Anne's, to our community, was more than a beautiful church. It was music. It was community. It was service.

My heart goes out to Reverend Don Beyers, the St. Anne's congregation and the entire community for this tragic loss. However, we know that after the darkest part of the night comes the light, and St. Anne's will rise bigger and better.

ORAL QUESTIONS*[Translation]***CARBON PRICING**

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this Prime Minister's economic vandalism and carbon tax cover-up were exposed today. Following pressure from the common-sense Conservatives, the government has finally revealed the data showing the real cost of its carbon tax, in addition to the cost at the pump. It is \$30 billion, or nearly \$2,000 for every family in Quebec.

The government tried to destroy the reputation of the Parliamentary Budget Officer to hide this information. Why?

• (1420)

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as we here in the House already know, math is not the Conservative Party's strong suit, even less so for the Conservative Party leader. I know that he has a hard time counting higher than six, the number of affordable housing units he built when he was the housing minister.

The data proves it. I have it here. Eight out of 10 families are receiving more from carbon pricing than they are paying. In addition, the Parliamentary Budget Officer confirmed that greenhouse gas emissions have been reduced by 25 million tonnes as a result of the implementation of carbon pricing.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this minister hid the data proving that this is costing the Canadian economy \$30 billion. The annual cost for Quebec is \$5 billion, according to row 17, column AN. Yes, this is costing Quebecers, and the Bloc Québécois is voting to increase this tax.

Why did the government try to destroy the Parliamentary Budget Officer's reputation when he was telling the truth?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again, he has proven just how ignorant the Conservative Party of Canada is when it comes to climate change, since federal carbon pricing does not apply in Quebec. Quebec has a system in place.

The Leader of the Opposition simply has to turn around, look three rows behind him and a little to his left. Then he will have the opportunity to talk to someone who voted in favour of carbon pricing in Quebec. All he has to do is ask her for an explanation. If she cannot give him one, I would be happy to.

[English]

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the economic vandalism and carbon tax cover-up of the government has now been exposed because of relentless Conservative pressure. The government finally leaked out, to the CBC, the economic hit Canada will take, originally reported at \$20 billion. With inflation, it is \$30 billion a year, or almost \$2,000 for every single family in Canada. The government tried to silence the Parliamentary Budget Officer on this.

How can we believe anything the Minister of Environment has to say on taxes?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as my hon. colleague and friend, the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, often says in the House, members of the Conservative Party of Canada are entitled to their opinions, not their own sets of facts.

The facts are clear. Eight out of ten Canadian families get more money back from carbon pricing than it costs them. Not only that, but the data also shows that carbon pricing is already responsible for a reduction in the pollution level of 25 million tonnes. That is half of our emission reduction so far.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, those are not my numbers. Those are the minister's numbers. His own department released data moments ago showing that the real cost will be a \$30-billion hit to our economy. This is above and beyond the direct cost at the pumps and in people's heating bills. When the Parliamentary Budget Officer said that, the minister denied it. He tried to gag the Parliamentary Budget Officer and shut him up completely.

Why did the minister try to hide the facts and punish a legitimate, hard-working public servant who tried to tell the truth?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think we have established in the House that math is not the forte of the Leader of the Opposition. He has a hard time counting past six, which is the number of homes built through social housing when he was the minister responsible for housing.

However, the facts are clear: Eight out of ten Canadian families get more money back from carbon pricing than the pricing system costs. Not only that, but carbon pricing is responsible for half of our emission reduction. Because of carbon pricing, there is less pollution in the atmosphere in Canada by 25 million tonnes.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that eight out of 10 fact does not include the \$30 billion of economic costs; that is \$2,000 of additional costs for every single family. When we exposed that, he denied it. When the Parliamentary Budget Officer reported on it, they attacked him and tried to gag him. The minister is not worth the economic vandalism. We cannot believe a word he says about taxes. He needs to resign.

When will the Prime Minister fire him?

• (1425)

Hon. Jonathan Wilkinson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I noted in the discussion yesterday that the Leader of the Opposition had a newfound respect for economists. However, I will tell him that 300 economists, in addition to the PBO, say eight out of 10 Canadians get more money back. The way it works is directly inverse to income. The Leader of the Opposition ignores the costs of climate change. Here are the facts: His climate plan is to let the planet burn. It is to ignore the economic opportunities associated with the energy transition. Look, this is a fellow who ran in the last campaign on putting in place a carbon price. Who is telling the truth?

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order, please.

[Translation]

The hon. member for La Prairie.

Oral Questions

FINANCE

Mr. Alain Therrien (La Prairie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in the supplementary estimates, this government wants to allocate \$3.5 million for medals to mark the transition of the Crown in Canada to Charles III.

There was already \$22 million budgeted for that. That is \$22 million too many, but that was not enough for the Governor General. She wanted an extra 15% and this government said yes.

The Liberals have one last chance to wake up before the vote later on. Will they remove this budget item and avoid wasting millions of dollars on monarchist trinkets?

Hon. Pascale St-Onge (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I know that the Bloc Québécois is not really interested in this, but there are Canadians who are attached to our history and who want to recognize that our sovereign, who passed away, was the Queen of the Commonwealth for more than 70 years. When such a thing happens, it is a tradition in Canada for medals to be produced and distributed to those who are interested in such things.

We respect traditions. It is too bad for the Bloc Québécois. Most of its members have refused to allow their constituents to receive any medals.

Mr. Alain Therrien (La Prairie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, what is truly despicable is that this additional \$3.5 million for medals bearing the image of Charles III is part of the same estimates as the funding that has finally been released for clean drinking water for indigenous communities, which could have used the extra money. That is pathetic.

Frankly, considering that Quebeckers and even most Canadians want nothing more to do with the monarchy, there are a lot of people who think that this money would have been better used in indigenous communities.

Seriously, will the government withdraw that money from the estimates while there is still time?

Hon. Pascale St-Onge (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we see that the Bloc Québécois members are once again trying to stir up trouble with stories like this, when many people in their ridings would like to be able to mark the transition in the monarchy.

They will not be able to do so because the Bloc Québécois made an ideological decision to deprive its citizens of these medals, when they are being made available across Canada. That is really unfortunate for my Quebec friends.

*Oral Questions***INFRASTRUCTURE**

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, all the experts agree. Everyone agrees. The proposed third highway link is not a good idea. It is too expensive. It will pollute. All that to save five minutes' driving time.

We know that does not matter to the Bloc and the Conservatives, because they support it. For the NDP, however, it is a hard no. The viable, environmentally friendly and efficient solution is a tramway.

Can the Liberals guarantee that not a penny of public money will go to the third link and that investments will instead be made in green solutions for Quebec City, such as the tramway?

Hon. Pablo Rodriguez (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would remind my NDP colleague that this is a provincial matter. It is a provincial undertaking.

The Government of Canada has said that we will always be there for public transit projects. Why? Because that is the way of the future, contrary to the Conservative vision, which involves eliminating public transit projects. They do not believe in public transit. They do not believe in the fight against climate change. They will do absolutely nothing. Meanwhile, we will get on board with public transit projects.

* * *

● (1430)

[English]

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Ms. Lori Idlout (Nunavut, NDP): *Uqaqtittiji*, for decades, Liberal and Conservative governments have ignored indigenous people's needs. As a result, the infrastructure gap is at billions of dollars. The Liberals committed to closing the gap by 2030, but they have committed less than 1%. This is just pennies.

Indigenous peoples deserve the same housing, roads and clean water as others. When will the Liberals follow through on their promises and close the gap so that indigenous peoples can thrive?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Indigenous Services and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I agree with the member that this country has had a deplorable history of depriving indigenous communities of the things that they need to thrive.

In fact, since we have taken office, spending on indigenous infrastructure and priorities has increased by 185%. It speaks to the lack of effort by those Conservatives, when they were in government, to actually prioritize the needs of indigenous children. We will keep working to close that gap.

* * *

CARBON PRICING

Ms. Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today, the government was forced to admit that the carbon tax will cost every single Canadian household more than \$1,800 in lost GDP. They kept a \$30-billion secret. Not once in anything ever released claiming that Canadians were somehow better off with the carbon tax did the minister include these devastating economic costs that

he knew existed. It was more important for him to continue to spread the falsehood.

Canadians know they deserve a minister who will tell the truth. If he is incapable of that, when is he going to resign?

Hon. Jonathan Wilkinson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier in the House, it is great to see that the Conservative Party of Canada now actually believes that economists are thoughtful and give good advice. Three hundred of them signed a letter that told people eight out of 10 Canadian families do get more money back.

I would encourage my hon. colleague to read that letter. Certainly, I would say that, as we move forward, we must have a plan to address climate change, and we must do so in a manner that is affordable. That is exactly what carbon pricing does. That is something we will continue to do, balancing the environment and the economy, versus a party that actually has no plan for the environment whatsoever.

Ms. Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government gagged the Parliamentary Budget Officer that actually told Canadians the truth; it then cherry-picked portions of the data that support its version of the truth. This makes it look even more guilty.

If the Liberals truly believed that the carbon tax was helping, they would release the report. Instead, they kept a \$30-billion secret from Canadians. The minister wanted to tell Canadians that, by paying more for gas, groceries and home heating, they would be better off, misleading them by about \$30 billion. I do not know how he looks anyone in the face.

When will the Prime Minister actually fire him?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is beyond me how the Conservative Party of Canada and those members who campaigned to put in place a price on pollution can look anyone in the eyes. How can they look anyone in the eyes and say, "We are doing nothing to protect you against forest fires, we are doing nothing to protect you against hurricanes, and we are doing nothing to protect you against flooding"?

The Conservatives have no plan for the economy. They have no plan for climate change. They have no plan to work with communities to protect them from the devastating impacts of climate change.

Ms. Leslyn Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government tried so hard to hide the truth that the carbon tax was driving up the cost of everything in Canada. The Parliamentary Budget Officer even had to call them out for blocking the release of their own economic impact report. They were literally forced to release the report.

Oral Questions

Now we all know that each Canadian family is losing at least \$1,800 a year, and there is no rebate for that. When will the environment minister finally resign from misleading Canadians?

Hon. Jonathan Wilkinson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would encourage my hon. colleagues on the other side of the House to actually go and talk to the PBO and the 300 economists who have said eight out of 10 Canadian families get more money back. They say it is those living on modest incomes who actually do the best.

I would say the collective amnesia that actually exists on the other side of the House is the pinnacle of hypocrisy. Every one of those members, including the member opposite who asked the question, campaigned on putting in place a price on pollution. It is hypocrisy.

• (1435)

Ms. Leslyn Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk, CPC): What is hypocritical, Mr. Speaker, is that, even while the Liberals' carbon tax was costing families more than \$1,800 a year, and even while they knew over two million Canadian families per month were accessing food banks, the Liberals continued to try to convince Canadians that they were better off paying for a higher carbon tax. An \$1,800 tax is a lot of money to many Canadians.

When will the Liberal government give Canadians back their money and fire the environment minister?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government is very proud of the environment minister, who put the first credible plan in history on the table to meet the Paris Agreement, the Paris Agreement that the Conservatives want to rip up.

It is no surprise, and the Conservatives got all of the data today, that eight out of 10 Canadians are better off. The Conservatives are standing up for the more well off in our society. They want to move on from what they did two days ago, which was to stand up for 0.13% of Canadians, not the people who draw a paycheque, make an honest living, go to work every day and pay their taxes on time.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: I know all members are excited to be returning to their ridings for the weekend, but to move things along quickly, I will ask members to only take the floor when they are recognized by the Chair.

[*Translation*]

The hon. member for Mégantic—L'Érable.

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Bloc tax is costing our economy \$30.5 billion a year. That adds up to nearly \$2,000 per family in costs that the Minister of Environment and Climate Change tried to conceal. The Minister of the Environment knew it, yet he deliberately hid the numbers from the Canadian public.

After deliberately hiding the facts, will the Minister of the Environment have the courage to stand up in front of all Canadians and resign for not telling them the whole story?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that member from Quebec will never do what the other member from Quebec, the Minister of the Environment, has done for Canada by submitting a credible plan for lowering greenhouse gas emissions. The minister has also complied, and will continue to comply, with the Paris Agreement, which the Conservatives want to take us out of.

It comes as no surprise that this member wants to pull us out of a plan that benefits eight out of 10 Canadians and, at the same time, is going to help us meet our climate change targets. That member should be ashamed.

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, he is absolutely right. I would never hide the \$5-billion cost of a carbon tax from Quebecers. That is exactly what the Minister of the Environment did in his own documents.

According to row 17, column AN, the carbon tax is costing Quebecers \$5 billion a year. The Bloc Québécois supports that tax. After trying to ridicule and muzzle the Parliamentary Budget Officer, who was telling the truth, as we now know, will the Minister of the Environment resign?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House, we will never hesitate to be there for Canadians, to defend their right to clean water, clean air and a clean environment, unlike the Conservative Party of Canada.

The extent of the Conservative Party's ignorance on this issue is beyond the pale. All the member has to do is turn around. If he were to turn around and talk to the member sitting right behind him, she can explain to him that Quebec has its own carbon pricing system, which was in place long before the federal system. What is more, several Conservative members have voted in favour of provincial carbon pricing. This is completely ridiculous.

* * *

PUBLIC SERVICES AND PROCUREMENT

Ms. Kristina Michaud (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia, BQ): Mr. Speaker, let us not forget that the CBSA's Arrive-CAN app cost \$60 million more than planned.

Well, the CBSA has found a way to do worse with its new app, the CBSA Assessment and Revenue Management, or CARM. This app is supposed to make it possible to register all imports at the border. So far, there has been \$300 million in cost overruns and counting. CARM does not work. The CBSA had to postpone its rollout.

These two apps are money pits. How much more money will the CBSA be allowed to throw out the window before the minister gets angry and cleans house?

Oral Questions

• (1440)

[English]

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Democratic Institutions and Intergovernmental Affairs (Cybersecurity), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the minister has stated that we are aware of some of the industry-led concerns, and we are working to make sure that the application is fully functioning, but I want to reassure all Canadians that the app was created to modernize Canada's border system to ensure that tariffs are collected fairly and promptly. I should also note that the app was purchased and developed in 2010 under the Harper Conservatives, but it is something we are going to ensure is working properly.

[Translation]

Ms. Kristina Michaud (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the worst part is that \$300 million has been wasted and CARM does not even work.

All of Canada's imports will have to go through this app. Its rollout had to be delayed because the tests did not go well. The CBSA is still unable to provide us with its contingency plans in the event that problems complicate billions of dollars in transactions every day. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce signed a memorandum expressing its concern. Imagine. Even the Americans are concerned about the CBSA's incompetent management.

Does the minister find that embarrassing?

[English]

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Democratic Institutions and Intergovernmental Affairs (Cybersecurity), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, we are going to ensure that the app is in good working order to ensure that Canada's border system and tariff collections are done in a modern, efficient and effective manner. Something that we have needed to do is hold consultations with industry leaders as well. This is where countries are going to ensure that our border services and our trade across borders is done in the most efficient way possible. We are continuing to work with CBSA to make sure that the processes are in place and that the app continues to work properly.

* * *

*[Translation]***CANADA BORDER SERVICES AGENCY**

Ms. Sylvie Bérubé (Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on the topic of the Canada Border Services Agency, Quebecers were scandalized to learn that some big stores are destroying and throwing away enormous quantities of unsold clothing that could have been donated to charity instead.

What they do not know is that the federal agency encourages this practice. The obsolete or surplus goods program refunds the duties and excise taxes paid on destroyed goods, but not on donated goods. The Bloc Québécois wrote to the minister a month and a half ago calling his attention to this, but we have yet to get a response.

Will the government stop rewarding waste?

[English]

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Democratic Institutions and Intergovernmental Affairs (Cybersecurity), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that is something that the minister has taken on seriously. He is working with finance to find the appropriate solution. We want to ensure that collection, and our customs and tariff system, are working properly, but the minister is well aware, and we are looking into the matter.

* * *

CARBON PRICING

Mr. Blaine Calkins (Red Deer—Lacombe, CPC): Mr. Speaker, while Canadians are struggling to make ends meet, the Prime Minister put a gag order on the Parliamentary Budget Officer to prevent the PBO from releasing the full report exposing the true cost of the NDP-Liberal carbon tax. We now know that the carbon tax will cost Canadians \$30 billion in economic activity. That is over \$1,800 for every family.

Why do they continue to muzzle the PBO? Is it because the report is so damning it should cost the minister his job? When will the Prime Minister fire his truth-evading minister?

• (1445)

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House, we can tell that Canadians are proud of the environment minister because he is standing up for what is right for this country, while we have the climate deniers on the other side. They want to see the planet burn. We want to act for our children. We want to act for future generations.

It is eight families out of 10. We know it is tough to go beyond six for those guys. It is just six plus two. That gets to eight. Six plus four gets to 10. Eight out of 10 will get more money.

We will fight for Canadians at every step of the way. We will fight for climate change, and we will fight for our children.

Mr. Blaine Calkins (Red Deer—Lacombe, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's dirty \$30-billion secret has been exposed. His carbon tax will cost Canadian families far more than they pay into it. That is money out of the pockets of people trying to feed their kids, heat their homes, pay their rent and fill up their cars.

Why are the Liberals so afraid of releasing the full report? Why is the budget officer muzzled? If the NDP-Liberals will not end the cover-up, tell the truth and release the full cost of the carbon tax, then the minister should resign. Why will he not get to it?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is no surprise that the Conservatives want to move on from the fiasco of two days ago when they voted for 0.13% of taxpayers and set aside the 99.87% of taxpayers who are not affected by a capital gains change. They want to stand up for people who have made \$250,000 on investments in a given year, and they will not stand up for the electricians, the farmers and the janitors, who earn a paycheque every week and do it honestly.

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, CPC): Mr. Speaker, a secret government report confirms what Canadians already know, which is that the carbon tax is costing Canadians more than they are getting back. The report says the carbon tax is costing Canadians \$30 billion a year. That is almost \$2,000 a household per year.

The government is not worth the cost. When will the environment minister resign?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Indigenous Services and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it looks like Conservatives want to change the channel. Yesterday, they were all about talking about capital gains. They were fighting for the rich guy and holding up plumbers and electricians, but not talking about waitresses or school bus drivers, when talking about how they are fighting for the little guy.

On this side, we know that Conservatives do not care about people who are pulling in a paycheque, but rather, they are focused on their ultrarich friends.

* * *

LABOUR

Mr. Matthew Green (Hamilton Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, when the Minister of Labour was asked about supporting the bargaining rights of Teamsters rail workers, he boasted about the government's success rate in trampling on the workers' right to negotiating a fair deal. The Liberals will say that they support workers, but will then pull the rug out from under them when they try to negotiate.

Instead of forcing a pathway toward binding arbitration on the rail workers, will the Minister of Labour respect the collective bargaining rights of Teamsters Canada and support its call to stagger negotiations to avoid a rail shutdown?

Mr. Terry Sheehan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour and Seniors, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government has had the backs of workers from the get-go. The first thing we did was reverse the most anti-union legislation ever created in the House of Commons, brought in by the Conservative government. We further went on to introduce replacement worker legislation, which I am pleased has passed.

Right now, the minister is absolutely correct. There are negotiations happening at the table with the mediators. We believe in our mediators, who have a 96% success rate. We are confident in collective bargaining. We know that the best deals are made at the table, and we encourage those conversations to continue.

Oral Questions

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Ms. Heather McPherson (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today the UN released its annual report on children in armed conflict. The report verifies that there are more cases of war crimes against children in Gaza, the West Bank and Israel than anywhere else in the world. It is an appalling and alarming confirmation of the grave violations taking place.

Children are dying and the Liberals are failing them. When, on what date, will the government finally impose sanctions on those responsible for the violence against children, including Netanyahu's war cabinet?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have said many times in the House that the situation in Gaza is catastrophic. Too many children and too many women have died. That is why the violence must stop. That is why we need a ceasefire now. That is why hostages must be released. That is why civilians must be protected. That is why humanitarian aid needs to get into Gaza.

We need to make sure that both parties support the Biden proposal. The Prime Minister, and the G7 prime ministers and leaders are in Italy as we speak. I really hope we can bring peace back to the Middle East.

* * *

● (1450)

LABOUR

Mr. Darren Fisher (Dartmouth—Cole Harbour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada's border services employees deliver important services that ensure Canadians are safe, secure and have timely access to goods coming from other countries. It is no secret that Canada's public servants have seen previous Conservative governments cut their jobs and cut services instead of giving them the respect they deserve by reaching deals at the table that are fair for them and reasonable for Canadian taxpayers.

Could the President of the Treasury Board share an update on her work to ensure a fair deal is made with our border services officers to maintain Canada's border security while ensuring respect for the work of our public servants?

Hon. Anita Anand (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this week showed that the best deals are reached at the table and that the collective bargaining process works. The Canada Border Services Agency employees keep our country safe every single day, and I am pleased to announce in the House that a tentative agreement has been reached that is fair for Canadian taxpayers and reasonable for public servants.

On this side of the House, we will always stand up for public service employees, and we thank them for their work every single day in protecting our country.

*Oral Questions***TAXATION**

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years of the NDP-Liberal Prime Minister, he has developed an extreme obsession with taxing farmers. First it was the carbon tax; now it is the capital gains tax increase that means that a 74-year-old farmer back home who has worked his whole life will struggle to pay off his debts and enjoy his retirement.

It also makes things even harder for the next generation of farm families. Without the family farm, big multinational conglomerates will take over. How is that fair for Canadians?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservative leader does not stand with workers, and he certainly does not stand with Canada's farmers. It is shameful that the leader of the Conservatives hides behind farmers and workers to justify his opposition to our plan for tax fairness.

We are in fact increasing the capital gains sheltering for farmers by boosting the lifetime exemption for qualified farming properties to \$1.25 million per owner, and when combined with the \$250,000 threshold, farmers are going to be better off.

We are standing up, on this side of the House, for Canada's agriculture. The Conservatives are standing up for the 0.13%.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC): Mr. Speaker, farmers are supposed to feed families, not the Prime Minister's extreme obsessions. The new tax is devastating for everyone, from farm to table.

Canada's "Food Professor" said yesterday that "to suggest that this change only affects a minimal number of Canadians...is misleading. I think it actually affects a lot of businesses, including in the agri-food sector, and I would start with farmers".

We need to keep family farms alive, but now they are under attack by the Liberals. How is that fair, and how can the ag minister sit quietly and let this happen?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition has not seen a hay baler or the top of a combine in his life.

What we have done over here is made things better for farmers by increasing the lifetime exemption and extending new provisions to farmers to ensure that capital gains do not affect them. Farmers will, in fact, be better off under this plan for tax fairness, just like waitresses, just like airline stewardesses, just like janitors, just like electricians, just like plumbers and just like 99.87% of Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Richard Lehoux (Beauce, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after nine years, the government and its Bloc Québécois partners have found a new way to undermine our agricultural industry: The day before yesterday, they voted to increase taxes on capital gains.

While one in five families cannot even pay off its debts, this punitive tax measure will make it even harder to sell a farm or transfer it to a family member. Farmers were not even consulted.

How does this measure make things fairer?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition does not know how to milk a cow or how to help farmers.

In our plan, we put new limits in place to help farmers. The exemption for farmers was extended. We know that farm succession is a major issue in Canada.

I encourage the member to do his homework, because things are going better for farmers thanks to the Liberal plan.

• (1455)

Mr. Richard Lehoux (Beauce, CPC): Mr. Speaker, here we have yet more proof that the government is truly out of touch. I have been milking cows for 40 years.

I can confirm that, in committee, the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food admitted that neither he nor his department were consulted about this new tax, which is disastrous for family farms. I have also heard from many owners of small and medium-sized businesses in my riding over the past few weeks. For example, this change will hit Louis from Saint-Joseph hard when he transfers his business to his daughter. The Liberals and the Bloc Québécois are not worth the cost.

Again, I ask, how is all of this fair?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what Canadians understand, especially farmers in Quebec, is fairness.

The latest federal budget we tabled was about fairness for every generation. It will enable us to invest in the next generation, in going concerns, and in our seniors. Surprise, surprise, the Conservatives voted against tax fairness.

I know farmers have big hearts. I know farmers are thinking about future generations. I know farmers want Canada to keep getting better.

That is exactly what we are doing.

* * *

NATURAL RESOURCES

Ms. Monique Pauzé (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, to return to the matter of Chalk River and the nuclear waste landfill site on the banks of the Ottawa River.

In late March, Canadian Nuclear Laboratories admitted to dumping toxic waters into the river.

Mr. Speaker, there is chatter coming from both sides of the House. I would ask for silence.

Oral Questions

The Speaker: Indeed, tempers are running very hot today. I ask members who wish to have conversations to please do so outside the chamber.

I invite the hon. member for Repentigny to begin her question again.

Ms. Monique Pauzé: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Returning to the matter of Chalk River and the nuclear waste landfill site on the banks of the Ottawa River.

In late March, Canadian Nuclear Laboratories, also called CNL, admitted to dumping toxic waters into the river. The lethality of these waters is already acute, which means that, within four days, they kill half of the fish that swim in them.

We know that many experts have warned about the risks of contamination caused by radioactive substances. Three months later, despite our questions, neither CNL nor the Department of the Environment has revealed which contaminants were involved.

Were they radioactive, yes or no?

Hon. Jonathan Wilkinson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, CNL has confirmed that the waste water was unrelated to radioactive contaminants and poses no threat to the public.

We continue working to ensure that the laboratories comply with the regulations.

The waters were certainly not radioactive.

Mr. Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Kebaowek First Nation, part of the Anishnabeg Nation, is a community in my riding that has made a number of demands to which the Bloc Québécois and 140 municipalities have added their voices. It is calling for a thorough investigation and compliance measures in consultation with indigenous peoples, which was not done in the Chalk River case. It is also calling for transparency.

Canadian Nuclear Laboratories knew as early as February that they were dumping toxic water, but did not report it until the end of March.

How can the federal government trust a laboratory that has problems with contaminated water and transparency to manage a nuclear waste dump on the Ottawa River, which flows right here beneath Parliament Hill?

• (1500)

Hon. Jonathan Wilkinson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have already said, Canadian Nuclear Laboratories has confirmed that the waste water is not linked to radioactive contaminants and poses no threat to the public.

CNL and government experts continue to monitor the Ottawa River. They are reporting that there is no obvious damage to the environment.

The health and safety of the environment and the public is our top priority.

[English]

HEALTH

Mrs. Shelby Kramp-Neuman (Hastings—Lennox and Addington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, over six million Canadians do not have access to a family doctor. According to the Commonwealth Fund, after nine years of the Liberal-NDP government, the number of Canadians without access to a regular care provider has doubled. What is the government's solution to the doctor shortage? It is to tax them out of the country. The health-care-killing tax on health care providers will force them to practise elsewhere, making the doctor shortage crisis even worse. How is that fair?

How many communities will go without doctors because doctors are leaving Canada due to the Prime Minister's new tax?

Hon. Mark Holland (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that the only time the Conservatives have asked in the House about health care or a shortage of doctors is when there has been a proposal to create a more fair tax system that asked the 0.13% of people to pay a bit more. Suddenly now, the Conservatives are interested in health care.

What is not going to help? Conservative cuts will not help. The \$200 billion that Liberals have invested, with 26 health agreements, in every province and every territory, is making sure we see progress every day in our health system, from dental care to pharmacare and primary care.

What is going to stop that dead in its tracks are the cuts the Conservatives want to bring. Liberals are here to make sure they do not get to do it.

Mrs. Shelby Kramp-Neuman (Hastings—Lennox and Addington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals are scrambling, and their facts do not add up. Kneecapping our health care providers to pay for the government's credit card bill is bad fiscal policy and it is bad health care policy. The key to a sound, robust health care system is preventative medicine, ensuring that Canadians get timely access to the health care they need. This not only saves lives but also saves government money. Increasing the tax burden on doctors who carry out this work will only force doctors out of the country.

When will the pompous Prime Minister finally listen to the thousands of people on wait-lists?

The Speaker: The hon. member is a well-respected member of the House. I am just going to ask her very quickly to withdraw that one word, because it does refer to an individual member.

Mrs. Shelby Kramp-Neuman: I will withdraw it, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: I thank the hon. member for doing so.

The hon. Minister of Health.

Oral Questions

Hon. Mark Holland (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when someone is out of arguments, they turn to insults. We are asking the 0.13% of people to pay a bit more so that we can have fairness and equity in our tax system, making sure a nurse does not pay a higher marginal rate of tax than a millionaire, which is fundamentally unfair.

Do members know what will kneecap our health care system? There have been 200,000 seniors in just six weeks who have accessed dental care, and the Conservatives want to take that away. Pharmacare is making sure that diabetes patients get the medicine they need; the Conservatives want to cut that. That will kneecap our health care system. We will not allow that to happen.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Joël Godin (Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the Minister of Health does not realize that after nine years, there is a major, historic crisis caused by the lack of family doctors in Canada.

Increasing the capital gains tax will have an impact on the economy and the quality of life of Canadians. In the midst of this challenging economic chaos they have created, the Liberals decide to tax capital gains even more. Supposedly, they want to make the rich pay. This is a tax cover-up and it will have a major impact. As a result of the exodus, the list of Canadians without a doctor will grow, not shrink. In Quebec, there are already 2.3 million people without a family doctor.

What does the Minister of Health say in response—

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Health.

Hon. Mark Holland (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can say clearly that, in a fairer and more equitable system, a nurse does not pay a higher rate of tax than someone with millions of dollars. It just makes sense.

It is absolutely undeniable that our health care system is threatened by fewer investments, which are essential to improving the quality of health care. We are absolutely going to protect our health care system. That is our goal.

* * *

• (1505)

HOUSING

Mr. Peter Schiefke (Vaudreuil—Soulanges, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, after a decade of chronic underfunding by the Conservatives, our government has made historic investments in housing and infrastructure for communities from coast to coast to coast.

Earlier this week, our government concluded a \$2.8-billion agreement with Quebec that will help the municipalities revitalize critical infrastructure and support housing projects through the Canada community-building fund.

Can the minister explain how this funding will help communities in Quebec to build more housing more quickly?

Hon. Pascale St-Onge (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Vaudreuil—Soulanges, who understands how critical it is to invest in our community in-

frastructure and in housing for Quebeckers and Canadians across the country.

The recent agreement with Quebec will guarantee \$2.8 billion over the next five years, including \$535 million this year to help build housing and to build it more quickly.

While the opposition leader spends his time finding excuses for opposing tax fairness, we will continue to focus on delivering help so that all Canadians and their families can get ahead.

We have a plan to help build housing in Quebec. The Conservatives have a plan to insult local leaders, create conflicts and not build any housing.

[*English*]

Mr. Jamil Jivani (Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, last week we learned that Canadian rents are at an all-time high, averaging \$2,200 a month, and it is only going to get worse. The Canadian Federation of Apartment Associations says the new Liberal capital gains tax will discourage construction of new rental homes. The NDP-Liberal government is crushing the prospect of bringing new rental units into our communities. What part of that says “generational fairness”?

Mr. Peter Fragiskatos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we say that the Conservatives do not care, and here is proof. The tax change would allow for more revenue to be directed to child care, pharmacare, dental care and measures to address the housing crisis. In fact, I direct the new member, and he is a new member, to look at the Conservatives' housing plan, which actually would tax home builders.

Therefore, today, when the member raises concerns about home building and taxation, it is the Conservatives' plan that is the problem. We have a plan. We are going to put in place that plan. We are going to solve the housing crisis.

Mr. Jamil Jivani (Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the president of the real estate company RE/MAX agrees that the Liberals' spin on their new tax hikes is bogus. I would like to quote him, if I might. He said, “The federal government has been vocal about this...only targeting the wealthiest of the wealthy...it's just not true.” He went on, “I think that it's going to penalize more average Canadians than were intended.”

My question is very simple. When will the government take the housing crisis seriously and stop letting down an entire generation of Canadians?

Oral Questions

Mr. Peter Fragiskatos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government has put in place a policy to lift GST off the construction of purpose-built rentals. The Conservatives want to maintain GST on the construction of purpose-built rentals; they will not get more apartments built that way, which is something that was verified at the House of Commons committee responsible for housing just a few days ago when the Conservatives raised this point.

Furthermore, if the member wants to talk about quotes, he can go back to the proceedings of the federal finance committee meeting a few months ago, when the Conservatives' housing plan was studied by the Department of Finance, showing that the Conservatives' plan would lead to fewer homes being built.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jacques Gourde (Lévis—Lotbinière, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the housing crisis, which is very much caused by Liberal incompetence, is wreaking havoc across the country, and the Liberal-Bloc coalition believes that taxing honest home builders will fix the situation. However, the simple fact is that taxing builders means fewer new homes and higher housing prices. It is unfair and counterproductive.

How does it make sense to increase taxes on housing if we want to build more houses?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am going to teach the member a little lesson, since he has likely not read the Conservative Party's rental housing plan. His party's proposal, believe it or not, is to maintain the GST on rental housing construction projects. That is unbelievable.

When I talk to people in my community and those who build housing, they tell me this is what makes the difference between a profitable project and an unprofitable one. The Conservatives want to bring the GST back for rental housing.

• (1510)

[*English*]

Mr. Ron McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, while the Conservative leader attacks B.C. mayors, we are working with them to build more housing faster. The housing accelerator fund is investing in the most ambitious places, to solve the housing crisis and deliver fairness for every generation. This includes in my community, where we are investing over \$25 million to help the City of Coquitlam fast-track thousands of new homes, including purpose-built rentals. Can the Minister of Energy update us on these investments to get more homes built in his community and mine?

Hon. Jonathan Wilkinson (Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to thank the member for Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam for his advocacy and focus on getting more homes built faster. The housing accelerator fund is indeed unlocking ambitious action on solving the housing crisis, including in my riding of North Vancouver, where a recent \$18-million investment will spur the construction of thousands of homes, very much including renters. Across Canada and B.C., hundreds of thousands of new homes are being fast-tracked thanks to investments like these. While the Conservative leader is vowing to rip up

these vital agreements, we are working on building homes for the middle class.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Richard Cannings (South Okanagan—West Kootenay, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the spotted owl is one of Canada's most endangered species, with only one wild-born owl left in the country, on the Spuzzum First Nation territory, near Hope, B.C.

The Minister of Environment has the power to protect this species under the Species at Risk Act, but he took so long to make a recommendation on that action that a federal judge found he broke the law.

Why did the Liberals delay protecting this endangered species and then refuse to take action?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for his advocacy for environmental and climate change issues. I would like to remind him that just a few months ago, we signed an historic agreement with all of the B.C. first nations, the Government of B.C. and the federal government: \$1 billion for nature protection to help the province achieve the goals we have in Canada to protect at least 30% of our lands and water. We will continue working with our partners, whether they be first nations or the Government of B.C., to ensure we can protect more species and more habitat.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Kevin Vuong (Spadina—Fort York, Ind.): Mr. Speaker, reports confirm what everyone knows but the out of touch government and the 23 missing in action Toronto MPs seem to have missed, which is that Torontonians are struggling. The Liberals have a new buzzword to gloss over their mismanagement, and it is “fairness”.

There is nothing fair in having more unemployed in Toronto than in all of Quebec. Excluding the pandemic, unemployment is the highest since 2015, when the architects of incompetence stumbled into power. Over 1.26 million Canadians have missed a mortgage or credit card payment in the first quarter of 2024.

When the banks call, do Liberals advise Canadians to just say, “Boo-hoo. Get over it”?

Government Orders

Mr. Ryan Turnbull (Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and to the Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this government has done more to support our local economies than any government I have ever seen in Canadian history. We are stimulating jobs and increasing productivity. We have made major investments in the research ecosystem within our economy, which is promoting innovation and creating more jobs for a sustainable future. I could not be more proud of this government. I know the member over there is training to become a member of the Conservative Party. I just hope the leader of the official opposition will finally accept him.

* * *

[Translation]

PAUL ARCAND

Mr. Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions among the parties and, if you seek it, I believe you will find unanimous consent for the following motion:

That the House:

- (a) recognize Paul Arcand's exceptional career at the helm of the morning show "Puisqu'il faut se lever";
- (b) recognize his rigorous work and his contribution to quality information accessible to all; and
- (c) thank him for his many years of service.

● (1515)

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

It is agreed.

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

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

[English]

REPUBLIC OF CYPRUS

Ms. Niki Ashton (Churchill—Keewatinook Aski, NDP): Mr. Speaker, there have been consultations among the parties, and if you seek it, I believe you will find unanimous consent for the following motion:

That, given that

- (i) 50 years ago, the Republic of Cyprus was invaded by Turkey in July and August 1974, resulting in the illegal occupation of 36% of Cyprus and the displacement of more than 150,000 Cypriots,
- (ii) Canada has condemned the invasion, as has the world community, including the United Nations through resolution 360 of the UN Security Council,
- (iii) Canada played a key role as a peacekeeper in Cyprus between 1964 and 1993,

the House

- (a) pay tribute to the 33,000 Canadian soldiers who put their lives on the line and honour the memory of the 28 Canadian soldiers who died during the deployment including during the invasion; and
- (b) reiterate its condemnation of the invasion of Cyprus and call on all parties to respect international law, end the illegal occupation and act to ensure the reunification of the Republic of Cyprus.

The Speaker: All those opposed to the hon. member's moving the motion will please say nay. It is agreed.

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

(Motion agreed to)

[Translation]

The Speaker: The hon. member for Rivière-du-Nord on a point of order.

Mr. Rhéal Éloi Fortin: Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions among the parties and, if you seek it, I believe you will find unanimous consent for the following motion:

The Speaker: I regret to inform the hon. member from Rivière-du-Nord that I am already hearing members saying no.

Again, this raises a point that I repeat quite often. It is very important for members to hold discussions to obtain consent from all the parties to move a motion. That way the House's time will be used more effectively.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

COUNTERING FOREIGN INTERFERENCE ACT

The House resumed from June 12 consideration of the motion that Bill C-70, An Act respecting countering foreign interference, be read the third time and passed.

The Speaker: It being 3:18 p.m., pursuant to order made on Wednesday, June 12, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at the third reading stage of Bill C-70.

Call in the members.

● (1530)

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

(Division No. 814)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Alghabra
Ali	Allison
Anand	Anandasangaree
Angus	Arnold
Arseneault	Arya
Ashton	Atwin
Bachrach	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Baldinelli	Barlow
Barrett	Barron
Barsalou-Duval	Beaulieu
Beech	Bergeron
Berthold	Bérubé
Bezan	Bibeau
Bittle	Blanchet
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney
Block	Blois
Boissonnault	Boulerice

Government Orders

Bradford	Bragdon	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)
Brassard	Brière	MacDonald (Malpeque)	MacGregor
Brock	Brunelle-Duceppe	MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maguire
Calkins	Cannings	Majumdar	Maloney
Caputo	Carr	Martel	Martinez Ferrada
Carrie	Casey	Masse	Mathysen
Chabot	Chagger	May (Cambridge)	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
Chahal	Chambers	Mazier	McCauley (Edmonton West)
Champagne	Champoux	McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty
Chatel	Chen	McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Chiang	Chong	McLean	McLeod
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)	McPherson	Melillo
Cooper	Cormier	Mendès	Mendicino
Coteau	Dabrusin	Miao	Michaud
Dalton	Damoff	Miller	Moore
Dancho	Davidson	Morantz	Morrice
Davies	DeBellefeuille	Morrison	Morrissey
Deltell	d'Entremont	Motz	Murray
Desbiens	Desilets	Muys	Naqvi
Desjarlais	Dhaliwal	Nater	Ng
Dhillon	Diab	Noormohamed	Normandin
Doherty	Dong	O'Connell	Oliphant
Dowdall	Dreeshen	O'Regan	Patzer
Drouin	Dubourg	Paul-Hus	Pauzé
Duclos	Duguid	Perkins	Perron
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Dzerowicz	Petitpas Taylor	Plamondon
Ehsassi	El-Khoury	Poilievre	Powlowski
Ellis	Epp	Qualtrough	Rayes
Erskine-Smith	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Redekopp	Reid
Falk (Provencher)	Fast	Rempel Garner	Richards
Ferreri	Fillmore	Roberts	Robillard
Findlay	Fisher	Rodriguez	Rogers
Fonseca	Fortier	Romanado	Rood
Fortin	Fragiskatos	Ruff	Sahota
Fraser	Freeland	Sajjan	Saks
Fry	Gaheer	Samson	Sarai
Gainey	Garon	Savard-Tremblay	Scarpaleggia
Garrison	Gaudreau	Scheer	Schiefke
Gazan	Généreux	Schmale	Seeback
Genuis	Gerretsen	Serré	Sgro
Gill	Gladu	Shanahan	Sheehan
Godin	Goodridge	Shields	Shiple
Gould	Gourde	Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Gray	Guilbeault	Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné
Hajdu	Hallan	Singh	Small
Hanley	Hardie	Sorbara	Soroka
Hepfner	Hoback	Sousa	Steinley
Holland	Housefather	Ste-Marie	Stewart
Hughes	Hussen	St-Onge	Strahl
Hutchings	Iacono	Stubbs	Sudds
Idlout	Ien	Tassi	Taylor Roy
Jaczek	Jeneroux	Thériault	Therrien
Jivani	Johns	Thomas	Thompson
Joly	Jones	Tochor	Tolmie
Jowhari	Julian	Trudel	Turnbull
Kayabaga	Kelloway	Valdez	Van Bynen
Kelly	Khalid	van Koeverden	Van Popta
Khanna	Khera	Vandal	Vandenbeld
Kitchen	Kmiec	Vidal	Vien
Koutrakis	Kram	Viersen	Vignola
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek	Villemure	Virani
Kusie	Kusmierczyk	Vis	Vuong
Kwan	Lake	Wagantall	Waugh
Lalonde	Lambropoulos	Webber	Weiler
Lantsman	Lapointe	Wilkinson	Williams
Larouche	Lattanzio	Williamson	Yip
Lauzon	Lawrence	Zahid	Zarrillo
Lebouthillier	Lehoux	Zimmer — 319	
Lemire	Leslie		
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)		
Liepert	Lightbound		
Lloyd	Lobb		
Long	Longfield	Nil	

NAYS

Business of Supply

PAIRED

Members

Blair

Gallant—2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed)

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Regina—Qu'Appelle, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the penultimate Thursday question.

I am just wondering if the government House leader could use this occasion to inform the House as to what may be the business for the rest of this week and into next week.

We heard some very helpful suggestions this week. If the government is telling the truth about its middle-class, working Canadian tax hike on the change to the capital gains inclusion rate, will it, next week, immediately table legislation to protect the bottom 99.87% of Canadians, who it claims will not be affected by this tax?

We would like the Liberals to enshrine that in law and to put the legislation where their rhetoric is. We would immediately fast-track that legislation once they do that. If they do not want to do it by income bracket and protect the 99.87% of Canadians, they could do it by profession. They could exempt plumbers, electricians, carpenters, farmers and fishermen, any one of the trades that they mentioned this week.

Will the Liberal government take us up on our challenge and enshrine into law that protection from this capital gains tax hike? What other legislation will it bring forward next week?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, for a moment there, I thought, for once, we were going to get away without a preamble, but we had a lot of amble there, a lot of post-amble.

I can assure my hon. friend that the law that is coming this fall would protect every single Canadian who draws their income from a paycheque, and 0.13% of Canadians would pay a modest amount of additional tax on capital gains over a quarter of a million dollars garnered in a single year.

Tax fairness not only will be written into the law, but also will continue to be the thing we talk about in the House.

[*Translation*]

Tomorrow, we will complete the report stage study of Bill C-40, Miscarriage of Justice Review Commission Act, which is also known as David and Joyce Milgaard's law.

I would like to request that the ordinary hour of daily adjournment of the next sitting be 12 midnight, pursuant to order made Wednesday, February 28.

[*English*]

Our priorities next week will be to complete report stage and third reading of Bill C-69, the budget implementation act, and second reading of Bill C-65, the electoral participation act. We will al-

so give priority to other important bills, namely third reading of the aforementioned Bill C-40 and report stage and third reading of Bill C-26, the critical cyber systems protection act.

Finally, there have been discussions amongst the parties and, if you seek it, I think you will find unanimous consent for the following motion:

● (1535)

[*Translation*]

That the motion standing on the Order Paper in the name of the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons related to the appointment of Christine Ivory as Parliamentary Librarian, pursuant to Standing Order 111.1(2), be deemed adopted.

The Speaker: All those opposed to the hon. minister's moving the motion will please say nay.

It is agreed.

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

(Motion agreed to)

The Speaker: Pursuant to order made Wednesday, February 28, the minister's request to extend the said sitting is deemed adopted.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS

The Speaker: I have the honour to lay upon the table the House of Commons' "Report to Canadians 2024".

* * *

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—GOVERNMENT'S ECONOMIC ANALYSIS ON CARBON PRICING

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Mrs. Élisabeth Brière (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development and to the Minister of Mental Health and Addictions and Associate Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Pickering—Uxbridge.

[*Translation*]

I would like to start by setting the record straight. Pollution pricing is a key tool for fighting climate change and supporting Canadians.

*Business of Supply**[English]*

Canadians know climate change is a real and serious threat to all of us. They have asked governments across the country to take action and to do our part to reduce the carbon pollution that is causing climate change. They also recognize that climate action needs to work with the economy, both to keep life affordable and to support the development of clean technologies here at home and to export around the globe.

Canada, alongside other international partners, including the United Kingdom, New Zealand, Sweden, Germany, the Republic of Korea and many others, recognizes carbon pricing is a powerful tool to achieve all these goals. The World Bank confirmed that there are now 75 carbon pricing instruments in place worldwide at the national and subnational levels.

This is not surprising. As economists and experts keep telling us, carbon pricing is the lowest cost and most effective tool to reduce carbon pollution. A price on pollution sends a signal across the economy. Each individual and business integrates that signal into their day-to-day decisions, finding ways to pollute less, so they can save money. The choice of when and how to act is left up to them. That is what makes carbon pricing so powerful.

[Translation]

Canada's approach to pricing pollution is flexible. Provinces and territories can adopt their own system if it meets minimum national standards. It was set up that way in recognition of the fact that Quebec and British Columbia have had their own mechanism for over a decade. In provinces and territories that do not have a price on pollution, the federal system applies.

The federal pollution pricing system is revenue neutral. All revenue is returned to the provinces and territories where it was collected. In provinces where pollution pricing applies, most of the revenue is returned to Canadians via the carbon rebate four times a year. For eight out of 10 households in Canada, the rebate is more than the carbon tax they pay.

[English]

This rebate is designed to benefit lower- and middle-income families the most. The exact payment depends on the number of people in the household and which province they live in. A family of four in Alberta, for example, will receive a Canada carbon rebate of \$1,800 this year, and more if they live in a rural community. The price signal on carbon pollution still works even though money goes back to households because of how the Canada carbon rebate is designed. Spending more on fossil fuels does not give someone a larger rebate. Households get their Canada carbon rebates regardless of how many cars they have, how they heat their home and how they get to work.

● (1540)

[Translation]

If people make an effort to use less fossil fuel by carpooling, for example, driving an electric vehicle or installing a heat pump in their home, every dollar saved goes back into their pockets. They still get the incentive. People who do not see the short-term importance of transitioning to clean energy or using less fossil fuel are

still protected from the effects of the cost of living because the climate action incentive payment gives back more to most Canadian families than they pay.

[English]

Our approach to pollution pricing is working. Estimates show that pollution pricing contributes roughly one-third of the greenhouse gas emissions reductions achieved by Canada's emissions reduction plan in 2030.

[Translation]

Putting a price on pollution is the simplest and most effective way to fight climate change. It encourages entrepreneurs to find innovative solutions, invest in clean technologies and transition to renewable energy. Clean energy and low-emission technologies are among the greatest opportunities of our time.

Canada's greenhouse gas offset credit system is also an important part of our pollution pricing mechanism, providing economic opportunities for municipalities, indigenous communities, farmers and project proponents. This encourages them to undertake innovative projects to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, create jobs and participate in the carbon credit market.

[English]

While other tools like regulations and incentives have an important role to play in Canada's climate plan, without carbon pricing, any climate plan will be more expensive and will miss opportunities for innovation. A price on carbon pollution is cheaper than other options, supports affordability and creates new markets for the new technologies we need.

Mr. Marc Dalton (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we are seeing the worst growth of income than any Prime Minister since the Great Depression in the 1930s under the Liberal-NDP coalition. Of the 40 advanced countries in the OECD, Canada is projected to have the worst growth for the next three decades.

Does the member not recognize that their policies, their tax policies and their governance is destroying our nation?

[Translation]

Mrs. Élisabeth Brière: Mr. Speaker, the opposite is true.

Business of Supply

It is entertaining to watch the official opposition do everything in its power to undermine the policies we are putting in place, which are actually allowing us to achieve our objectives. With all the measures we have taken and implemented since 2015, we are firmly on track to achieve a one-third reduction in Canada's emissions by 2030. Without carbon pricing, we would be facing an additional 24 million tonnes of emissions. That amounts to taking seven million cars off the road. Carbon pricing works.

[English]

Mrs. Tracy Gray (Kelowna—Lake Country, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we just heard today about how much the cost of the carbon tax would be to our economy. We are looking at a \$30-billion hit to our economy, costing over \$1,800 per Canadian family every year. However, the only reason we have this information out is because of the pressure from the Conservatives in this place. This document that we were told really did not exist we have now seen was true. The Parliamentary Budget Officer was telling the truth.

I wonder if the member could comment on this new revelation and on whether she knew of this information, as a Liberal MP, before it was released today.

• (1545)

[Translation]

Mrs. Élisabeth Brière: Mr. Speaker, what I can confirm is that we will always be there for Canadians and Quebecers. We will ensure that they have clean air to breathe and clean water to drink. Thanks to our price on pollution, eight out of 10 families in Canada are getting more money back than they spend.

Once again, I think it is a good system, one that is also recognized across the world.

[English]

Ms. Lori Idlout (Nunavut, NDP): *Uqaqtittiji*, if the Liberals are so confident in their climate policy, why will they not be transparent and share their economic analysis with Canadians?

[Translation]

Mrs. Élisabeth Brière: Mr. Speaker, we can be confident because we are seeing results. We are here to fight climate change, unlike the official opposition, which has no plan.

We are here to protect the environment and to fight climate change. Climate change is becoming increasingly costly. We really need to take action. That is what we have been doing since we have been in office.

[English]

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Democratic Institutions and Intergovernmental Affairs (Cybersecurity), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is being stated in the House today that somehow families are worse off, according to the Conservatives. However, the facts are the facts, and eight out of 10 families are actually better off with carbon pricing.

The Conservatives are focused on cuts, while we are focused on investments in Canadians. Could she speak about how that will help Canadians across the country?

[Translation]

Mrs. Élisabeth Brière: Mr. Speaker, the opposition party is there to propose cuts. This is a critical time in the fight against climate change.

I think that the measures we are implementing year after year show Quebecers and Canadians that this important issue is a priority for us. We are helping municipalities, indigenous communities and developers to undertake innovative projects to make the energy transition and turn to clean and renewable energy.

We have no choice. This is what we have to do.

[English]

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Democratic Institutions and Intergovernmental Affairs (Cybersecurity), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today in the House to speak to this important issue dealing with climate change and a price on pollution. It is a shame, however, that the Conservatives, once again, use an opposition day to promote their ideology. They work hard every day in the House to simply promote a set of opinions that they purport to be facts.

The motion does give us an opportunity to speak about something that at I think is on the minds a lot of Canadians, and that is climate change and the impacts of that.

While the Conservatives have no plan to deal with climate change, we have been steadfast and focused on ensuring that future generations have a planet and that with the impacts of the rapidly changing climate, our communities are going to be resilient. Investments need to be made, and all orders of government have a role to play in dealing with the impacts of climate change.

It is also crucial that we reiterate this. The government's carbon pricing plan is one of the most effective ways to implement change, but it also puts more money into the pockets of eight out of 10 Canadian families. I want to speak to some facts to ensure that Canadians hear the numbers that we are dealing with. The average Canadian family in Alberta is \$723 ahead with the price on pollution. In Ontario, my home province, a family is \$255 ahead with the rebate.

The Conservatives want to take that rebate away. However, what they do not address is that climate change is real and that the impacts and the costs that Canadians face as a result do not go away. This rebate allows for 100% of the revenues collected in the jurisdiction to go back to that same jurisdiction. It allows Canadians to invest in some greener choices, if possible, but it also allows them to offset some of the costs associated with climate change and the impacts that we face.

Business of Supply

I spent nearly a decade in municipal politics before running to serve my community of Pickering—Uxbridge in this place. One of the things we dealt with the most at the municipal level was infrastructure and how we could put infrastructure in place that was resilient and adaptable to the changing climate and storms. We used to refer to “hundred-year storms”, which were happening more and more.

Our plan also supports municipalities that need help to ensure their communities truly are resilient and can adapt to what we see more often. We saw catastrophic wildfires in the country. We have seen flooding. In my community of Uxbridge, we had a horrible tornado that damaged businesses, infrastructure, other important community spaces and the homes of individuals.

The cost of inaction is far greater than any proposal to put a price on pollution, but that is something the Conservatives feel everybody should deal with on their own. They do not think the federal government has a role to play in ensuring that communities are resilient. The federal government is going to be there for individuals who are impacted.

The irony in all of this is that the Conservatives know that Canadians care deeply about climate change and the impacts on our planet. In the last election, the Conservatives actually ran on a price on pollution. However, their plan reminded me a lot of going to an arcade, buying tickets and trading them in for a prize. I think there was a bike on the list, gift cards and things like that.

● (1550)

What Canadians can really use to help deal with affordability issues and resiliency in their own homes in dealing with climate change is cash, not a gift card for a bike or Tim Hortons. That is exactly what Conservatives ran on, because they realized that not dealing with climate change was not politically viable.

If we fast-forward to the current leader, they want Canadians to forget that climate change is real, that the impacts are real, that the financial costs are real and that our government's plan is not only reducing emissions but also ensuring there is more money in the pockets of Canadians, like I said, in eight out of 10 families. That is precisely what Conservatives do not want to talk about. They want Canadians to think that this is some sort of ideology and tax policy, when it is ensuring Canada's future. It is ensuring affordability for Canadians, and it is ensuring that we are reducing emissions in a way that allows Canadians to move forward in that work together. It is about fairness. It is about ensuring that our communities are resilient. It is about supporting each other as we experience more severe weather events right across this country. It is about making sure there is more money in the pockets of Canadians right across this country.

Conservatives do not have a plan to deal with the environment, so they are trying to distract Canadians from the reality. I think they are going to be in for yet another surprise when they realize that Canadians care deeply about this issue. They care deeply about the environment and want Canada to be a leader. If we want to talk about the economy, countries around the world, in trade and doing business with other countries, are going to expect each country to have a very real plan to deal with climate and reduce carbon emissions. Canada will lag behind if we do not address the very real is-

ssues of the world and if we do not do it in an economically responsible way.

It is a shame that this motion was brought forward today. It would be incredibly important for this House and Parliament to constantly debate the very real issues of climate change. Unfortunately, Conservatives want to pretend it does not exist. In the last speech, we heard about the fact that this plan will have a one-third reduction in carbon emissions by 2030, the equivalent of seven million more cars off the roads. These are very real results.

We are making our communities resilient, focusing on affordability issues for all Canadians and making sure that it is not free to pollute anymore. Canadians will be watching. They will see that if anyone who runs for office and wants to hold the highest position in this country is not serious about climate change, they are not serious about Canada's future and they are certainly not serious about Canada's economy.

● (1555)

Mr. Pat Kelly (Calgary Rocky Ridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member did not really address the motion. The motion is about the production of documents. We have seen the government withhold information from Canadians.

The member ran in 2015 on a promise to be the most open and transparent government in Canadian history, which would be open by default and would release data to Canadians that is the property of Canadians. Under the government, why did it take the presence of this motion on notice for the Liberals to reluctantly, after weeks of obfuscation, finally release the data? It was some of the data, as they have not conformed with the substance of the motion. The Parliamentary Budget Officer, an officer of Parliament, was actually being told to suppress information and had to resort to the broken ATIP system to get data.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Mr. Speaker, the irony in that question is unbelievable, given the cuts that were made to our independent public servants under the Conservative government whenever they had opinions that did not suit the Conservative government. In fact, we have said time and time again that eight out of 10 Canadian families would be better off under our pricing of pollution. Over 300 economists have also confirmed that, but Conservatives do not want to be confused by the facts.

Business of Supply

[Translation]

Mr. Denis Trudel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is always a bit disconcerting when we have debates on carbon pricing and the fight against climate change. On the one hand, the government has clearly not done enough for the past nine years, but on the other hand, the official opposition is proposing to do even less. It is quite disconcerting. In my riding, groups are coming to me or writing to me because they are very concerned that Canada is not doing enough.

The Liberals are always bragging about their efforts, their results and so on. According to the International Monetary Fund, in 2022, Canada gave \$38 billion U.S., or \$50 billion Canadian, to oil companies. The five major oil companies in Canada made profits of \$200 billion in 2022. I am not even counting the \$35 billion that Trans Mountain cost.

I would like my colleague to tell me, at a time when we need housing, when seniors are struggling, and when people are having trouble finding a family doctor, how can they send \$50 billion to the oil companies?

• (1600)

[English]

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Mr. Speaker, I, too, hear from constituents who are deeply concerned about climate change. In fact, I agree with my hon. colleague that there is more we should be doing and we must be doing, but it becomes very difficult when we have an official opposition that does not even believe climate change is real and that continuously puts forward motions like this, when instead we could be pushing each other to do more and to take more action to make Canada a true leader in fighting against climate change. Instead, Conservatives want to put their hands over their eyes and pretend it is not an issue. I look forward to working with Bloc members, who take this as seriously as I do and as our government does.

Ms. Heather McPherson: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take this opportunity to check that we actually have quorum to continue this debate.

The Deputy Speaker: We will do a quick count.

And the count having been taken:

The Deputy Speaker: We do have quorum.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Langley—Aldergrove.

Mr. Tako Van Popta (Langley—Aldergrove, CPC): Mr. Speaker, despite what the Liberals say, they actually do not have a plan for dealing with climate change. Just ask the people from Abbotsford, Princeton and Merritt in my home province of British Columbia, who got zero dollars from the disaster mitigation and adaptation fund. The Liberals' plan is to tax people, but not to actually help communities with climate-resilient infrastructure.

Where is the money for the province of British Columbia?

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Mr. Speaker, I agree that we need to be investing in communities. That was a big portion of my speech. I take the member opposite in his sincerity for wanting to ensure that there is resiliency in communities like his that have been impacted

by climate change. The problem with that statement is that it is his party that would actually reduce the ability to fund resiliency and infrastructure projects. Conservatives want to cut the budgets that would allow this to happen. They want to make pollution free again. While I agree with his sincerity around resiliency and investments, he comes from the party that actually wants to cut all of these funds and leave cities and communities on their own to deal with climate change.

Mr. Stephen Ellis (Cumberland—Colchester, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to rise in the House. I am going to split my time today with the hon. member for Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry, a great guy, a fantastic guy. I look forward to hearing his words of wisdom here this afternoon.

Primarily, even though the costly coalition wants to talk about climate change, the motion is about the duplicity of the NDP-Liberal government that Canadians have sadly had to put up with for a long time. I am not sure why, but the Liberals continue to want to somehow induce scandal upon themselves and keep facts hidden from Canadians. Of course, today, the facts, as presented from the secret report, which was in some way, shape or form made available this morning, are that the Liberals' carbon tax is going to cost Canadians \$30.5 billion, yes, "billion" with a "b", which turns out to be about \$2,000 per Canadian family. Certainly, this is above and beyond the direct costs of the carbon tax at the pumps, on people's heating bills and on food.

This is really no surprise. There are many, many things that the government has wanted to keep hidden and, thanks to the great work of my colleagues here on this side of the House, we have been able to uncover many of those things. Certainly, the carbon tax, though the government would have people believe it should be named something else, is the tax on everything. We have heard it multiple times in this House, and I think it bears repeating: When they tax the farmer who grows the food and tax the trucker who ships the food, the person who buys the food in the end has to pay for that cost. That is just simple economics, but good luck trying to explain that to the costly coalition. It really fascinates me, because it appears that maybe the Liberals' constituents experience it differently than those of us on this side of the House.

As I have said in this House many times, I was a family doctor for 26 years, and people reach out to my office as a member of Parliament every single day wondering how they are going to make ends meet. I would suggest that often the relationship with a family physician is an incredibly intimate one, where people often tell their deepest secrets, and that is something that I never heard in my office previously. Certainly it is not because I lived in an incredibly affluent neighbourhood and that just was not happening there. We live in a rural place. It is very average in terms of income, but I never heard that before, and that is incredibly troubling. Therefore, when we begin to hear this from everyday Canadians, we really wonder how difficult times are out there, and we actually know that they are incredibly difficult.

Business of Supply

We know, though, that there are some Canadians who want to speak up on behalf of others, including the Parliamentary Budget Officer. Certainly we know that on television the Parliamentary Budget Officer said, “overall, a vast majority of people will be worse off under a carbon pricing regime than without, and we don't expect that to change.”

• (1605)

The Deputy Speaker: I have a point of order from the hon. member for Pickering—Uxbridge.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE HOUSE

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Democratic Institutions and Intergovernmental Affairs (Cybersecurity), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am rising to offer some very brief comments in response to the question of privilege raised by the member for Winnipeg Centre on June 6.

There is a tradition in this House that when a member apologizes, the House accepts this apology, whether people feel it is sincere or not, and the member for Saskatoon West has apologized. What I believe to be unresolved on the issue is the inappropriate changing of Hansard to try to erase what the member for Saskatoon West said from the official record. There is an old saying that the cover-up was worse than the crime, and I believe that the change made in Hansard by the member is completely inappropriate and goes beyond the scope of permitted changes.

House of Commons Procedure and Practice, third edition, on page 1228, states, “Members may suggest corrections to errors and minor alterations to the transcription but may not make material changes to the meaning of what was said in the House.”

The change that the member for Saskatoon West made to the blues goes entirely against this practice. The edit made material change to the meaning of what the member said. While it was appropriate for the member to apologize, it was not appropriate for him to try to cover up what he said. I ask that the Speaker consider this point.

The Deputy Speaker: I thank the hon. member for that.

I want to remind colleagues that, when we have responses to points of order or whatever, it is always a courtesy to the members who are speaking to bring these things up between speeches. Therefore, I would ask that the next time we wait until after the speech, or maybe after questions and comments, to do those things.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Cumberland—Colchester.

* * *

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—GOVERNMENT'S ECONOMIC ANALYSIS ON CARBON PRICING

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Mr. Stephen Ellis (Cumberland—Colchester, CPC): Mr. Speaker, before I was so rudely interrupted without precedent, I

was getting to the point about the Parliamentary Budget Officer and his good nature once again being besmirched by the government.

Certainly, we know that on June 3, the Parliamentary Budget Officer appeared before the finance committee to say, “the government has [an] economic analysis on the impact of the carbon tax itself.... We've seen that—staff in my office—but we've been told explicitly not to disclose it and reference it.”

This is another cover-up from the costly coalition. It is no surprise to Canadians that the government wants to keep its dirty laundry hidden. This is something it does regularly, to me and all Canadians. It does not want Canadians to know the true cost of the carbon tax. Why? It is because it is a tax on everything. It is causing hardship, misery and a constant state of anxiety for Canadians, who are simply trying to live their lives and put food on the table.

In the wonderful place in and around Truro in Cumberland—Colchester, which I represent, the Colchester Food Bank served 482 more households this May than it did in January 2023. It is mind-boggling when we think about it, but what do we hear from the caustic coalition? Yes, I did say “caustic”, not “costly”, but they are equally appropriate. We hear that another \$1,800 to \$2,000 per household is nothing, that they should not worry about it. Food banks across Nova Scotia saw a 27% increase in visits in 2023. Last winter, it was reported that the food bank in New Glasgow, Nova Scotia, where the housing minister lives, was busier than it has ever been. What is certainly mind-boggling is that we get calls from the member for Central Nova's constituency frequently, and we have to explain to them why their cost of living is much greater than it is.

The CBC reported that folks in Louisbourg, many of whom are seniors, have been going days and even weeks without a proper meal, and some children have not been attending school because they do not have food. The members opposite would just say that they would create another program to feed the children for them. Why do we not give their parents an appropriate job, an appropriate paycheque, stop taking money out of every pocket that they have and let them feed their own kids? What a common-sense idea.

Of the Canadians who went to the food bank last year, 61% were first time users. They are real people, and we know they deserve better. We also know that Canada's Food Price Report in 2023, from Dalhousie University, reported that a family of four would see their grocery bills rise by \$700 this year. Perhaps the costly coalition does not think that is a lot of money, but I grew up in a trailer park, in very humble circumstances. As my dad would say to me, and I know this is not proper grammar, “Son, those 20 dollares do not grow on trees.” We certainly know that they do not; it would be great if they did.

Business of Supply

We know that one in five Canadians is out of money, skipping meals or accessing charities, such as food banks, for their basic needs. Two million Canadians visited a food bank in a single month last year and, very sadly, one-third of them were children.

We also know that the members of the costly coalition are the kings and queens of cover-up. Where should we start? Interestingly, it would seem that maybe it is an accident that they are covering up or forgetting things. A former minister testified about the green slush fund and had a sense of dementia. Everybody who testified there could not remember anything. It appears that this is a foundational feature of the costly coalition, not a glitch; this is how it wants things to be.

There are cover-ups such as the top secret lab in Winnipeg. We had to have four orders of Parliament, which were all denied, to produce some documents.

We had the president of PHAC brought here, in front of the bar, to be embarrassed in front of all Canadians.

We talked a bit about the green slush fund. We know that the chair of the green slush fund approved \$200,000 to her own company. That is absolutely shocking.

● (1610)

Of the projects that were approved, 10% were ineligible. In 90 cases, reporting \$76 million of funding, these projects did not even qualify for funding. It is not shocking, but we see this over and over again.

We hear about meddling in our elections. We hear from NSICOP that there are members of Parliament who have befriended other governments. This is, of course, another cover-up that we are trying to allow Canadians to see.

In summary, what do we see? We see, again, a cover-up and a costly coalition that is costing Canadians right out of their lives. They are unable to afford their basic necessities of food, shelter and, in many cases, of course, in the rural area where we live, gasoline for their vehicles to even get to work. We hear cases where people are taking on two and three jobs to try to pay their bills. Of course, with the coalition that allows criminals to go free, they lose their car. What happens then is they have to take on another job to pay for that car.

It is time the truth were told; it is time it became known that the carbon tax costs this country billions of dollars. It is time for the Minister of the Environment to resign.

● (1615)

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Democratic Institutions and Intergovernmental Affairs (Cybersecurity), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I found the member opposite's speech interesting, and he spoke about everyday people in his riding.

Was he thinking about those everyday people while he was dining in London, England, having \$1,800 worth of champagne, eating porterhouse steak and chateaubriand, on a trip that cost over \$7,000 and was paid for by the Canadians for Affordable Energy? We

should not let that name fool us. It is a group that advocates against pricing pollution.

While he was sipping on champagne, were they working on the motion to ensure that they make pollution free again and that Canadians are on the hook to deal with climate change on their own?

Mr. Stephen Ellis: Mr. Speaker, unlike the cabinet retreats that the member opposite's government takes at the expense of the Canadian taxpayer, we know that not a dime of taxpayer money was spent on that trip. It was a very important trip to understand the U.K. point of view, which is much farther ahead of us with respect to reversing its changes on carbon tax, and to have the incredible opportunity to meet the Hon. Tony Abbott, who also fought a carbon tax election.

It is no surprise that when Australians were running out of money, as Canadians are, Tony Abbott won that election handily, as we expect to happen here as soon as the frightful and running-scared coalition is able to call an election in this country. We know that, when the carbon tax election comes along, it will be no problem for the Conservatives to have power in Canada and reverse the incredible, costly and ridiculous charges that the government has foisted on Canadians now for nine long years.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Denis Trudel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, a journalist from The Canadian Press published an article on March 26 about an open letter on the carbon tax signed by 165 Canadian economics professors. The letter states the following:

As economists from across Canada, we are concerned about the significant threats from climate change. We encourage governments to use economically sensible policies to reduce emissions at a low cost, address Canadians' affordability concerns, maintain business competitiveness, and support Canada's transition to a low-carbon economy. Canada's carbon-pricing policies do all those things.

In the article, the journalist says the following:

According to the director of the department of economics at Université Laval, Stephen Gordon, economists are "almost unanimous" that carbon pricing is the best way to fight climate change.

He then adds, citing the content of the letter, and look at how wonderful it is:

"Not only does carbon pricing reduce emissions, but it does so at a lower cost than other approaches", according to the economists, who say "that is...common sense".

Business of Supply

I would like to know what my colleague thinks about that.

[English]

Mr. Stephen Ellis: Mr. Speaker, realistically, we need to focus on all this talk about the need for an affordable change to protect the climate. When Canadians cannot afford to eat, heat or keep a roof over their heads, the plan is not affordable for Canadians.

As I said during my speech, before I was so rudely interrupted, we know, clearly, that Canadians are no longer able to do those things. When one is not able to eat, house oneself or keep the heat on in the winter, it becomes an unbearable prospect. Should I look at saving the climate, or should I feed my family? I know from the Canadians I hear from every day that they need to choose to eat first.

What we will do on this side of the House is to have a technological plan to fight climate change. That will be significantly better. It will support Canadian businesses, which will employ more people and bring in more tax revenue. This will give us the ability to look forward into the future to say this is how we need to do things. It is not about continuing to take money out of the pocket of Canadians and give it to the green slush fund so that the Liberals can give it to their friends and waste millions more dollars. It is an easy prospect, and an easy choice for Canadians to make, to get the minister of the environment to resign.

• (1620)

Ms. Rachel Blaney (North Island—Powell River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I will do my best to be quick.

I know that the member and I have a fairly different perspective, but I agree that a lot of people are struggling right now. I hear that in my riding. I also represent a rural riding and understand that transportation is a challenge, and an important one, that I think could be addressed in a lot of different ways.

I also am aware of how much money the oil and gas companies are getting. I looked it up: They made \$63 billion in profits in 2022, while oil prices soared. The reality is that they are seeing a bigger profit than they have in a long time. We can talk about tax. I am happy to have that discussion, but I think it is also important to talk about price gouging. Has the member spent any time actually doing some research into that aspect of this concern?

Mr. Stephen Ellis: Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to live in the member's part of the world, North Island—Powell River and Comox. I am not sure if it is exactly in that riding. I also know that the people of that area of this great country are not dissimilar from the folks I now represent in Nova Scotia, in the sense that they cannot afford \$1,800 a month coming out of their pocket and a \$30.5-billion hit to this economy. I know they cannot afford that.

I know that the member is also getting the same emails and calls from people who cannot put food on the table every single day, just as we are here on this side of the House. Therefore, again, let us have a resignation from the minister of the environment.

Mr. Eric Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry, CPC): Mr. Speaker, sadly, after nine years of the NDP-Liberal government, time and time again despite its promises, the reality of what is actually happening here in Ottawa is the polar opposite. Before the Prime Minister came into office, he said he was going to

have the most transparent and accountable government Canadians had ever seen. Fast-forward nine years, and it has never been worse. The open-by-default promise the Prime Minister made is blown and completely decimated.

Here we are again, with months and months of a continued, in this case, carbon tax, cover-up, where the independent Parliamentary Budget Officer has been gagged. He is not able to provide to the public, not only the House but all Canadians, the real numbers and the real facts on the impacts and the proof of the negative impacts of the carbon tax plan currently under way and set to expand significantly and make life even more unaffordable in the coming years.

We see the reality on the ground every day, regardless of what part of the country someone comes from. Food bank use has skyrocketed; two million Canadians are using a food bank in one month. Even with the increase so bad, it is expected that a million more visits will be made to food banks in Canada this year alone. Canadians are going to pay \$700 more on their grocery bill in 2024. Every metric with respect to trying to make life more affordable, to give Canadians some relief, is getting worse, not better, the longer the Liberals are in office.

Here are the games the Liberals tried to play and failed miserably on today. For months, we have called on the Liberals to allow the Parliamentary Budget Officer to table the full report that he has been gagged about. He cannot speak about it. He cannot make it public. He cannot show Canadians the facts we all know on the ground but that would be proven through the work that he has done.

Just as we started to debate our opposition motion on document production, which would order the government to release the full report and show all the homework today, the Liberals played a game. They tabled, to the CBC of all places, spreadsheets, bits and parts of the report, in an attempt to say, "Here you go; here's the information."

Like everything with the Prime Minister, and everything that the Liberals do these days, propped up of course by the NDP, we cannot trust the Liberals, and rightfully so. They have earned that reputation after nine years here in Ottawa.

What the data has shown so far today confirmed what Conservatives have been saying all along and what millions of Canadians are feeling in their communities in the past couple of years. The government plans to quadruple the carbon tax on the price of gas and diesel in the coming years to 61¢ a litre, with the first carbon tax, the second carbon tax being brought in, and of course the tax they taxed with GST as well.

Business of Supply

The report and the numbers that we have seen so far today show just how devastating it will be. There will be a \$30-billion hit to the Canadian economy in the coming years. It is a massive hit to our GDP, our economic growth, our potential and our engine that is already stalling under the current NDP-Liberal regime.

What does that mean? Every Canadian family, with the Liberal carbon tax plan, not just at the rates that they are at but with the plan to drastically increase them, will be hit by \$1,800 per year just from the carbon tax. This is at a time when Canadians are already hurting, at a time when our federal deficits are endless, with no plans to balance the budget, and at a time when Canadians desperately need more houses but fewer houses are getting built. Everything the Liberals touch is broken. Everything they touch gets worse. The more solutions and photo ops they claim to do, the worse it gets for Canadians.

• (1625)

Here we go. The government has known for months just how devastating the carbon tax is, and for months it has just blocked it from even being talked about. They gag the Parliamentary Budget Officer. They claim the carbon tax is so great and people are further ahead after all the carbon tax money the government collects is redistributed.

If it is so true and if that is correct, why are the Liberals hiding the report? Why do they not table the full documentation with the report and everything included, not just the morning of? Finally, when they get backed into a corner, when they know they have to do something, they do not do the right thing and produce everything; they sliver off something and give it to the CBC the morning of and try to say that their work is done.

We see the first part. We see the \$30-billion-a-year hole it is going to blow in our GDP and in our Canadian economy when the carbon tax gets even larger on the price of gas and on home heating, driving up the cost of everything. It is endless how much the carbon tax impacts Canadians: the price of gas for families to go around on their own and the price of diesel for trucking companies to transport food, furniture, goods and supplies. The carbon tax is driving up the cost there as well. In aviation, there is a carbon tax on plane fuel, and airlines use tens of billions of litres. The government is driving up the cost of every mode of transportation and driving up the cost of living.

Therefore we need full accountability, not the game the Liberals tried to play today of tabling something minutes after debate started and saying that it is enough. It is not enough. Canadians are sick and tired of the games the Liberals play. They were sick and tired when the Prime Minister bragged about the line “open by default” and said that the government would just share all the information and let the chips lie down. Now the government is blocking.

I have never seen this. The Parliamentary Budget Officer has a report and would like to make it public. He has both hands tied behind his back, and backbench Liberal MPs are taking shots at him. There is a report that can vindicate the good, independent work that this public servant is doing. The Liberal government has gagged him, and then it played the game this morning of tabling only selective pieces: some Excel spreadsheets and numbers, not the full picture.

It is important that Canadians see the full report, not only the report or the numbers that the Liberals tried to show today. They need to show their homework. They need to provide their sources. The Parliamentary Budget Officer needs the ability to show the work that he did and how he got to the numbers showing just how devastating the carbon tax is, the economic vandalism that is going to be further exacerbated the more the carbon tax goes up.

On this side, we are going to be very clear. The entire House, the Bloc, the NDP, the Greens, the Liberals and everybody must allow full transparency, when it comes to the work of the Parliamentary Budget Officer in the report, so in my remaining time I would like to move an amendment, just so we are clear to Canadians and in the vote that will be taking place this evening.

I move:

That the motion be amended by replacing the words “provided that it” with the following: “, together with any bilingual memoranda or other briefing materials prepared in relation to this analysis, provided that these documents”.

It is time for full transparency. It is time for all of the information. Allow the Parliamentary Budget Officer to be ungagged and show all of his homework, and let Canadians see just how devastating life is after the carbon tax and after nine years of the Liberal-NDP government.

• (1630)

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: It is my duty to inform hon. members that an amendment to an opposition motion may be moved only with the consent of the sponsor of the motion. If the sponsor is not present, the House leader, the deputy House leader, the whip or the deputy whip of the sponsor's party may give or refuse consent on the sponsor's behalf.

Since the sponsor is not present in the chamber, I ask the deputy House leader if he consents to this amendment being moved.

The hon. member for Mégantic—L'Érable.

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, given the political games that the government has been playing today, I believe that this amendment is entirely relevant and advisable. I therefore agree to my colleague's moving the amendment.

[*English*]

The Deputy Speaker: The amendment is in order.

Questions and comments, the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety.

Business of Supply

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Democratic Institutions and Intergovernmental Affairs (Cybersecurity), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member opposite spoke about transparency, so I am wondering whether he will be transparent with the House and Canadians on how Conservatives will address climate change.

The Conservatives' slogan about technology does not provide any details. How are they going to actually support Canadians in dealing with climate change? How are they going to invest in communities to make them more resilient? Can they be specific?

Mr. Eric Duncan: Mr. Speaker, I will take our Conservative slogan of “technology, not taxes” any day of the week over the member's slogan of “Boo hoo, get over it”. I will not take any lectures from her on slogans and how that is working for her.

To the question at hand of what we have been very clear on, a number of clean-energy projects have been proposed across this country, but because of red tape by the government specifically, they have been withdrawn. In Nova Scotia, for example, a tidal energy company wanted to bring forward projects that would create jobs and clean energy, and have an impact in reducing our emissions.

What did it say? It said there is so much red tape, so much confusion and so many delays. I think it is a testament that the government could not organize a two-car parade, as we would say back home. The company cancelled its project. When it comes to nuclear and clean energy projects right across this country, a number of companies are backing out.

Conservatives will get rid of the red tape and allow investment to move ahead, not tax Canadians with a carbon tax that does nothing to address climate change.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Sylvie Bérubé (Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou, BQ): Mr. Speaker, let us talk a bit about history. In 1904, Wilfrid Laurier said that “the 20th century shall be the century of Canada”. While that could be true, what is clear is that the 21st century is the century of Quebec. Each Quebecker produces 2.5 times less greenhouse gas emissions than an Ontarian, six times less than an Albertan and seven times less than an individual in Saskatchewan.

In a world where polluting is expensive and protecting the environment pays, Quebec is the new Klondike. By trying to prolong the oil and gas heyday of the 20th century a few years longer, the Conservatives are doing everything they can to stop Quebec from enjoying its comparative advantage.

My question for the Conservatives is this: Do you know what climate change means? Do you know that the carbon tax does not exist in Quebec?

• (1635)

The Deputy Speaker: I would remind the member that she must address her comments to the Chair.

The hon. member for Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry.

[*English*]

Mr. Eric Duncan: Mr. Speaker, what I find fascinating about the Bloc Québécois member who just spoke is her support of the carbon tax over and over again, when she represents the most northern riding in the province of Quebec. If we look at the chart right now on aviation gasoline and aviation turbo fuel, we see that her own constituents require tens of millions of litres in northern Quebec for medical appointments, for work, for everything, and the government is adding, with zero in rebates for the companies, millions and millions of dollars to the cost of flying back and forth to many remote communities in the member's riding.

The member has no problem with jacking up the tax or with zero rebates. She is a Bloc Québécois, separatist MP who loves sending more money to Ottawa and quadrupling the current rates in many cases. Where the Bloc stands or does not stand now I find absolutely fascinating. What does it even stand for anymore? It is certainly not the residents in northern Quebec.

Ms. Heather McPherson (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my colleague talked about how Canadians cannot trust the Liberals, and I will not argue with that of course, but I am wondering how he expects Canadians to trust the Conservatives.

The member ran on a price on pollution in the last election. He talks about affordability but voted against dental care, pharmacare and a children's school lunch program. He is the same member who is in a party whose leader refuses to get top security clearance so he can deal with foreign interference.

The member talks about how Canadians cannot trust the Liberals. Believe me, I also wonder how they can trust the Liberals, but how on earth can Canadians be expected to trust the Conservatives?

Mr. Eric Duncan: Mr. Speaker, my favourite part of speeches is when the NDP does questions and comments.

Here is the thing: New Democrats do not trust the Liberals, but they are going to prop them up for four years and keep them in office. The hypocrisy of what they say makes no sense.

If the member is so tough and does not trust the Liberals, and they are doing such wrong, bad, terrible things, they can call the election and let Canadians decide. However, that member will not do that because she knows, like many in her caucus, the response they are getting on the ground for propping the Prime Minister up, even when they do not trust him, and for voting confidence, voting for the budget and voting for these cover-ups that happen at committee and here in the House.

I cannot wait for the next election, and neither can millions of Canadians. The NDP is the fourth party, and trust me, it is going to have an even smaller corner after the next election because Canadians do not trust them anymore either.

Business of Supply

[Translation]

The Deputy Speaker: 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 Lanark—Frontenac—Kingston, Correctional Service of Canada; the hon. member for Kelowna—Lake Country, Housing.

[English]

Mr. Francesco Sorbara (Vaughan—Woodbridge, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is always an honour and a pleasure to rise in the House, this most honourable House, and it is wonderful to see so many of my colleagues here this afternoon.

I will be sharing my time with the hon. member for Bonavista—Burin—Trinity, from the beautiful province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

We are here in the House debating the important issue of climate change, what that means for the environment, for Canada's environment and for the world, as well as what that means for our economy and where our economy is going. On this side of the House, we have made decisions on where the economy should be going and the investments that we need to make. We have made those critical investments in areas such as dental care, pharmacare, and a national early learning and child care program, which, in the province of Ontario, will bring in, on average, \$10-a-day day care by September 2025. There is also the national school food program. These are investments that are critical, needed and wanted by the residents in all our ridings. On the dental care side, we have seen that over 200,000 seniors have already gone to visit a dental care provider.

On the economic front, there are investment tax credits to continue to build our economy. There are the strategic investments in the auto sector, where we have seen over \$50 billion of foreign direct investment come into the Canadian economy for all provinces. There are the investments in Saskatchewan by BHP in potash and Dow Chemical in Alberta. These are multi-billion dollar investments that are powering our economy forward thanks to the know-how of the wonderful residents we get to represent. It is thanks to their generous and entrepreneurial spirits.

That is how we confront the issue of climate change. The opposition party members like to bury their heads in the sand and say that climate change does not exist. I wonder what result we would get if we did a poll on the other side and asked them if climate change was a man-made cause. We need to address climate change.

An hon. member: Oh, oh!

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Mr. Speaker, there we go. We just heard the response from one of the hon. members. Hon. members should know that, when another member has the floor of the House, they should wait their turn. We were taught that at a young age.

From east to west, Canada is warming at twice the rate—

An hon. member: Oh, oh!

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Mr. Speaker, I hear my hon. colleague from Calgary over there, who will be golfing this summer. I wish him the best on the golf circuit.

Canada is warming at a rate twice as fast as the global average, with the north warming three times as fast. The impacts of widespread climate change are already impacting Canadians profoundly, from deadly heat waves to wildfires and flooding, which are all expected to intensify. Last year, the scale of the fires, the smoke, the length of season and the national impacts all contributed to the worst wildfire season Canadians have ever seen. Smoke and ash impacted air quality across North America and beyond.

We must take action now to drive down greenhouse gas emissions and make our communities more resilient to the impacts of the changing climate. We can do that while we are economic leaders. In fact, the Canadian economy next year is forecasted to grow at the fastest pace of all G7 countries.

As I like to say as an economist, our deficit-to-GDP ratio is among the lowest in the developed world at around 1%, versus the United States, which is between 5% and 6%, and some of the European countries, which range from 3% to 5%. Our debt-to-GDP ratio, on a net basis, which is what we look at and how our AAA credit rating is examined, is again very low. Our unemployment rate is very low. Jobs continue to be created. In fact, our economy continues to perform very strongly. We all have our challenges. The world has its challenges today, and we are responding.

Canadians will have a choice in another few months or so. They will have to choose between a narrow-minded, small, less ambitious type of government and a government that has ambitions for its people, has the confidence to invest in its citizens and its industry, and collaborates with labour and industry. Canadians will have to choose between that and a potential government that would bring in an austerity agenda.

Let us come clean. It would bring in an austerity agenda. What would that mean for Canadians? It would mean no dental care for seniors. It would mean cutting the Canada child benefit and raising the retirement age back to 67, when we lowered it to 65.

● (1640)

What does it mean when the Conservatives say they are going to do something with the budget? That means cuts. In economist terms, there is no other word to use. Austerity equals cuts. When the Leader of the Opposition says he wants small government, that means no ambition and no confidence, whether it is domestic or global. It means an austerity agenda would be brought in front of Canadians, but that is not going to happen.

I look at what is going on in the world and, as an economist, I know we need to fight climate change. In fact, our plan is working. Emissions are going down. We are meeting our targets, and we will meet them. We will do that collaborating with governments.

I am an MP who represents a wonderful riding in Ontario. It is nice to see, in the province of Ontario, how we are working with the provincial government to make all of these strategic investments in the auto sector. To every auto sector worker in the province of Ontario and across Canada, there is an opposition party that is not supportive of investing in the auto sector. It is not supportive. It does not believe in that.

Liberals believe in investing in Canadians. The Conservatives do not. That is what smaller government is. That is what an austerity government is. The Conservatives will need to answer those questions in the coming weeks and months because that is the truth. For climate change, putting a price on carbon is a market-based policy. In fact, nearly every one of those members ran on that in the last election, and now they have changed their minds.

● (1645)

[Translation]

The Canadian Climate Institute estimates that, by 2025, Canada could lose \$35 billion due to climate change as compared to a more stable climate scenario. This represents 50% of anticipated growth in the gross domestic product for 2025.

The cost and impact of inaction on the lives and livelihoods of Canadians is far too great.

[English]

Taking climate action seriously now is critical to cutting emissions, and making our economy more resilient to climate change and more competitive. Our way forward, for now and for the foreseeable future, is to make the transition to a clean, sustainable future as quickly as possible.

We will continue to move forward; we will not go back. That is what I have learned in life, to continue to move forward. We will continue to move forward and build an economy that is more competitive, creates more jobs and creates more wealth, and that is exactly what we are doing.

For instance, in 2021, the Government of Canada adopted legislation that committed it to achieving enhanced 2030 emissions reductions of 40% to 45% below 2005 levels under the Paris Agreement, along with a commitment to achieve net-zero emissions by 2050. It is not just Canada going this way.

Some hon. members like to say that China is building coal plants and stuff, but China right now is installing more renewable power than ever. The United States, under the Inflation Reduction Act, is providing incentives for its clean tech industries and attracting investment. Europe is doing the same thing. We are all going in the same direction because that is the way of the future. We know it.

The Canadian Net-Zero Emissions Accountability Act provides a durable framework of accountability and transparency for Canada's climate action. As an early deliverable under the Canadian Net-Zero Emissions Accountability Act, Canada published an emissions

Business of Supply

reduction plan in 2022. There is nothing stopping the official opposition from putting up a plan. Where is the plan? We need a plan for the economy and the environment that go together.

An hon. member: Oh, oh!

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Mr. Speaker, I again hear the hon. member from some part of Calgary.

This plan is an ambitious and achievable road map that outlines a sector-by-sector path for Canada to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and fight climate change, while strengthening our economy with sustainable jobs and clean, industrial growth. It lays out optimal and the most cost-effective emissions reductions. That is everything from the retooling of our transportation sector with zero-emissions sales targets and EV charging stations, industrial policies on batteries and critical minerals, and historic investments in public transit, including zero-emission buses.

As the chair of the auto caucus within the Liberal Party, I have been able to visit a lot of plants and attend the announcement of investments with the Prime Minister and the Premier of Ontario. For the auto sector and the nuclear sector, it is a very exciting time. We are seeing Ontario workers, B.C. workers and Quebec workers, as well as the supply chain across the country, benefiting from these multi-billion dollar, once-in-a-lifetime investments.

I am proud to be a part of the government that is leading the charge on this and participating with industry and labour.

Mr. Tako Van Popta (Langley—Aldergrove, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member for Vaughan—Woodbridge says that he is concerned about the economic effect of climate change. Well, I can say that so are the one million people who live in the Fraser Valley, who just received news last week that they will be getting zero dollars out of the disaster mitigation and adaptation fund. We are getting just empty words from the Liberal Party about worrying about the economy and climate change. Why is there no money coming to British Columbia to defend, protect and support the port of Vancouver, the biggest port in all of Canada, which was cut off for nine days due to severe flooding in 2021? Where is the money?

● (1650)

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Mr. Speaker, I know the member for Langley—Aldergrove's area quite well, as a born-and-raised B.C. boy who attended Simon Fraser University in the area.

With regard to any funds directed to the Lower Mainland and the Fraser Valley, my heart goes out to all the residents who had to experience the impact of climate change. I believe it was last year, if my memory serves me correctly. Obviously, speaking to the relevant minister, those issues of concern should be raised and so forth.

Business of Supply

I know the disaster mitigation fund application quite well. The city I live in also applied for it, and I understand the member's concerns. However, we have been there. The Minister of Defence was there, and there have been funds provided to the Lower Mainland and the Fraser Valley to get the roads repaired and those farmers back to doing what they do.

[Translation]

Mr. Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois are in favour of transparency. It is important to be able to make informed decisions and have informed debates. We are also in favour of this motion because intellectual integrity means a lot to us, unlike some Conservative members from Quebec who have spent the past year fearmongering about the carbon tax and saying it applies in Quebec when it does not.

They tried to tell us that it was terrible, that it was a disaster and that its indirect effects were causing the economic crisis. On the issue of inflation, the Leader of the Opposition constantly quotes the Bank of Canada, which is not just anyone. However, Bank of Canada representatives told the Standing Committee on Finance that the indirect effect of this carbon tax on Quebec was 0.02%.

This means that it costs 20¢ out of every \$1,000. I would like my colleague to explain why the government is withholding information if it is so proud of this environmental measure.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question. Climate change is a very important issue.

[English]

Climate change is obviously very real, and I know that in the province of Quebec they are leaders in fighting climate change, much like they were leaders in adopting an early child care plan in the province of Quebec.

[Translation]

I agree with my colleague about transparency, which is very important to me. I am an elected member of Parliament.

[English]

I analyze all information so I can make the best decisions when it comes to putting a price on carbon. As an economist, I support market-based measures, and it is one measure.

[Translation]

Putting a price on carbon is very important in the fight against climate change.

[English]

Ms. Lori Idlout (Nunavut, NDP): *Uqaqtittiji*, the Kivalliq Hydro-Fibre Link project of the Nukik Corporation made some great submissions in the federal budget, in both 2023 and 2024. One of its recommendations was to increase the investment tax credit from 15% to 30% for indigenous- or Inuit-owned transmission intertie projects in development.

I wonder if the member can explain why the Liberals are only giving lip service and not actually listening to great recommendations by indigenous corporations so that they can be more engaged in combatting climate change.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Mr. Speaker, I have much respect for the hon. member for Nunavut. In budget 2024, we put in place, I believe, a \$5-billion indigenous loan guarantee, which I think is transformational. I know it was applauded by indigenous organizations and indigenous groups across the country, and it continues the path of reconciliation and a nation-to-nation conversation.

I have, again, much respect for the hon. member for Nunavut.

Mr. Churence Rogers (Bonavista—Burin—Trinity, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is my honour to rise in the House today to discuss some of the government's key actions to combat climate change, cut pollution and drive clean technologies.

In recent years, climate change has had unprecedented effects on Canadians. Impacts from climate change are wide-ranging, affecting our homes, our cost of living, infrastructure, health and safety, and economic activity in communities across Canada.

The latest science warns that to avoid the most severe impacts of climate change, greenhouse gas emissions must be reduced significantly, and urgently, to hold the global average temperature increase at 1.5°C.

The government is taking this seriously. We have a plan to reduce Canada's emissions by 40% to 50% below 2005 levels by 2030 and to reach net zero emissions by 2050. Carbon pricing is the cornerstone of our plan. Since 2019, every province and territory has had a price on carbon pollution. Some provinces, like B.C. and Quebec, have had carbon pricing in place for much longer than that. The question is why. It is because it works.

It creates powerful financial incentives for industries and individuals to take concrete steps to reduce their emissions and invest in clean options. Carbon pricing has proven to be effective around the world and here in Canada. We remain focused on ensuring that it is designed to keep life affordable for Canadians. Over 90% of the federal fuel charge proceeds go back to households via quarterly Canada carbon rebate payments delivered to families by cheque or direct deposit. The majority of households, particularly lower- and middle-income households, get back more through these rebates than the cost of the fuel charge.

We are also working with provinces and territories, as well as other stakeholders, on ensuring that carbon pricing and our credit markets remain effective across the country and drive the big investments needed to decarbonize industry. Most provinces in Canada maintain their own carbon pricing systems for industry, which have broad support across businesses and experts in Canada.

Business of Supply

Our federal and provincial systems for pricing carbon pollution from industry are designed to send a strong carbon price signal that creates a powerful incentive for all polluters to reduce their emissions.

For every tonne of pollution reduced by an industrial polluter, either they avoid paying the carbon price or they can earn a credit that they can sell to other emitters. These trading systems are key to protecting industry's competitiveness while still driving emissions reductions, and all proceeds collected under Canada's pricing system for industry are used to further support industrial decarbonization and clean electricity incentives.

We also recognize that many Canadian industries are trade-exposed, competing in the global market. That means that too heavy a hand will just shut down production and lead to carbon leakage, more production by competitors outside of Canada who may face a lower carbon price. That is not going to accomplish anything, not emissions reductions and not economic growth.

Our system, however, as well as provincial and territorial systems for industry, is carefully designed to achieve both. The clean fuel regulations in place since 2022 are another market-based instrument that will accelerate the use of clean technologies and fuels and support good jobs in a diversified economy. In fact, they are expected to deliver up to 26.6 million tonnes of emissions reductions annually by 2030, which is a significant contribution to our emissions reduction target.

● (1655)

We have already seen significant investments in the energy sector as a result of the incentives from the clean fuel regulations. Since the announcement of the regulations, over \$53 billion in investments have been announced across Canada in low-carbon industry fuels such as green hydrogen, renewable diesel and sustainable aviation fuel.

For example, Imperial's renewable diesel complex at its Strathcona refinery near Edmonton is under construction. Once completed, it will produce more than one billion litres per year of renewable diesel from locally-sourced feedstocks. Covenant Energy will start construction of a renewable diesel and sustainable aviation fuel production facility in Saskatchewan this year, with production expected to start in 2026. Another example, Braya Renewable Fuels, has finalized the retrofit of the refinery at Come By Chance, Newfoundland, right in my riding of Bonavista—Burin—Trinity. I was delighted to attend the opening and the celebration of the first renewable diesel being produced in Come By Chance. It has saved the refinery and salvaged it from closure, and now people in the region are seeing long-term, sustainable jobs for decades ahead.

These companies, and others like them, will be able to create and sell valuable credits for supplying low-carbon fuel to Canada. These are the types of economic investments that the clean fuel regulations are supporting in Canada.

The Government of Canada is committed to ensuring that Canada's transition to a low-carbon economy is achieved in a way that is fair and predictable for businesses. It supports Canadian jobs, as I just alluded to in Come By Chance, Newfoundland and Labrador, as well as Canada's international competitiveness.

Climate change is arguably the defining issue of our time. Canadians want to be a part of the solution. The government is taking concrete action to cut emissions and to create incentives and opportunities for new investments and technologies.

● (1700)

Mr. Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the member has had a chance to read the report that the Liberals just released this morning. Does he believe that a \$30.5-billion hit to our economy is going to affect Canadians' everyday lives?

Mr. Churence Rogers: Mr. Speaker, the narrative coming from the Conservative side is very different from what we are hearing. When we look at the investments, for example, the \$53-billion investment in clean fuel energy and projects going forward, creating good, sustainable jobs, I am certainly good with that.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I have a very simple question for my colleague.

How does he explain the fact that the minister made the documents public today after this motion was tabled? Can my colleague encourage the members of his government to learn from their mistakes and to be more transparent?

Now, the Liberals are going to try to appear virtuous. They are going to say that, yes, they provided the study. That is not true. Some unparliamentary words are coming to mind that I will not say. That is completely false. The Liberals have to be forced to do things. We always have to put their backs against the wall for them to take action. We are tired of that. The public is tired of that.

For goodness' sake, can they not take this work seriously and provide all of the information to parliamentarians so that we can make informed decisions?

[*English*]

Mr. Churence Rogers: Mr. Speaker, again, the narrative from the Bloc and what we are debating in the House on a regular basis are always very different.

We use the commentary from the PBO and other sources. As the minister alluded to today, we have over 300 economists across the country who support what we are doing with the climate change initiatives and carbon pricing.

● (1705)

Ms. Heather McPherson (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have to say that I agree with my colleague from the Bloc, that the government has shown itself to be very untransparent and very difficult to get information from, on a number of different fronts.

Business of Supply

In the House, we are discussing a lot of things around climate change and climate issues. We have heard the Liberal government claim that it is doing things on climate change, and then it provides loopholes, time and time again, that undermine its own policies and that make its own policies not work.

I have a very simple question. In Alberta, the fire season started extraordinarily early this year. Climate change is real. It is having incredible impacts on communities in my province and across the country. My colleague, the member for South Okanagan—West Kootenay, has asked the government to finally put in place a national wildfire task force to help us deal with these wildfires.

Does the member agree that this is something that is urgently needed and that is long overdue?

Mr. Churence Rogers: Mr. Speaker, actually, I do agree. It would make an immense contribution to preparing for wildfires, every season.

We saw the disasters that happened, last year in Western Canada and three summers back in my province of Newfoundland and Labrador. We see fires now that have started in Labrador West, in Newfoundland and Labrador. We have seen the effects, particularly on the island of Newfoundland and Labrador, and in Atlantic Canada, from major hurricanes and from what is happening.

I firmly believe in climate change. I want to protect the world that I live in, going forward, for my two children, for my four grandchildren and for all my family and friends. I think the member's suggestion is certainly a good one, and I thank the hon. member for that suggestion.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Democratic Institutions and Intergovernmental Affairs (Cybersecurity), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask my hon. colleague a question about the Conservatives' approach to dealing with climate change.

The Conservatives say that they are going to use technology, yet in his home province of Newfoundland and Labrador, Conservatives stood in the way of creating sustainable jobs. When there are opportunities for Atlantic Canada, Conservatives are opposed to technology and creating new jobs of the future.

What does the member think about that, and how would this have negative impacts on his community?

Mr. Churence Rogers: Mr. Speaker, the one thing I can say is that Newfoundland and Labrador is poised to be a major wind energy production province, along with Nova Scotia and others.

We see immense possibilities and a bright future for Newfoundland and Labrador, with other clean energies that we are going to build and implement as we do green hydrogen projects and so on. It is a great example of how we can invest in technology that will benefit not only the economy but also the climate.

Mr. Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to take to my feet today and talk about the common-sense Conservative motion to release the secret report, which the environment minister had the PBO hide from Canadians, and to reveal the truth to Canadians.

Before I get to the substance of my presentation, there are two things I want to say.

First and foremost, this will be the last time I have a chance to be on my feet and to wish a Happy Father's Day to fathers across Canada, which is coming this Sunday. My wish for Father's Day is that the Oilers get two wins. I will put on record that it was the first time an NDP member has ever clapped for anything I have said in the House.

Second, I will be splitting my time with the member for Foothills. I am looking forward to hearing his presentation later in this debate.

It has come to light that the environment minister has been gagging the PBO and has not been allowing him to let Canadians see the full effect of what the carbon tax has been doing to our economy. Hurriedly this morning, the Liberals were forced to release some, but not all, of the report. That is why this motion is so salient today, because we would like to see the full, unredacted report released so that Canadians know how much the job-killing carbon tax is crippling our economy. The report states that \$30.5 billion is going to be put at risk in our economy because of this carbon tax when it is fully implemented. We do not have to look very far to see the results of what is going to continue to happen.

This all came to light because of some very good work done at the finance committee by one of my colleagues. The PBO stated, "it doesn't change the overall conclusion...as I pointed out...our numbers have been out there since 2022. In that time...the government...has not published anything regarding the economic impact of the carbon tax." He went on to say, "We know...that the government has these numbers on the economic impact.... They have not published anything...."

Our colleague went on to ask, "you understood that the government had economic analysis on the carbon tax that it has not released. Are you saying that the government has not been transparent with the analysis it has?"

The PBO stated, "I mentioned that the government has economic analysis on the impact of the carbon tax itself and the OBPS.... We've seen that—staff in my office—but we've been told explicitly not to disclose it or reference it."

Our colleague said to the PBO, "The government has given you their analysis, but they have put a gag on you, basically, saying you can't talk about it."

The Parliamentary Budget Officer responded, "That is my understanding."

This revelation is something that should be quite shocking to Canadians. We know that the Liberal government has had a disregard for the rule of law. We saw it bring in the Emergencies Act. It had a disregard for the rights of Canadians when it came to trying to divide us based on a personal health choice. We know that the radical environment minister is an eco-terrorist and has no respect for the law, because he was actually arrested climbing a tower. Therefore, to have such little respect for the independent Parliamentary Budget Officer is not out of character for the members of the government, who really believe, as they are so out of touch, that they can do whatever they want and that Canadians should just go along with it.

Now, we are talking about the long-term damaging effects to our economy. We know that our GDP continues to decrease and that it is one of the lowest in the G7. That is a direct result of the radical fiscal policies, and one might say the wacko policies, that the NDP-Liberal costly coalition has forced on Canadians.

I had the honour to attend the 111th AGM of the Saskatchewan Stock Growers Association on Monday. We had conversations about this, constantly, because it is getting harder for ranchers and for farmers to try to make ends meet. We know the PBO has also said that by 2030, when the carbon tax is fully implemented, it is going to take \$1 billion out of the ag sector alone. It is going to cost the average farm about \$170,000 a year. Who can eat that kind of a tax increase? It is going to be harder for farm families to make ends meet and to put food on the table, because if we tax the farmer who grows the food and tax the trucker who trucks the food, then we tax all Canadians who buy the food.

• (1710)

I really think it is important that we look at how the Liberals have continued to put terrible policies in place that are affecting our farmers. The fertilizer reduction tariff is making it harder for farmers to grow food, as is the carbon tax. We did have a common-sense Conservative bill, Bill C-234, that was going to actually lessen the weight of the crushing carbon tax on our Canadian farmers. The Senate sent it back and gutted the bill, and now the Liberals and New Democrats will not let us get this bill passed. There are things we can do, and have tried to do, to ensure that our farmers are able to be better off, but that is just not something the current government is focused on, trying to help ranchers, farmers and producers across the country.

When it comes to the hidden report that Canadians were not allowed to see, I appreciate the member for Whitby, who is famous for saying that Canadians will go through pain because of the carbon tax. He got that part right. Canadians have felt pain all over this country, as we see millions lined up at food banks. That is the type of pain the member for Whitby was talking about. However, he is also the one who actually brought up the hidden report in the first place at committee. I think it is very interesting that we have not heard him speak on this motion, as of yet, but I would love to hear some of the comments that he might have on a \$30.5-billion hit to our economy.

We are now saying that the environment minister is unfit to have his job. He should resign or the Prime Minister should fire him, because he purposely misled Canadians on the Liberals' flagship tax

Business of Supply

policy. I think it is time that he does the right thing and that he resigns from his position as the environment minister. The Prime Minister does not show leadership on this front. We all know that he is flailing in the polls, but it is time for him to actually show some leadership, which he has not done in nine long years, and get rid of the environment minister, who is making it harder for Canadians to make ends meet.

When it comes down to it, \$30.5 billion from this crippling carbon tax is going to hurt our Canadian economy, and Canadians everywhere will be out about \$1,800 a year, for every Canadian family. That is unconscionable, and it should stop.

• (1715)

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Democratic Institutions and Intergovernmental Affairs (Cybersecurity), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our colleague opposite, in his speech, brought up questions around divisive politics and a right to health decisions. Since he brought that up, I am curious to know if he supports his colleague, the member for Peace River—Westlock, in trying to roll back a woman's right to choose, as well as in rolling back equal marriage rights. Does he support his colleague?

Mr. Warren Steinley: Mr. Speaker, we always can tell when the Liberals or the NDP members are in trouble because they go back to more divisive policies. If the Liberals have been in government for nine long years, why have they not brought in the law?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I regularly see in the House and at the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food that my colleague is very interested in the cost of the carbon tax and its secondary impact.

Is he also interested in the cost of climate change and its secondary impact? We, of course, have to take into account the effects of any policy that we put in place. Does he, in good conscience, believe that we also need to calculate and compare what the cost would be if we did not have a policy? For example, if we did not have a climate policy, what would the secondary impact be on international trade and a host of other factors? I would like to hear my colleague's thoughts on that.

[*English*]

Mr. Warren Steinley: Mr. Speaker, that is really a straw man argument. People ask what the cost of doing nothing is. The carbon tax is not actually an environmental policy because it has done nothing. It has taken money out of the pockets of hard-working Canadians and has made it harder for them to put food on the table, but the carbon tax has done zero when it comes to the environmental part. It is a tax policy, not an environmental policy, and the Liberals and the NDP have not made one environmental target. This is all about redistributing wealth and taking money out of the pockets of Canadians.

Business of Supply

Ms. Rachel Blaney (North Island—Powell River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I thought the member's intervention was interesting. The area that I represent is a rainforest, and we have seen a drought like we have never seen before, to the point that even during the very rainy winter season when we gather up a lot of that wetness, we just did not see that. We continued to be in a drought into the winter season, which was quite concerning to me.

I hear from the Conservatives this vague idea of having a technological solution to climate change, but I am wondering if there is any particular example of what that actually means, because it is very vague, and it would be great for us to have a better understanding of what their plan is.

Mr. Warren Steinley: Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleague to come to southeastern Saskatchewan and visit a carbon capture and sequestration plant. There are tons of examples of what has legitimately been done in Saskatchewan. I was proud to be part of the government that brought in the world's first scalable carbon capture and sequestration plant, which has been working wonderfully. It has taken the equivalent of millions of cars off the roads in terms of pollution, which is one reason to use technology over taxes. It worked well and cleaned up our environment.

Other manufacturers will continue to use carbon capture. Evraz is looking at doing it. With the upgrader, the Co-op Refinery is looking at doing it. If Liberals would just take their heads out of the sand and look at the technology, there would see a lot of examples in Saskatchewan. They have beneficial effects on the environment, unlike a tax plan such as the Liberals' carbon tax.

● (1720)

Mr. John Barlow (Foothills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise today to speak about a very important topic, which is the Liberal-NDP government's almost religious dedication to the carbon tax, where they ignore the impact it is having on Canadians right across this country. Listening to most of the debate today, I find it interesting that the overarching message from the Liberal government is that Canadians have never had it so good and that paying the carbon tax is a benefit to Canadians.

As I was sitting here only a few minutes ago, going through my Gmail account, I received an ad from the Ottawa Food Bank. It is desperately asking for help because 490,000 visitors are expected this summer, with 40% of them children. If Canadians were really benefiting so much from the Liberal carbon tax, then why are food banks right across Canada talking about visits and demand being up more than 50%? Food banks are unable to meet demand and are asking for donations and volunteers while we see families, many of them first-time users, now using the food bank. It is quite hypocritical for Liberals to say that Canadians have never had it so good when we see record lines at the food bank.

I do not know why the Liberals are being so coy with the economic analysis of their carbon tax. They refused to table those documents; they actually muzzled the parliamentary watchdog and did not allow him to table that document. If the Liberals are so proud of the impact the carbon tax is having on everyday Canadians, they should be more than happy to table those documents here in the House and brag about the impact it is having. By their metrics, the carbon tax has never been more successful. If their goal is to ensure

that Canadians cannot put gas in their car, cannot afford to put food on the table and cannot afford to heat their homes, the Liberal carbon tax is doing exactly what they wanted. Certainly, many Canadians will not be able to afford a summer vacation. If those are the metrics of success, then they are to be congratulated.

The carbon tax has caused an unaffordability crisis right across this country, and Canadians have had enough. If the Liberal members of Parliament and their NDP and Bloc partners can honestly say that their constituents are telling them to please keep racking up the carbon tax, because they are enjoying seeing their grocery bill go up \$700 this month or their fuel go up 61¢ a litre, they are delusional. Otherwise, they are misleading the House to say this is the message they are getting.

Liberals are saying their documents prove that what the Parliamentary Budget Officer was saying was incorrect. I want to mention what the Parliamentary Budget Officer said when he was being harangued by the member of Parliament for Whitby, who put his foot in his mouth trying to challenge the Parliamentary Budget Officer. The Parliamentary Budget Officer was adamant, and he said that the overall conclusions were that the vast majority of households are worse off with a carbon pricing scheme regime than without. He was confident this would remain, based on preliminary analysis and discussions with government officials and stakeholders.

That is a pretty damning statement. The Parliamentary Budget Officer's job is to analyze government legislation and policy, yet the Liberal government is trying to say there is nothing to see here. It says that Canadians have never had it so good and are quite pleased with what is going on.

The Liberals were under relentless pressure not only from the opposition but also, I would argue, from Canadians right across this country. They demanded to see the documents the Liberals refused to table, which highlighted the economic impact of their carbon tax. After it was tabled today, I can see now why the Liberal government was so anxious about tabling those documents. The documents show that the carbon tax steals \$30 billion from the Canadian economy every single year. It is costing every Canadian household close to \$2,000 every year. I am not sure where their argument would come from when they take \$2,000 out of the pockets of Canadian taxpayers and give them back a little, which does not come close to what is being taken by the carbon tax.

Business of Supply

• (1725)

Initially, the government's argument was that the carbon tax was going to be revenue-neutral. We have gone from revenue-neutral to the vast majority of Canadians being worse off with the carbon tax than they are getting the phony rebates. That shows how far this has come since 2016. The government keeps having to change the story about Canadians being maybe a little bit better off; we now know the exact impact. This is devastating to Canadians and increases prices right across the supply chain and on just about everything Canadians do.

I know that the Liberals have talked quite a bit today about these 300 economists, these 300 Liberal elites who are supportive of the carbon tax. Unlike the Liberal government and their NDP cohorts, I know that on this side of the house, Conservatives are not listening to 300 Liberal elite academic economists. We are listening to our constituents. We are listening to Canadians, who have a very different point of view of the impact the carbon tax is having on their everyday lives.

I want to quote from a letter I received the other day from a small business owner in Bragg Creek, Alberta, one of my constituents. This is quite common in the letters I am getting every single day. It reads:

As the owner of a heating company operating in rural Alberta, I hear every day from my customers how [the Prime Minister's] carbon tax has forced them to make the decision whether to "heat or eat" and how the hike on April 1st is only going to force them into deeper and deeper poverty.... The fact that anyone in this great [country] has to live impoverished is already distasteful, the Liberal government seems to take pleasure in our suffering.

The same is true for businesses. Especially rural businesses. We are barely staying above water as it is.... We need...the government [to] release the [small business] carbon tax rebate."

Where is the rebate small business owners were promised? He has not seen it.

I have dozens of these letters. I know my Conservative colleagues across this floor have similar ones.

As the shadow minister for agriculture and agri-food, I would certainly be remiss if I did not talk about the impact this is having on Canadian food production. I know we have said this many times in the House, but when one taxes the farmer who grows the food, the trucker who ships it, the manufacturer who processes it and the retailer who sells it, there is no question that the Canadian consumer is going to be paying for that carbon tax at the grocery store shelf when they go to buy that food.

The Agriculture Carbon Alliance did a study. It took a number of farmers from across Canada and asked them to give it their carbon tax bill for the one month when it was at its highest. Fifty sample farms paid a total of \$329,644 in carbon tax in one month. That was before the April 1 increase of 23%. In Alberta alone, according to the Parliamentary Budget Officer, Alberta farmers paid \$17 million in carbon taxes last year just on natural gas and propane. That was to dry their grain and heat and cool their livestock barns. This year, Alberta farmers will pay \$20 million in carbon taxes. By 2030, that number will be \$209 million. Again, according to the PBO, whom the Liberals tried to muzzle, in Ontario, farmers paid \$44 million last year in carbon taxes just in natural gas and propane. After the increase, Ontario farmers will be paying \$53 million in carbon tax-

es. By 2030, that total will be \$566 million in carbon taxes. One farm in Simcoe—Grey paid \$25,000 in carbon taxes in one month.

There is no way that farmers can be economically viable under the pressure of those costs. Now the Liberals want to add a capital gains tax hike on those farmers, something that the Minister of Agriculture had no idea was actually going to be in the budget. We know that this policy is going to be devastating to succession planning for Canadian farmers and young farmers trying to get into the business. How is it possible that the Minister of Agriculture did not know about this pillar of the Liberal budget?

In conclusion, it is crystal clear that the Liberals were trying to hide the real data from Canadians; this is going to cost Canadians more than \$30 billion a year and almost \$2,000 per household. That is insurmountable. The Minister of Environment should resign, and the Minister of Agriculture should not be too far behind.

• (1730)

Mr. Heath MacDonald (Malpeque, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am sitting here reading data from a School of Public Policy, University of Calgary, economist Trevor Tombe. This is not coming from the Liberal government; it is coming from an economist in the hon. member's hometown:

"We find that carbon taxes increase air transport costs by about 0.9 per cent. We find that food in B.C is only 0.3 per cent more expensive as a result of carbon taxes and clothing, only 0.2 per cent."

The paper says if Canada eliminated the carbon tax as a whole, consumers would likely not see a lot of extra cash in their pockets.

"All in, we estimate that the changes in carbon taxes affect consumer prices today by only 0.6 per cent".

Does the hon. member believe Mr. Tombe, an economist from the University of Calgary?

Mr. John Barlow: Madam Speaker, as much as I respect the member for Malpeque, questions like that say why it is a Conservative safe gain if that is the message he is giving his constituents.

I will point out that the Caring Cupboard food bank in P.E.I. has seen an increase in food bank usage of 70%. The food bank operators are out there asking for people to step up and help. Those are the member's constituents; therefore I would ask him to go back to his constituents and say, "Hey, I do not know why people need to use the food bank, but we are going to increase the carbon tax another 23%. Have a great summer."

Business of Supply

[*Translation*]

Mr. Denis Trudel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, BQ): Madam Speaker, it is quite fascinating. When I was elected, I was advised to always try to tell the truth, especially in the House, and in parliamentary committee. I was told to just try to tell the truth, to talk about the facts. We have been debating the carbon tax for months now, and what the Conservatives have been saying is nonsense. First, they refuse to accept the idea that the carbon tax does not apply in Quebec. It simply does not apply.

In response to a question at the Standing Committee on Finance, Bank of Canada representatives said that it applied indirectly to products transported from, say, Winnipeg to Quebec. The financial impact on consumers, as calculated by the Bank of Canada, is 0.02%. Basically, out of \$100,000, that is a difference of \$20. To hear my Conservative colleagues say that the carbon tax in Quebec is what is causing lineups at food banks is completely absurd.

I would like my colleague to comment on that.

[*English*]

Mr. John Barlow: Madam Speaker, I do not know where the out-of-touch positioning comes from, wherein the Liberals want to say that food inflation is up less than 1%. One just has to go to a grocery store. We know that the cost of bread is up almost 30%. We know the cost of produce, in many cases, is up 25%.

The “food professor” from Dalhousie University, who is an expert on this, said that as a result of the carbon tax and other Liberal policy, wholesale food prices are up 54%. He suggested the Liberals cap the carbon tax and not increase it on April 23, but they did so anyway. The facts are clear: Carbon tax is driving up food prices.

Ms. Heather McPherson (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am going to pile on a bit like the member from the Liberal Party and the member from the Bloc have done.

The member started by talking about the cost of food. Trevor Tombe from the University of Calgary was somebody we witnessed. I have read articles in the National Post, which I think we can all agree is hardly a left-wing socialist rag, that have said that actually the carbon tax does not impact the price of food to nearly the extent the member is saying. It is minuscule.

In Alberta, the cost of groceries is out of control. In fact food insecurity in Alberta is at 20% higher than in the rest of the country, under the UCP government. I am wondering how the member keeps wanting us all to believe a fact-free zone, when economists, journalists and members of Parliament have made it very clear that the carbon tax is not what is responsible for the cost of food increasing so much. Corporate greed is responsible for that, and the Conservative Party voted against the NDP plan to stop corporate greed from taking more dollars from Canadians.

• (1735)

Mr. John Barlow: Madam Speaker, I appreciate the question, but the member just said herself that food prices are higher than they have ever been. It is just a coincidence then that the carbon tax has gone up 23%. The government is increasing taxes on farmers, truckers, processors, manufacturers, grocery store retailers, every other part of the supply chain, fertilizer and feed. All of those

things have gone up because of the carbon tax, but it is just a coincidence that food prices are also at a record high.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Xavier Barsalou-Duval (Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères, BQ): Madam Speaker, I would like to begin by saying that I will be sharing my time with the member for Berthier—Maskinongé.

We are here today to discuss the Conservatives' opposition day motion. It is not hard to guess what today's topic of discussion will be. For at least a year, I cannot recall a single Conservative opposition day that addressed anything but the carbon tax. Generally, when another party has an opposition day, we wonder what the next day's debate will be about. We do research, we discuss it and we look forward to finding out the topic. For the Conservatives, however, it never changes, it is always the carbon tax. It is like an obsession. For them, oil is a religion. Any interference with that and they lose their minds.

More specifically, today's motion seeks to uncover more information about the impact of carbon pricing on the national and provincial GDP for the period from 2022 to 2030. Essentially, the Department of the Environment did the calculations and submitted them to the Parliamentary Budget Officer. Projections were made to determine what the impact of carbon pricing might be. The Conservatives were outraged because the government ordered the Parliamentary Budget Officer not to disclose these documents.

To everyone's surprise, five minutes before today's session, the Liberals decided to unveil the famous documents that they did not want the Parliamentary Budget Officer to unveil. With the Conservatives' motion now moot, they had to come up with a new angle of attack. They had a look at the documents and examined the numbers. To their eyes, it was catastrophic: The impact on the GDP is expected to be about \$30 billion by 2030.

One member, who thought he was pretty clever, came to tell us this would be a big deal for Quebec. We have been saying for months that the carbon tax does not apply in Quebec. For the longest time, the Conservatives did not seem to get it, but eventually they understood. They understood and changed their tune.

Now they are back at it after finding one row. I know which row it is. It is row 17, column AN. The file tab is labelled “Growth_GDP_pivot”.

That was like the holy grail for them. They were pretty proud of their coup. The number on row 17 is \$5 billion, so when they saw “Quebec” and “2030”, the Conservatives concluded that the carbon tax would cost Quebec \$5 billion.

I wondered about a few things when I saw that, so I had a look at the document, which is an Excel spreadsheet. I looked at the estimated effect of the infamous carbon tax in 2030. The figure for Alberta is \$4.9 billion. The figure for British Columbia is \$3.5 billion. The figure for Saskatchewan is \$1.2 billion, and the figure for Ontario is \$8 billion. The figure for Quebec is \$5.25 billion.

I had to wonder. The figure for Quebec is \$5.25 billion, but the carbon tax does not apply there, so these are all indirect effects of the carbon tax. Quebec will therefore have more indirect effects from the carbon tax than Alberta as a whole. That is what the Conservatives are saying.

I do not know if the Conservatives have thought about this, but there may be another hypothesis, another possible explanation for that much-touted figure. The document provides an explanation, in the preamble, but it seems that the Conservatives may have been too lazy to read it. The document states that this is basically a theoretical model. It is based on the cost of the carbon tax and GDP growth over time. This is then applied to all sorts of calculations, taking into account greenhouse gas emissions by sector, to show the impact it would have in each of the provinces.

● (1740)

That is the effect that it would have in each of the provinces if the carbon tax applied everywhere. The thing is that the carbon tax does not apply in Quebec. It is as simple as that. The Conservatives have been lying through their teeth all day. They have gone all out. Basically, ordinary citizens need to start realizing what is happening. The Conservatives think that this will all go off without a hitch, that no one will ask any questions. They are talking about the \$5 billion in column AN for Quebec and saying that it is settled until 2030. They are saying that that is the impact of the carbon tax in Quebec, when in actual fact, the carbon tax does not apply in Quebec. It will never apply in Quebec because Quebec uses the carbon exchange model, so this \$5 billion they keep talking about does not exist. It is hypothetical and comes from a fictional, theoretical model in an Excel spreadsheet. That is where it comes from. It is as simple as that.

One question comes to my mind when I see all this. It took me five minutes of looking the Excel spreadsheet to figure it out. The Conservatives are the official opposition. They have a research team. They want to form the next government, yet they are being sloppy and behaving like amateurs. They think people will swallow anything. The Conservatives want to govern a G7 country, but they cannot even read an Excel file and some documents. Nevertheless, they take themselves seriously and think that people will trust them. That is just sad.

The moral of this story about the Conservatives trying to pull the wool over everyone's eyes is that their fearmongering must never be believed. Basically, they failed to prove that the carbon tax would be a disaster for Quebec's economy. No, all they proved was their shocking bad faith. That is all they proved. They have shown that they will say anything and everything to fool people into be-

Business of Supply

lieving their cockamamie stories. They think people are stupid. The good news is that they have been caught in the act. The Conservatives can huff and puff all they like, but what they say does not matter.

The fact is, the real carbon tax that Quebeckers pay is all the lovely subsidies the Liberal government hands out to oil companies. The Liberals blew \$35 billion on the Trans Mountain pipeline. In the last two budgets, they shelled out \$83 billion in carbon capture tax credits so oil companies could pump even more oil out of the ground. Who pays for all that? Ordinary people. It impacts their bottom line. It is a lot of money. Ordinary people foot the bill, but the Conservatives and Liberals will never talk about that. Instead, the Liberals finance oil companies with our tax dollars. It is downright scandalous. Quebec needs to get out of this country now. Canada needs to stop using Quebec taxpayers' money to finance oil companies and pollution.

The good news is that the train has already left the station in Quebec. No matter how worked up the Conservatives get or how much they huff and puff, the reality is that there are already 275,000 electric cars on the road in Quebec. The reality is that one in four cars sold in Quebec is a zero-emission car. The reality is that by 2030, gas-powered vehicles will no longer even be sold in Quebec. The Conservatives are panicking. The reality is that, sooner or later, Quebec is going to separate. Quebec will be independent and we will finally be free from the lies we keep hearing from the Conservatives, the Liberals and all federalists. All they do all day long is try to scare us out of moving forward as a nation, to prevent us from doing what we need to do to fulfill our destiny.

● (1745)

Mrs. Élisabeth Brière (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development and to the Minister of Mental Health and Addictions and Associate Minister of Health, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to hear that my colleague opposite understands math better than the Conservatives do.

It is odd that the Conservatives are saying that doing away with the carbon tax, or rather the price on pollution, will put more money in Canadians' pockets when, on the contrary, many economists and experts of all kinds are saying that the carbon tax is putting more money in Canadians' pockets. I would like to hear my colleague's comments on that. I would also like him to tell us how doing away with the carbon tax would set back the fight against climate change.

Mr. Xavier Barsalou-Duval: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for her question.

To be perfectly honest, I did not really examine the effect the carbon tax has on all Canadians, and I did not calculate how much money does or does not end up back in their pockets, because it simply does not apply in Quebec.

Business of Supply

The Conservatives do not seem to understand that, because they insist on discussing the carbon tax on every one of their opposition days, even though it does not apply in Quebec. Every opposition day, they show how little they care about Quebec, they ignore Quebec. Then they wonder why they are not making any headway there and why they have never had more than 10 MPs in Quebec since 2004. Sometimes they have no MPs at all; other times, they have five. It could also be because they do not talk about Quebec or care about it. All they care about is oil.

Mr. Marc Dalton (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge, CPC): Madam Speaker, I find my Bloc Québécois colleague's comments a bit sad.

He said that this carbon tax does not affect Quebec because it does not apply there, but the fact is, the Parliamentary Budget Officer says it is costing Canada more than \$30 billion per year, and that does have an impact on Quebec. We are also seeing a significant decline in quality of life, and people's earnings are going down year by year.

Does the Bloc member not realize that his party's support for the Liberals is having negative repercussions on both Canada and Quebec?

Mr. Xavier Barsalou-Duval: Madam Speaker, what I find sad is the Conservatives' total lack of intellectual integrity. That is what I find sad.

All day, they have been saying that the tax will have a \$5-billion impact on Quebec, but that is utterly false. That \$5 billion does not exist. It will never exist. It is a number in an Excel spreadsheet, and they know perfectly well that it does not apply to Quebec. All they wanted to do was lead us down the garden path.

[*English*]

Ms. Rachel Blaney (North Island—Powell River, NDP): Madam Speaker, the hon. member's speech made a lot of sense to me, and I have not heard that from every speech in the House today. I wanted to express my appreciation for that.

One of the things that concerns me, and I think we share this concern, is that the loopholes in the carbon pricing system mean that oil and gas companies are paying a tiny fraction of the cost of their pollution. We know, for example, that Suncor only pays one-fourteenth of the full carbon price.

I am just wondering if he shares that concern about seeing a lot of money going toward these oil and gas companies as they are making huge profits and not really respecting everyday Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Xavier Barsalou-Duval: Madam Speaker, my colleague raises a good point.

She asked me whether I am concerned about so much money ending up in the oil companies' coffers. My answer is yes, absolutely. The government is taking our tax dollars and sending them to the oil companies.

Here are some figures on oil company profits in 2023.

Suncor made \$2.8 billion in profits. Imperial Oil made \$4.9 billion. Enbridge made \$5.8 billion. Shell made \$28 billion.

How could we not feel sorry for them? Those companies really need our money. I think we have the answer to that question.

• (1750)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): A brief question, only.

The hon. Minister of Environment.

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his speech and for his many very relevant answers to questions.

I would like to ask him the following question.

The claim is that this will cost the Canadian economy \$25 million, but that does not take into account the annual benefits of investments made in the fight against climate change. That figure is \$25 billion a year now. It also does not take into account the costs associated with climate change that will be avoided between now and 2030. That figure is \$23 billion a year.

Would that not add up to two, almost three times as much as the Conservatives claim?

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The response will have to be brief.

The hon. member for Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères.

Mr. Xavier Barsalou-Duval: Madam Speaker, my response will be very brief.

The minister just raised a good point. However, I also wonder about the cost of all these tax credits that the Liberal government is offering to the oil companies and all these subsidies in terms of the impact on climate change.

That is information that we would very much like to have. Perhaps our next opposition day could be on that issue.

Mr. Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I commend my hon. colleague from Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères, who set the bar high, as usual. When we, the members of the Bloc Québécois, share our speaking time with each other, we always want to go first because we are all good and that puts pressure on the next person. I will try to make sure my speech is as good as my colleague's.

Today's motion is indeed repetitive, as my colleague mentioned, but it is quite simple. It calls for information. It is too bad that I cannot address the minister directly to ask him the question. I hope he will ask me or that he will want to participate in the exchange, but the first question that I will raise in the House is the following. Why did it take this motion for the document to be released? That bothers me tremendously.

Business of Supply

What I find the most difficult about politics is not the long hours, the travel or the documenting work. It is working with so many elected officials who are not always working for the common good or who do not always seem to be doing so. There is a lot of partisanship in political parties in general. One might wonder why the Liberal Party did not make this study public. Is it because it confused its electoral interests with the interests of the public? I am throwing that question out there because it is important and because we have a responsibility here. However, not everyone lives up to that responsibility.

Today is another Conservative opposition day on the carbon tax where we are hearing nonsense. Earlier, a member even referred to the line of the report that gives the projected impact the federal carbon tax would have in 2030, if it applied in Quebec. The cost would be \$5 billion. That number was used in question period today and members said that Quebec was losing \$5 billion every year. What is that if not a cheap populist approach? I would invite parliamentarians to elevate the debate and show some discipline.

They got the documents. Now, they want something else, they want the notes and the emails. What will they then do with those? That question deserves some thought, considering how the tables obtained today were used. In very short order, the information in the documents was cherry picked rather than subjected to serious analysis. What would happen with the emails and briefing notes? It is a worthwhile question.

I want to reassure everyone, however, that the Bloc Québécois has always supported transparency, and that we are not afraid of information. We want to know how measures like the federal carbon tax will affect the environment, even though the carbon tax does not apply in Quebec. We know that we are here, in the federal Parliament and that we are called upon to deal with things happening in the other provinces now and then. That is fine. We have to know the repercussions.

However, we should also find out how much it costs not having measures in place. How much does insurance cost? In recent years, the cost of insurance has risen by tens of billions of dollars. There have been increases of over \$30 billion. Do the claims for natural disasters not cost anything? I did not realize that. The floods and torrential rains that affected our farming operations, did that not cost anything?

Many businesses are on the verge of bankruptcy. This week I received a delegation of produce growers. According to what these Quebec strawberry and raspberry producers were telling me, dozens of members have announced that they will not be farming this year, because they lost too much last year and the government programs are not working.

They are now telling themselves that climate change is not going to stop, because there is a group of real winners promising to abolish the measures that can help mitigate climate change. It is rather astonishing. That same group of winners actually includes a decent number of elected representatives in Quebec, who agree to speak 9.5 times out of 10 on measures that do not apply to their constituents. That is what amazes me the most.

• (1755)

For a year I have been watching members from Quebec rise in the House and get all worked up over the big bad federal government, over the carbon tax. They say that our farmers are suffering. That does not apply in Quebec. Are they not supposed to be working for their constituents? I keep asking questions. I do nothing but ask questions.

To inform my Conservative colleague who is rising while I am in the middle of making a speech and who seems to be unaware, Quebec is covered by a carbon pricing system called the carbon exchange in association with California. This represents a much bigger market than Canada can offer, by the way. These measures are very effective. What we are seeing in Quebec is that having those measures ends up being less expensive for people and is having an impact on reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

Maybe the people in the other provinces who are unhappy with the big bad federal carbon tax should look at what Quebec has put in place, as they are doing on child care and as they want to do on dental care and on pharmacare. Let us look at what Quebec has been doing since 2014. We are still ahead on this. Let us look at what Quebec has done and how this has affected Quebecers. Maybe some will wish they got on board at the time, but no, because these people want pollution to be free.

I have a lot to say. I am going to run out of time again. However, I want to raise one important point today, concerning the much-touted Bill C-234. We, the Bloc Québécois, agreed to support this bill even though it did not apply in Quebec. We did so because we thought it seemed reasonable to give people who produce food credits for grain drying and for certain buildings. The bill came back from the Senate in early January. My first speech in 2024 was about Bill C-234. It had come back with amendments. Instead of returning it to the Senate and having it come back or not come back, or leaving it stuck there without making any progress, we thought that since it had something to offer grain farmers, that it could give them the credit for drying grain, we should support it. I understand the Conservatives' reaction. They initially said no because they wanted the bill to stay in its original form. That is fine; it is part of the debate. However, once the debate ends, voting has to follow.

Business of Supply

Now, I am going to talk about hypocrisy. It is June. We are coming up to the summer adjournment and we still have not voted on Bill C-234. As I said earlier, the first speech that I gave in early January was about this bill. Sometimes bills stall in the Senate, but that is normally not the case in the House of Commons. How does someone stall a bill? It is easy. Every time the government wants to put it back on the agenda, people keep rising to fill the time so that we cannot finish the debate and can never vote on the bill. One has to wonder why the Conservatives would want to avoid voting on their own bill. It is because they are getting political mileage out of it. They talk about the bill at least 12 times a day. If we do not vote on the bill, then they can call the government incompetent, unfair and mean. However, they could vote on the bill now and give grain farmers the credit next fall.

I hope there are farmers listening, and I hope they realize that their Conservative MPs are working in the interest of getting themselves elected, not in the interest of our farmers. That really irks me. It grates on me. It gets under my skin when MPs put their energy into scoring political points, posting clips on social media and launching fundraising campaigns. They are raising money. The people who donate that money do not have all the information. I just gave them all the information. The people who are up in arms about the carbon tax are currently blocking Bill C-234. So much for integrity. So much for noble intentions to help our farmers.

Earlier, I heard a member say that this is why grocery prices have gone up. We know there are all kinds of reasons for that. As my colleagues said earlier, the impact on Quebec is minimal. Yes, inflation is high, and there are other reasons for that. The member stands to answer questions, and he says the answer is no, it is the carbon tax. He can say that a dozen times, but that will never make it true. I would like MPs to be a little more diligent. Let us get serious about working for the common good. I think that would be a good thing.

• (1800)

[*English*]

Mr. Han Dong: Madam Speaker, on a point of order. I apologize for the interruption.

I missed the earlier vote on the third reading of Bill C-70. I humbly ask for the unanimous consent of the House to allow my vote to be recorded as in favour.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Does the hon. member have unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Dan Mazier (Dauphin—Swan River—Neepawa, CPC): Madam Speaker, I completely agree with my colleague about making the carbon tax discussion partisan.

I am really quite disappointed with the Bloc Québécois and how they think this does not impact them and does not impact the people of Quebec. The carbon tax knows no boundaries, just like carbon emissions. People from Quebec still have to buy energy from other provinces, other entities, actually. When farmers have to buy propane from Ontario, they have to pay a carbon tax. This is directly impacting the people in Quebec.

I wish to God they would understand that, and that this has a very severe impact on farmers right across the country, including in Quebec.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Perron: Madam Speaker, I am going to try to show restraint.

This is astounding. I hope my colleague has put his earpiece in to understand what I am about to say. The Bank of Canada has analyzed the impact of the carbon tax, and it is 0.02%. The carbon tax has a very minimal impact on Quebec. It is very minor.

I would like to inform my colleague that Quebec has its own system, known as the carbon exchange, which also has a certain economic impact. However, this system reduces gas emissions and saves money in the long term on climate disasters.

What I find disappointing is hearing other people say they are disappointed in the Bloc Québécois when, as I explained earlier, we were very reasonable when we agreed to an exemption for grain drying, even though it does not apply in Quebec. Those folks refuse to support it. My colleague certainly did not mention that. I find that disappointing.

Ms. Heather McPherson (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Madam Speaker, please excuse my French, but I am practising.

I like what my colleague said about transparency. I too think the government needs to be more open.

What steps does he think Parliament should take to achieve that?

Mr. Yves Perron: Madam Speaker, I congratulate my colleague for making an effort to speak French.

I would say that every elected member could make the effort to properly read the documents they are given. The Bloc Québécois is the third-largest political party, and we have a whole research department. Our researchers are brilliant and work very hard. They carry out analyses and give us a really detailed background document before each debate. That is why we sound so smart in the House of Commons.

I find it hard to believe that the government and official opposition do not have their own research departments that are just as big, if not bigger. This is one of those times when we doubt their integrity.

I would advise my colleagues to read the documents and to try to find arguments that align with their political views, but to please not make them up.

• (1805)

[*English*]

Mr. Dan Mazier (Dauphin—Swan River—Neepawa, CPC): Madam Speaker, before I get started, I would like to inform you that I will be splitting my time with the member for Haldimand—Norfolk.

The carbon tax cover-up continues. Canadians already know that the carbon tax is driving up the cost of living. It is increasing the cost of gas. It is increasing the cost of groceries. It is increasing the cost of home heating. Everything Canadians buy is more expensive because of the carbon tax. No matter how the Liberals try to spin it, we know that most Canadians pay more in carbon tax than they get back in these phony rebates.

The Liberals do not like talking about the carbon tax anymore, because they know it does not work. That is because the carbon tax is not an environmental plan; it is a tax plan. In fact, the Liberal environment minister actually admitted that the government does not measure the emissions reduction results of the carbon tax. In other words, the Liberals do not measure for results. We know why the Liberals do not measure the results of the carbon tax. It is because there is nothing to show for it.

Since the last carbon tax hike, Canada dropped four rankings in climate change performance, falling to 62 out of 67 countries. Canadians also learned that emissions went up in 2022, despite the Prime Minister's plan to quadruple the carbon tax. Even Canada's environment commissioner revealed that the Liberals are not on track to meet their own emissions reductions target. Despite their damning record, the Liberals are plowing ahead with their plan to quadruple the carbon tax.

The NDP-Liberal government is plowing ahead with its plan to quadruple the carbon tax on Canadians. In fact, the Prime Minister's radical environment minister refuses to tell Canadians if his government will raise the carbon tax further than their current plan to quadruple it.

I asked the environment minister at committee, "Has your government decided whether it will increase the carbon tax over \$170 a tonne past 2030? Give me a yes or no." The environment minister had the audacity to respond with, "I'm not obliged to answer yes or no to those questions." That is unbelievable.

If the government is re-elected, I have no doubt it will go beyond the plan to quadruple the carbon tax. After all, the former Liberal minister, Catherine McKenna, lied to Canadians in the 2019 election when she promised the carbon tax would not go up. During the 2019 election, she said, "The price will not go up." That was when the carbon tax was at \$20 a tonne. Now the Prime Minister is increasing the carbon tax to \$170 a tonne.

Canadians will not be fooled by the Liberals in the next election. That is because the next election will be a carbon tax election where Canadians will choose between common-sense Conservatives who will axe the tax or the costly coalition that will quadruple the tax.

Do members remember when the Liberals promised Canadians their government would be "open by default"? The Prime Minister promised Canadians his government would be the most open and transparent government in history. "Sunny ways", he said. Today, we find the government caught in another carbon tax cover-up.

Canada's watchdog, the Parliamentary Budget Officer, revealed that the Liberals were hiding a secret report from Canadians. Not only did we learn that the Liberals were keeping the internal carbon tax report a secret from Canadians, but we also learned that they

Business of Supply

placed a gag order on Canada's budget watchdog. Yes, the Liberals silenced the Parliamentary Budget Officer with a gag order, preventing him from speaking about the damning piece of evidence.

We must also ask ourselves why a government would hide its own economic analysis of the carbon tax. Well, now we know. After Conservatives were about to force the Liberals to release the report, the Liberals panicked and shared some information with the taxpayer-funded CBC. The CBC revealed that the government's carbon tax analysis proves that the carbon tax will lower GDP, gross domestic product, and harm Canada's national economy. According to the article, the carbon tax "is expected to reduce national GDP."

• (1810)

That is what the government's very own carbon tax analysis says. Now we know why the Liberals placed the Parliamentary Budget Officer under a gag order. The carbon tax will cost Canadians \$30.5 billion by 2030, but Canadians already knew that the carbon tax was damaging the economy. Canada already had the worst GDP growth of any G7 country in 2015. Canada's economic growth is projected to be the worst in nearly 40 advanced economies for this decade and for 30 more years to come. It is astounding.

Canada has lost \$460 billion in investment to the United States, and now we are seeing the consequences. Canadians cannot afford groceries. Canadians cannot afford gas. Canadians cannot afford to heat their homes. Things were not like this nine years ago. Things were not like this before the Prime Minister took office, that is for sure.

This is not the first time the Liberals have been caught in a carbon tax cover-up. My Conservative colleagues and I on the environment committee demanded that the Liberals release the emissions reduction data to prove that the carbon tax reduces emissions. The environment committee ordered the production of the government's emissions reduction data to see if the Liberals had any proof the carbon tax actually reduces emissions. It makes sense.

Business of Supply

The first time we did this, the Liberals insulted the committee and sent us a screenshot of the government website. The second time we ordered this information, the Liberals sent us an 18-page draft paper that was not even written by the government. It was so bad that the environment committee passed a third motion ordering the government's carbon tax emissions reduction data. We demanded that the government prove its carbon tax reduces emissions. Every single time we ordered this information, the government defied the committee and did not provide it. It could not prove whether its own carbon tax reduces emissions.

Even the Liberal's hand-picked chair of the environment committee stated, "My understanding—and maybe I'm wrong—is that there is no data specifically stating that the price on carbon resulted in X amount of reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. I don't even think that's possible, quite frankly." The Liberals and the NDP continue to hike the carbon tax, increasing the cost on gas, groceries and home heating on Canadians. Never has it become clearer that the carbon tax is not an environmental plan. It is a tax plan.

The Liberals are also hiding the truth about another so-called environmental policy. A few years ago, the Liberals quietly announced an \$8-billion program called the net-zero accelerator fund. They told Canadians that this \$8-billion net-zero accelerator fund was needed to reduce emissions. The Liberals claimed that they could reduce emissions by giving away tax dollars to Canada's largest emitters in exchange for a commitment to reduce emissions, but now we know the \$8-billion net-zero accelerator fund is also a complete scam.

In fact, Canada's environment commissioner revealed that 70% of the companies received money without any commitment to reduce emissions. What a farce. I asked the environment minister's top official what the emissions reduction target was for this \$8-billion net-zero accelerator fund. He did not know. The environment minister's top official would not say how many emissions an \$8-billion emissions reduction program was supposed to reduce. According to the government, the emissions reduction target of the net-zero accelerator slush fund is protected under cabinet confidence. How convenient. While the government gives away free cash to Canada's largest emitters, it hikes its costly carbon tax on Canadians.

On November 4, 2015, Canadians received a letter. It was addressed to "My dear friends". The letter read, "Canadians need to have faith in their government's honesty and willingness to listen. That is why we committed to set a higher bar for openness and transparency in Ottawa. Government and its information must be open by default. Simply put, it is time to shine more light on government to make sure it remains focused on the people it was created to serve—you." That letter was signed by the Prime Minister.

It is time for the Prime Minister to heed his own words.

• (1815)

Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I take umbrage at my colleagues' characterization of what I said about calculating emissions from the price on carbon. The Conservatives clipped what I said in committee and put it on Twitter, and I got some attention in my riding for that, which I appreciate because people pay attention when something is on Twitter.

However, what I was saying is that the reductions in emissions from the price on carbon are calculated as part of a modelling exercise, which is analogous to the unemployment rate. When we come out with an unemployment rate every month, it is not as though we have asked all 40 million Canadians, "Did you get a job this month or did you not get a job?" The number is arrived at through modelling, sampling and statistical methods. I would ask the member to be clear about that.

However, my question is the following: The other side says that the price on carbon is damaging the economy, but today there was a headline in *The Globe and Mail* saying, "Household wealth jumps to record" high. It rose by nearly \$550 billion during the first quarter of 2024. I know the opposite side likes correlations, but—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member for Dauphin—Swan River—Neepeewa.

Mr. Dan Mazier: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague, the chair of the environment committee, for coming out and having this debate today.

I am glad the member brought up the environment committee because the other thing is that we are always trying to get to the bottom of this. The Liberals say that they are reducing emissions, so we are simply asking them to prove it.

We had asked a very direct question in environment committee. We asked if the government measures the annual amount of emissions that are directly reduced from carbon pricing. Can members guess what the answer was? It was that the government does not measure the annual amount of emissions that are directly reduced by federal carbon pricing. If we do not measure, there is no result. It is pretty simple math.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am going to repeat my colleague's last sentence. He said that if we do not measure, there is no result. He is right. We have to measure.

If there is one thing the Conservatives are right about today, it is that we need information. We voiced our agreement right from the start. Parliamentarians need information to make sound decisions.

Business of Supply

Does my colleague agree with me that just knowing information on the economic impact of the carbon tax or other measures is not enough? Does he agree that we also need information on the cost of climate change and natural disasters? Should we not know how much more money ordinary people have to pay for their insurance, which is getting a lot more expensive? Should we not also consider the fact that our farmers are stuck in a shocking state of uncertainty, without any appropriate programs?

Does he agree that we need to reflect on all these measures, be consistent and try to reduce pollution and mitigate economic impacts? Does he agree with that? Is he interested in the impact of global warming or not?

[English]

Mr. Dan Mazier: Madam Speaker, I am totally interested. I farmed up until 2019. I am a lifelong farmer. I lived every day with climate change. I called it “weather” at the time.

The problem is that I do not have this long timeline and bottomless taxpayer pocket to make a living like the government does. It keeps on insulting Canadians and taxing them until they cannot make a living. What is going on, and how this government is continuing to drive farmers out of business because of its carbon tax and make everything unaffordable to even make a living in this country, is ridiculous, and this member should be more aware of that.

• (1820)

Ms. Heather McPherson (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Madam Speaker, my colleague talks about the costs to the Canadian economy, but surely he knows that research has shown that there could be up to a \$38-trillion cost to the global economy from climate change. The cost of climate change is wildly larger, and the impact on farmers, families and individuals in our country is going to be very severe.

What is the Conservative plan on dealing with the extraordinary cost of climate change? What will it cost our economy, our farmers and our families?

Mr. Dan Mazier: Madam Speaker, Conservatives will axe the tax, build the homes, fix the budget and stop the crime.

Ms. Leslyn Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk, CPC): Madam Speaker, in Canada, we have been blessed with generations of abundance and prosperity. Nine years ago, the average Canadian could be confident that, if they worked hard, saved their money and invested, they would be able to afford a home, start a family and leave more for their children than they inherited, and more than they had achieved. That is not the case anymore.

Under the Prime Minister, Canada has seen the worst growth in income per person since the 1930s and is on track for its worst decline in the standard of living in 40 years. The Liberal government has managed to squander the inheritance of generations through irresponsible and wasteful spending. These policies have not made Canada better off, but have impoverished Canadians. The Liberals have also misled Canadians about the true cost of the carbon tax and have failed to prove that their environmental plan is anything more than just a tax plan.

It is clear that Canadians across the country, whether they are farmers, carpenters, business owners or single parents, are just struggling to get by. Canadians are paying the price for this punitive carbon tax and see their grocery bills skyrocketing. It is so sad that the government not only failed to put forward policies in the best interests of Canadians, but also seeks to hide the truth from them and gaslights them by telling them that they are better off for paying more carbon tax every single year.

The government tried so hard to hide the truth about the carbon tax. It even tried to do it with its own report because it did not want Canadians to find out that the carbon tax is responsible for driving up the cost of almost everything in Canada. The Parliamentary Budget Officer had to call out the Liberal government for blocking the release of its own economic impact report.

Let us be clear. If Conservatives had not applied pressure on the government and shamed it into releasing even just part of the report, we would have never learned of the \$1,800 that each Canadian family is paying as a result of the carbon tax. I must say that the motion we have proposed today has already succeeded, in some respects, in holding the government to account. However, the government has not yet offered up all of the data, and Canadians deserve nothing less. They deserve nothing less than the full report and all the data the government has. That is why this motion remains of vital importance.

The Liberals have broken their promise of transparency time and again. It is not too late for them to release the full data on how the carbon tax hurts Canadians. To be fair, we see why the government did not want the numbers out. Its own report shows that the carbon tax has cost Canada \$30.5 billion in economic activity, in lost GDP, every single year. That \$30.5 billion amounts to the cost of \$1,800 per Canadian family every single year, which they do not get a rebate for. The trickle-down economic impact of this carbon tax is too high for a rebate to even begin to address it. This is terrible at a time when, on top of this outrageous cost to our economy and the cost to every single Canadian family across the country, the government knew there was a cost and that Canadians were suffering all along.

Business of Supply

● (1825)

Even though the Liberals knew the true cost of their carbon tax, they had the temerity to tell Canadians that this tax was making their lives better. They knew two million Canadians per month were going to the food bank. They knew one in five Canadians is skipping meals just to get by. They heard the stories of mothers diluting their baby's formula, even though it could lead to malnutrition, because they had to stretch the food for their baby due to a lack of money. They knew families were paying hundreds of dollars more for food for every year that the government was in power. Even members of the armed forces, people who fought in the war for our freedom, could not afford the price of groceries and have turned to food banks for help.

In the community of Haldimand—Norfolk, where I reside, the health unit came out with a report earlier this year that warned there was a growing number of residents who do not have enough to buy food that is healthy for their diets. The report said that for many, incomes are not enough to cover even the basic expenses.

Knowing all of this, the Liberal government refused to listen to the cries of Canadians, and it has not responded to the suffering. Even as the evidence mounts of the negative impact of these policies on everyday Canadians, the government has chosen year after year to raise the carbon tax on Canadians. In the middle of this historic cost of living crisis, the Liberal-NDP government decided earlier this year to hike the carbon tax yet again another 23%.

In fact, under the Prime Minister, fuel prices have surged by more than 50%. Then the Liberals refused to give families a summer break from the carbon tax so they could afford just a simple road trip. The Liberals are not done taxing Canadians. They plan to quadruple the carbon tax over the next six years, which would make everything even more expensive.

What the government has repeatedly failed to understand is that, when one taxes the farmer who grows the food, taxes the trucker who transports the food and taxes the store that houses the food, one taxes the Canadian who buys the food.

Why are Liberals putting Canadians through this financial pain at the worst time in our nation's history? The Liberals have always defended their ideological tax on the basis that carbon emissions will continue to go up, global temperatures will continue to rise and Canada will burn if there is no carbon tax, yet they fail to mention that Canadians and our industries already lead the world in sustainable practices. They also do not want to talk about the fact that there is no evidence to show the carbon tax works.

In closing, the Liberal government clearly does not believe in the efficacy of its own carbon tax regime. If it did, why would it not have measures to measure the impact?

● (1830)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): It being 6:30 p.m. and this being the final supply day in the period ending June 23, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forth with every question necessary to dispose of the opposition motion.

[Translation]

The question is on the motion.

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

[English]

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Madam Speaker, we request a recorded division.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Pursuant to Standing Order 81(18), the division stands deferred until later today.

* * *

MAIN ESTIMATES 2024-25

Hon. Anita Anand (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That the main estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2025, less the amounts voted in the interim supply, be concurred in.

She said: Madam Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Pickering—Uxbridge.

Before I begin, I would like to acknowledge that the lands on which we are gathered are part of the traditional unceded territory of the Algonquin Anishinabe peoples.

Today I rise to speak to the 2024-25 main estimates and supplementary estimates (A). The estimates help to ensure that parliamentarians and Canadians are informed of the government's expenditures and their resource plans so that we can be held to account for the allocation and management of public funds. The estimates, in conjunction with the budget and the economic and fiscal updates, reflect the government's annual resource planning and allocation priorities.

[Translation]

I will now talk about the 2024-25 main estimates. The document is divided into two parts.

Part I presents a summary of three main elements: the federal-government-wide projected expenditures for the 2024-25 fiscal year, a historical comparison from one year to another, and a breakdown of planned spending on transfer payments, operating and capital expenditures and public debt charges.

Part II presents the estimates by organization. It also provides more detailed information on the planned expenditures.

[English]

Of the 129 organizations presenting funding requirements in the main estimates, 11 are seeking more than \$5 billion in voted budgetary expenditures. I want to outline these because they are so very important to the functioning of our country.

Let us think about the \$28.8 billion for national defence, including support for Ukraine, and training and equipment for the Canadian Armed Forces. Let us think about \$20 billion for Indigenous Services Canada for programs for indigenous communities and legal settlements, \$11.4 billion for ESDC to build a stronger and more inclusive Canada to help Canadians live productive and rewarding lives, and \$8.4 billion for Global Affairs Canada to advance Canada's place in our international relations.

Let us not forget the \$8.4 billion for Health Canada, including funding to expand the Canadian dental care plan. By 2025, the fully rolled-out dental plan will cover nine million Canadians who currently do not have dental insurance.

I would be remiss if I did not take this opportunity to mention that budget 2024 lays out a bold strategy to unlock 3.87 million new homes by 2031. This includes a minimum of 2 million net new homes, on top of 1.87 million homes already expected by 2031. Federal actions will support at least 1.2 million new homes, and the federal government is calling on all orders of government to build at least 800,000 more homes by 2031.

I urge all parties to support these measures. They are necessary for—

• (1835)

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): I have to interrupt the President of the Treasury Board. The member for Montcalm is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Luc Thériault: Madam Speaker, there is no interpretation.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Can we please check to see if the interpretation is working?

The interpretation is working now.

The hon. President of the Treasury Board.

[*English*]

Hon. Anita Anand: Madam Speaker, I was saying that I really urge all parties to vote in favour of supports for new housing, supports for the Canadian Armed Forces and supports for Canadians via ESDC. These are measures that are important for the functioning of our country and for the protection and defence of our country. I am sure that all members of this House will recognize that importance.

In terms of the supplementary estimates (A), the estimates present a total of \$12.7 billion in incremental budgetary spending, which reflects \$11.2 billion to be voted on and a \$1.5-billion increase in forecast statutory expenditures.

The primary objectives for that new voted spending on the organizations responsible for that spending are settlements to address past grievances and historic harms committed against indigenous peoples. For example, \$1.8 billion is for agricultural benefits and claims and \$1.5 billion is for federal Indian day schools and Indian residential schools day scholar settlements.

Funds are also requested by Citizenship and Immigration Canada for support and services for migrants, such as \$411 million for the interim federal health program.

Business of Supply

Finally, \$604.9 million is requested by Transport Canada for purchase incentives for zero-emission vehicles.

[*Translation*]

The main estimates also include additional information about an important priority for our government: refocusing government spending, as first announced in budget 2023. At the beginning of this exercise, I asked ministers to find savings in their organizations. We have already announced some results. I also want to say that, with this initiative, we will refocus our government's spending on Canadians' current priorities while ensuring that we do not reduce the direct supports and services Canadians need.

As indicated in the main estimates, the government is on track to refocus \$15.8 billion over five years and \$4.8 billion annually thereafter. This is a very important exercise. It is our government's first initiative to address government spending. The goal of the exercise is to refocus spending, in other words, to spend smarter. The goal is not to reduce the programs and services Canadians rely on.

• (1840)

[*English*]

The fact of the matter is that the government is doing what Canadians across our country are doing, which is examining their own pocketbooks. By refocusing funds to Canadians' most important priorities in this way, the government is ensuring that it can continue to invest in Canadians and in the Canadian economy for years to come.

I want to assure members that this process is and will continue to be fully transparent, as it has been from the start. The government will continue to provide details on the initiative through departmental plans and departmental results reports. To that end, the estimates support Parliament's review of proposed new government spending and the bills ensuring appropriation that will occur thereafter.

Every year, the main estimates and related documents provide clear insight into how the government proposes to allocate taxpayer dollars and help to ensure that our spending is transparent and accountable. I cannot overstate the importance of this information to the functioning of our system of government and our parliamentary democracy.

In safeguarding our democracy, exercising oversight of government spending is one of the most important roles that parliamentarians can play on behalf of our citizens.

Business of Supply

To conclude, I would like to say that funding in the main estimates and supplementary estimates (A) is important to delivering on the government's commitment to the health and well-being of Canadians as well as other key priorities: affordable housing, health care, dental care and supports for Canadian families, the elderly included.

That is what we will continue to put on the table. That is what we urge all members of this House to vote in favour of, and to that end, I will encourage us all to support the motion before us.

Mr. Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC): Madam Speaker, the President of the Treasury Board talked about providing clear insight into spending in the departmental plans and the estimates process, as well as transparency on all government spending, yet the departmental plans and the departmental results show that almost one-quarter of departments had zero targets set and zero dates set to achieve such targets.

How is Parliament supposed to be providing oversight and proper vetting of spending when the government itself is not even providing targets for the spending or what it plans to achieve in the spending on fully one-quarter of its programs?

Hon. Anita Anand: Madam Speaker, as always, I enjoy receiving the hon. member's astute questions, including at committee, but if we look across the departmental results reports and the departmental plans, oversight is being done through those plans and through the results reports that we publish every year.

In certain cases, the targets, if they have been recently set, need sufficient time to be filled in, but let us make no mistake: They will be filled in by the departments' deputy ministers, and we certainly put the message out to deputy ministers to make sure that their departmental results reports are as complete as possible.

We believe strongly in transparency. That is why I recently published our trust and transparency overall strategy for the Government of Canada. That includes not only departmental results reports but also a strategy to engage the Canadian public in ensuring a more transparent government and in ensuring that we have time limits relating to the release of information that is requested through ATIP.

Members can see that we do have a commitment to transparency across the board.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the minister a question on a topic she is quite familiar with because of her former role.

What does she think about the budget being allocated to defence across the country? As a member of NATO, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Canada should theoretically be investing 2% of its GDP in defence, but that is not happening. It is not clear that the plan that has been presented will help Canada meet that target.

Could she elaborate on that? I think it is a bit surreal that a Bloc MP is asking that question, but I think it is important.

• (1845)

Hon. Anita Anand: Madam Speaker, I appreciate my hon. colleague's question very much.

We continue to support the Canadian Armed Forces, for example by providing \$28.8 billion in our budget. We continue to support them with other measures as well.

We recently released an update to our defence policy. It increases our spending for the Canadian Armed Forces, and we continue to increase our spending to achieve the 2% target, but there is still a lot of work to be done on that score, and that includes our procurement and our work with our NATO allies, as well as with the United States.

I would like to mention that when I was minister of national defence, I announced \$40 million for NORAD, the North American Aerospace Defense Command, for our continental defences, especially in the Arctic. It is a priority for our government and for me too.

[*English*]

Ms. Heather McPherson (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Madam Speaker, one of the things we have found most disappointing in the recent budget has been the failure to support people living with disabilities. The amount that has been allocated is about six dollars a day. It will not scratch the surface. We know that every community and every country must be judged by how we treat those who are most vulnerable within our community. The failure to support those who need the most support from the government is really shocking.

I am wondering what the minister has to say about the fact that her government has by and large abandoned people living with disabilities in this country after promising them and giving them hope that there would be something for them in the budget.

Hon. Anita Anand: Madam Speaker, we know that there is more work to do, but I want to underline that this is the first time in the history of Canada that a disability benefit has been introduced. I would like to say that we are the government that put that on the table, and we are the government that will continue to work with persons with disabilities to ensure that we are augmenting the supports across the board.

It is an issue I take very seriously, accessibility across the board, at the Treasury Board Secretariat. I know my colleagues in the House and across government will agree with me that we are standing behind the community of persons with disabilities.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Democratic Institutions and Intergovernmental Affairs (Cybersecurity), Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to speak to the main estimates

Business of Supply

One of the key components to our estimates process is to ensure that we have an open, transparent and accountable government. Canadians and the parliamentarians who represent them have a right to know how public funds are being spent so they can hold government to account. That is why, in addition to the estimates documents, reporting tools such as the GC InfoBase and the Open Government portal provide easily accessible and easy-to-understand information to Canadians about authorities approved by Parliament.

With respect to the specific numbers, I will begin with the highlights of the main estimates for 2024-25. This year's main estimates present a total of \$191.6 billion in voted-on spending. Also presented are non-budgetary expenditures of \$1.2 billion. Some significant investments included in these estimates are \$28.8 billion for national defence, including support for Ukraine, and training and equipment for the Canadian Armed Forces; \$20.9 billion for Indigenous Services for programs for indigenous communities and legal settlements; \$8.4 billion for Global Affairs Canada to advance Canada's international relations; \$8.4 billion for Health Canada, including funding to expand the Canadian dental care plan; and \$5.6 billion for the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation for much-needed housing infrastructure.

All the funding in the main estimates allows the government to provide many different programs and services to Canadians and support other levels of government, organizations and individuals through transfer payments. The statutory spending in the estimates, which is the spending that has been approved in previous legislation, includes \$81.1 billion in elderly benefits, \$52.1 billion for the Canada health transfer, \$25.3 billion for fiscal equalization, \$16.9 billion for the Canada social transfer and \$11.4 billion for the Canada carbon rebate.

I would now like to turn to the supplementary estimates (A). Overall, the estimates present a total of \$12.7 billion in programs and supports for Canadians. Here are some of the highlights. First I would like to note that much of the new voted spending is requested by Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada for settlements with indigenous groups. As the Prime Minister has stated on several occasions, no relationship is more important to Canada than our relationship with indigenous peoples. This is why we are continuing to work collaboratively with indigenous peoples to honour treaty rights and resolve historical wrongs.

To that end, the supplementary estimates include \$1.8 billion for agricultural benefits claims. These funds would support the negotiation and settlement of agricultural benefit claims related to Treaty Nos. 4, 5, 6 and 10, which are part of a series of 11 treaties made between the Crown and first nations from 1871 to 1921. There is also \$1.5 billion for federal Indian day schools and Indian residential schools day scholars settlements. This will be used for compensation, administration costs and legal services relating to these two settlements.

There is \$1 billion to replenish the specific claims settlement fund, based on anticipated payments for negotiated settlements and tribunal awards up to \$150 million. The supplementary estimates also include \$447.9 million to settle historical claims, and the federal government is committed to resolving legal challenges through respectful discussions and mediation. As such, it is in active discus-

sions related to various legal challenges. The funding would ensure that Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs is in a position to quickly implement negotiated settlements should agreements be reached.

Finally, there is \$393.1 million for land-related claims and litigation, and another \$303.6 million for a settlement providing compensation for individuals placed in federal Indian boarding homes.

• (1850)

There is new voted spending for the Department of Indigenous Services to improve the lives of indigenous peoples and create new opportunities in communities across the country. For example, there is \$769.7 million for water and waste-water treatment. This includes the construction of new water and waste-water infrastructure on reserves, repairs and upgrades to existing systems, facility operations and maintenance, training of system operators, water monitoring and testing, and development of local governance capacity.

The Department of Indigenous Services is also requesting \$633.5 million to improve services that preserve the ability of indigenous families to care for children in their communities, such as the availability of safe and adequate housing for children on reserve.

Let me also mention spending for immigration. Canada continues to bring people from other countries to safety and provide them with resettlement and settlement supports. As such, the Department of Citizenship and Immigration is seeking funding for support and services for migrants. This includes \$411.2 million for the interim federal health program, which provides limited temporary health care coverage to specific groups of foreign nationals, including asylum claimants and refugees who are not yet eligible for provincial or territorial health insurance. There is also \$314.5 million for the interim housing assistance program, through which the government provides funding to provincial and municipal governments to address housing pressures resulting from increased volumes of asylum claimants.

Business of Supply

As the House knows, a priority of the government is to also cut greenhouse gas emissions. To help meet our 2030 emissions reduction target and reach net zero by 2050, we are making it more affordable for Canadians to switch to zero-emission vehicles. Accordingly, the Department of Transport is requesting \$604.9 million to provide purchase incentives of up to \$5,000 for eligible zero-emission vehicles.

Another organization, the Department of Veterans Affairs, is requesting \$471.4 million for compensation and administrative costs relating to settlement for veterans as part of the Manuge class action settlement.

I would also note that, of the planned voting, about \$1.6 billion relates to the funding announced in budget 2024. This includes the already mentioned incentives for the zero-emission vehicle programs as well as the interim federal health program.

The voted funding already announced in the budget also includes \$141.2 million for temporary accommodation and support services for asylum claimants, \$121.3 million for the Inuit child first initiative and \$100.5 million to advance indigenous children and family service laws.

I would also like to address the changes in the plan's statutory expenditures, which are shown for information purposes. Statutory budgetary expenditures are forecast to rise \$1.5 billion, 0.6%, to a total of \$259.1 billion.

Finally, there are statutory non-budgetary expenditures. These are forecast to rise, reflecting the additional allocation of \$1.3 billion to the International Monetary Fund's Poverty Reduction and Growth Trust announced in September 2023.

To conclude, the funding for federal programs and services presented in the main estimates and supplementary estimates (A) demonstrates the government's actions to make life better for all Canadians. It shows that the government is responding to immediate needs while continuing to make long-term investments that benefit all of our citizens.

I would remind my hon. colleagues that we have a responsibility to authorize the spending on behalf of and for the benefit of Canadians, and I encourage everyone to support this.

• (1855)

Mr. Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am looking at the main estimates, and Public Safety is asking for \$1.6 billion, yet when I look at its departmental results, it failed to achieve 54% of its goals for the year. Why should Canadians trust the Liberal government to continue such spending, \$1.6 billion, when it is failing over 50% of the time?

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Madam Speaker, as I have said before, Conservative cuts have consequences. While we are investing in public safety to keep Canadians safe, Conservatives would actually cut programs, things like keeping our communities safe with investments in our guns and gangs programming and helping to support young people in their communities. Conservatives cut the budget for public safety and then stand up here and claim that they somehow would provide safer communities. Those cuts have conse-

quences. What we are seeing is that our government investing to keep our communities safe.

[Translation]

Ms. Sylvie Bérubé (Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou, BQ): Madam Speaker, we are talking about the government's budget, but what about indigenous people? We know very well that many communities do not even have water. Is there anything for that in the budget? Climate change is also a big problem. People in these communities are even experiencing food insecurity.

Seniors aged 65 to 74 have also been forgotten. Is there anything for them in the budget?

[English]

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Madam Speaker, it is absolutely a shame to see any community across this country without clean and safe drinking water. It is precisely why I outlined, in the main estimates, significant funding to help these communities not only to make the infrastructure investments, but also to make the investments in job training to ensure that members of the community can also be part of the continued work ongoing, to ensure that every community right across this country has access to safe and clean drinking water.

• (1900)

Mr. Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC): Madam Speaker, I would like to correct the record. If the member looks at the public accounts, she will see that the spending actually started to drop in 2015, as soon as the Liberal government took over. There were cuts to public safety and also to CBSA. As the member talked about safety in the community, I noticed one of the failures of the government was that it set a target of 5,200 police-reported crimes for 100,000 population, yet it actually ended up with 6,625. That was a 27% higher number of police-reported crimes than what the Liberals targeted. Why is the government failing to protect its citizens?

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Madam Speaker, on the contrary, Conservatives continually gutted our budgets, including budgets of CBSA, for example to inspect illegal guns and drugs coming into this country. We have made the right kinds of investments to support communities. Conservatives like to cherry-pick numbers without looking at the overall record, and theirs was an abysmal failure. We are making those investments back to keep our communities safe.

Business of Supply

Ms. Lori Idlout (Nunavut, NDP): *Uqaqtittiji*, I want to thank the member for speaking so much to indigenous issues and expenditures for Indigenous Services. Unfortunately, as the member knows, because there has been underinvestment for decades, including in this budget, with upwards of a \$425-billion infrastructure gap, these expenses that we are going to see are only going to address 1% of the infrastructure needs for indigenous peoples. If the Prime Minister does say that there is no relationship more important than that with the first nations, Inuit and Métis, why has the Liberal government spent so little to improve indigenous people's lives?

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Madam Speaker, I agree with the member that there have been decades of underinvestment in our indigenous communities, and it is something that we must continue to invest in and support. We will continue to make those investments. We are going to make sure that we are doing it with each community, making sure that we get this right, and we are committed to doing so.

Mrs. Stephanie Kusie (Calgary Midnapore, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is the evening when we vote on the estimates, and they are estimates, in fact, because we really never know how much the government is going to spend, so we really can only estimate. Today proves to be no different.

This is the result of two things. First, there is the complete out-of-control spending by the Liberal government. We have seen it since 2015, but it has increased rapidly since 2020, and now it is just completely out of control. The second thing, as a result of this out-of-control spending, is that the government makes Canadians pay for its incompetence and for its moral disregard, time and time again. This has three negative effects on the nation. It taxes generational wealth. It taxes the middle class. It destroys productivity.

Let us take a quick look at the numbers to justify what I am saying. We have a current deficit of \$39.8 billion. In the beginning, I used to have to double-check myself to see if I was supposed to be saying "million". Now, I feel very confident in saying billion because it is, in fact, \$39.8 billion. There is new spending of \$52.9 billion, which is a huge number. There are debt servicing costs of \$54.1 billion and additional debt servicing costs of \$1.9 billion. That was a surprise I raised at the government operations committee to the President of the Treasury Board, which I think I would notice an anomaly like that on my credit card, were that the case.

The government claims to have refocused \$15.4 billion of spending. That was the government's initiative, but that initiative is 3.5 times less than the actual amount of new spending. There is quite a differentiation between the two. We see here a government that just has an absolute spending problem.

In fact, it was reported in *The Globe and Mail*, in an article I have. It states, "the government does not have a revenue problem. Annual federal revenue is increasing and has grown (nominally) more than \$185-billion (or 66.2 per cent) from 2014-15 to 2023-24.

"Before tabling the budget in April, the government was already anticipating annual revenue to increase by more than \$27-billion this year. But the government has chosen to spend every dime it takes in (and then some) instead of being disciplined.

"Years of unrestrained spending and borrowing have led to a precarious fiscal situation in Ottawa."

The government "largely chose" to continue spending, and "clearly raising taxes to generate revenue was unnecessary and could have been avoided with more disciplined spending." It was unnecessary.

Next, I would like to provide some examples of that wasteful spending. There was the \$169.5 million sole-sourced contract for ventilators purchased at \$220,000 each, that have now been sold for \$6 apiece for scrap. That is the first example. The second example is Parks Canada spending \$12 million on culling deer in British Columbia, a job my caucus colleagues say that Canadian hunters would have done for free. The Auditor General identified at least \$32 billion in overpayments and suspicious payments by ESDC, which is not a surprise at all with the current government.

In March, the Parliamentary Budget Officer, someone the government likes to gag, released a report, warning that the Prime Minister's government spending plans remained out of control. The amount that taxpayers spend just to service the national debt is expected to go up 33.4% in 2024 and 11.6% in 2025. That means the amount we pay just to cover the interest on the national debt will rise from \$35 billion to \$46.7 billion in 2024 and to \$52.1 billion in 2025.

It is important to put those figures in perspective because those debt payments offer no services and rob precious dollars from services that the government likes to brag about. The debt payments will be double the amount we will spend on the military. When I make reference to these amounts, they are not small amounts that I am referring to.

I will now turn to the second part, which is the pain that the government inflicts upon its citizens in an effort to compensate for its spending problem. This is out of incompetence and a lack of moral guidance.

- (1905)

The first example I will give is from an article in *The Globe and Mail*. It states, "50 per cent of taxpayers who claim more than \$250,000 [worth] of capital gains in a year earned less than \$117,592 in normal annual income from 2011 to 2021.... Contrary to the government's claims, the capital gains tax...will [actually] affect 4.74 million investors in [different] Canadian companies."

This also means, as I said, regarding the productivity, as it says in the article, "that potential entrepreneurs or investors are more likely to take their ideas and money elsewhere, and Canadians will continue to suffer the consequences of a stagnating economy."

On the carbon tax, just this week Canadians discovered that, for years, the Prime Minister has been hiding the fact that the carbon tax will cost Canadians \$30.5 billion by 2030 and that this works out to \$1,824 per family in extra annual costs.

Business of Supply

As well, I will be splitting my time with the wonderful member for Northumberland—Peterborough South, an individual I like and enjoy very much.

I will continue with my examples. CTV News wrote that Joseph Steinberg, an associate professor with the University of Toronto's economic department, said, "I don't think that this...policy is likely to be successful". He also said, "Given what my research into policies on raising taxes on the wealthy has found...since we don't enforce any rules against tax avoidance and tax evasion, these kinds of policies are really unlikely to raise much, if any, in the way of tax revenues." This is not surprising given the ESDC fraud I mentioned moments ago.

The CTV news article went on to say, "The Canada Revenue Agency estimates Canada loses nearly \$3 billion a year in offshore investing, which is close to how much the government projects to bring in each year with the changes."

In addition, economist Jack Mintz estimated that "1.25 million individuals—not just 44,000—will make a capital gain greater than \$250,000 at some time in their taxpaying life", not just this year alone. He states, "Many of these people will have relatively modest incomes and only earn extraordinary capital gains at retirement or death."

The official opposition shares these stories every day, during question period and in our interventions, in the House of Commons.

Jack Mintz says, "How many Canadian investors would be affected by higher capital gains taxes at both the personal and corporate level? In 2021, 4.74 million tax filers (15.7 per cent)... Of those, 69 per cent—3.29 million—had incomes below \$100,000."

They are the middle class. He goes on to say, "The increase in corporate capital gains tax is going to hurt many Canadians investors with middle or modest incomes."

The Globe and Mail states, "the Liberal plan to raise the taxable portion of capital gains over \$250,000 for individuals, and of all capital gains for corporations in most trusts, is not the end result of a careful examination of tax policy, but of the Liberals' need to raise billions of dollars to plug a hole in their latest budget." The government is always reactive.

The article goes on to say, "The increase to the capital-gains inclusion rate will take place [right] when Canada's lagging productivity needs a boost. Higher taxes on investment will be a drag on the economy and could harm our diminishing prosperity."

The government has had years in office to address the issues dominating Canadian politics today, such as housing costs, affordability and, yes, the income gap, which has grown steadily since 2015, yet it has failed to address these.

The Financial Post has a headline I love, which reads, "Liberals playing with inclusion rates is divisive policy at its worst". The article states, "the government ignored almost every single recommendation made about the proposals by very qualified people and great organizations. The Joint Committee on Taxation of the Canadian Bar Association and CPA Canada made some excellent technical recommendations [that were ignored]."

Thomas Sowell is quoted in the article as saying, "The real goal should be reduced government spending, rather than balanced budgets achieved by ever-rising tax rates to cover [increasing] spending."

As I come to the last 30 seconds of my speech, I would just like to reiterate what I said at the beginning. The current government has a significant spending problem, which is evident by the numbers I have put here today. It does not responsibly address it through lowering its spending and through not having unethical overspending like we see with the arrive scam and the green slush fund; rather, the government enforces this on Canadians. It makes them pay for its incompetence and for its moral disregard through tools like the carbon tax and the capital gains tax. This has to stop. Tonight in the estimates, though, we are not going to—

• (1910)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Questions and comments, the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Democratic Institutions and Intergovernmental Affairs (Cybersecurity), Lib.): Madam Speaker, in part of the estimates, we have included funding for the Canada dental care plan. Would the member opposite tell Canadians tonight that this is a program she would recommend we cut and that seniors who need dental care should not have access to that?

Mrs. Stephanie Kusie: Madam Speaker, it is very sad that the government continues to point to failed programs. I have said time and time again that the government takes so much from Canadians and gives back little crumbs with the hope of keeping Canadians dependent. The capital gains tax is just another example of that. If the government had its way, Canadians would be dependent on it forever.

Conservatives believe in Canadians. We will fix the budget and right the deficit and the debt.

[Translation]

Mr. Maxime Blanchette-Joncas (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Madam Speaker, it is always a pleasure to hear my colleague speak.

The Conservatives pride themselves on being the party of common sense. Something in the supplementary estimates does not make sense. I am referring to a \$3-million increase for something that had already been allocated \$22 million. Ottawa is investing an additional \$3 million in little medals to be awarded in connection with the coronation of King Charles III following the death of Queen Elizabeth II.

More than 70% of Quebecers oppose the monarchy. It is an archaic symbol and an undemocratic institution. I would like my colleague to tell me whether her common-sense party is for or against the monarchy.

• (1915)

Mrs. Stephanie Kusie: Madam Speaker, I am not going to talk about the monarchy, but I am going to talk about common sense. A Conservative government will have something for all Canadians, including Quebecers.

Common sense does not just apply to the budget or to just one province. It applies to all of the provinces, including Quebec. Common sense is for all Canadians.

[*English*]

Mr. Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC): Madam Speaker, in the main estimates, there is over \$46 billion just in interest payments on the debt of the government. Could the member explain some of the things that Canadians could use that \$46 billion for instead of paying off wealthy bankers?

Mrs. Stephanie Kusie: Madam Speaker, what could Canadians not use this \$46 billion for? They could use it to put groceries on the table, to put gas in their vehicles and to keep their homes warm. They could use it to buy homes if there were a better supply of habitations in this country at this time.

I think the point my wonderful colleague from Edmonton West is making is that the government has unnecessarily spent not only this generation but following generations into complete debt and despair. The estimates that we will be voting on this evening are another example of that.

I wish I could offer a brighter outlook to my colleague from Edmonton West, but I see gloom and doom ahead until a Conservative government is elected.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Madam Speaker, Conservatives say they stand with Ukraine. In the main estimates, there is funding to help support and train Ukraine. Will they finally stand and vote to support Ukraine?

Mrs. Stephanie Kusie: Madam Speaker, this is a Conservative caucus, an opposition and a government in waiting that supports democracies around the world. I was very proud to testify in front of the member at the procedure and House affairs committee today, where her government, frankly, once again let parliamentarians from all parties down by not reporting the cyber-attack.

My point is that Conservatives support democracies around the world, such as in Taiwan. We support those who have been oppressed in Cuba or in South Korea. This also includes Ukraine. The first step the government could take is protecting us from those who not only try to intimidate—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Alexandra Mendès): Resuming debate, the hon. member for Northumberland—Peterborough South.

Mr. Philip Lawrence (Northumberland—Peterborough South, CPC): Madam Speaker, I want to start this conversation with a quote from Margaret Thatcher. Of course, the honourable

Business of Supply

and fabulous Margaret Thatcher said that the problem with socialism is that one eventually “run[s] out of other people's money.”

We have hit that point. I think it is official. The government has hit rock bottom. However, it will find a way, just as it has done with ethics scandals, to find a level even below rock bottom.

Let us take a look at the facts right now. When we look at the way to balance a budget or to bring a fiscal house in order, a government has three levers. One is economic growth. The more an economy grows, the more production there is, and the more there is to tax. That brings us to the next one, which is revenue. The more revenue there is, the more money is coming in. The higher the taxes are, the more revenue is coming in. The third part is expenditures. We have seen, of course, that this is the money going out the door. We have growth. We have the money coming in the door and going out the door. Let us take a systematic approach. We will start with government expenditures.

The reality is that no government has ever spent anywhere near the amount of money the government will be spending this year and what it has forecast in its main estimates. The main estimates present a spending of a total of \$449.2 billion; \$191.6 billion is to be voted on, and \$257.6 billion is statutory.

We can take that and look at where we were at the end of 2015, when we were spending about \$250 billion. This is nearly a doubling of government expenditures in less than 10 years. That is truly a shocking number. The reality is that this could actually be affordable, potentially, if we had the economic growth to back it up. However, as we will see in a moment, we do not. The reality is that more Canadians are paying more money. Nine out of 10 in the middle class are paying more. We have seen, right from the Parliamentary Budget Officer, that the carbon tax is costing the majority of Canadians money. We saw, actually, just from their own secret report, because of the pushing and prodding of one of my colleagues at finance committee, they admitted that \$30 billion in additional funds is coming out of Canadians' pockets just in the form of indirect costs of the carbon tax alone.

We have seen that the spending just keeps going. The question we will often hear from the other side of the aisle is this: What would Conservatives change?

Here are a couple of things that I will just rattle off: \$250 million to the Asian infrastructure bank, \$76 million of funding awarded in the green slush fund to brazen conflicts of interest, \$12 million in ineligible contracts, \$50 million to Mastercard and \$12 million to Loblaw's for fridges. It just goes on, with \$200 million to McKinsey and millions of dollars being wasted by the government. It is truly just a firehose of spending going anywhere and everywhere. We have seen the expenditures increase and increase.

Business of Supply

Before we talk about the increase in taxes, let us talk a bit about economic growth. The reality is that, if an economy is thriving and doing well, it will benefit everyone, depending on how the wealth gets split up. There are arguments to be had, and those are arguments that are valuable and should be had. If, however, there is no revenue coming in, there is no revenue to redistribute. Often, in worse economic times, the ones who suffer the most are the most vulnerable.

Let us look at the government's economic record. Since 2015, we are looking at a nearly flat or a zero growth in GDP per capita. GDP per capita can really be used interchangeably with incomes, because it is a measure of how much every Canadian's economic livelihood is increasing on average. We have had almost no growth when it comes to Canadians.

● (1920)

We have also seen record numbers of children now falling into poverty and people going to the food banks, including record numbers of children. We have an economy that is stalled. We have a lost decade here in Canada.

It is not just me saying what I am going to say. Members can look to John Manley, former Liberal finance minister; Bill Morneau, former Liberal finance minister; and David Dodge, current Liberal and former governor of the Bank of Canada. These individuals are all saying the same thing: Canada needs to focus more on growth. We need to have our economy grow because, of course, this will help our citizens, and it will also help secure our government. More economic growth means the government can collect more and do more to protect health care and other important social safety nets. Just to sum up, we have actually had record revenue because the current government is obsessed with increasing taxes and increasing the burden on middle-class Canadians. Nine out of 10 people pay more.

Of course, the Liberals' most recent cash grab is the capital gains tax. They create the fabrication that it will only affect the ultrarich. Nothing could be further from the truth. LiUNA, a union, recently came out opposing it because its members realize it. Physicians, electricians and mechanics realize it. Canadians who are taking the steps to secure their retirement through a secondary rental property realize it. Parents who are buying a secondary house to invest in their children, because the children cannot afford a house anymore, realize it. This is a cash grab. It is true that there is a limited portion of the population that will realize it in a given year; however, the reality is that although only 1% of Canadians will die in a year, 100% of us will eventually die. Much the same logic applies to capital gains.

We have seen the government increase the tax burden on the middle class to pay for the McKinseys and, perhaps worst of all, to pay \$54 billion in interest, which goes to wealthy bankers and bondholders. The government is literally robbing the middle class, endangering our most vulnerable in order to help its Liberal-insider buddies. That is the Liberals' story on taxation. We have seen what happened to spending, and the Liberals' growth is equally as bad.

What is the result of this? People at the Fraser Institute said that we are in the worst decline in the standard of living in the last 40 years. I am thankful for the Fraser Institute's work, but simply talk-

ing to our neighbours and to our constituents will reveal the same thing. It was almost taken as a given, when I was growing up, that we would do better than our parents and that my kids would do better than I did. This was just a reality that was going to happen. Unfortunately, we have seen that reality disappear in front of our very eyes. At this point, to be able to afford a house is beyond the aspirations of many Canadians and many young folks, who are just struggling to barely get by.

We are in a place where there are encampments from coast to coast to coast. There are dumpster-diving communities, who need to get food out of garbage cans. Workers are living out of their cars. Students are living underneath bridges. This is not right, and we can quote all the empirical numbers we want, but all we really need to do is go out there and talk to our constituents, and we will hear just the same. I am sure, whether Conservative, Liberal or NDP, we are all hearing the same thing.

As I noted when I started my speech, Margaret Thatcher once very wisely said that the problem with socialism is that one eventually "run[s] out of other people's money." With a debt of over \$1.3 trillion, with interest payments of over \$54 billion and with a government incapable of doing the most basic of services, such as delivering passports, we have hit rock bottom. I do not want to see what is next in the current Liberal government.

● (1925)

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Democratic Institutions and Intergovernmental Affairs (Cybersecurity), Lib.): Madam Speaker, the hon. member mentioned the most vulnerable, yet he and his party have voted against dental care for the most vulnerable and child care for families across this country. They voted against the school food program and the Canada child benefit. Canadians who could use investments and supports are the ones the Conservatives vote against. Who do they stand up for? It is the wealthiest in this country, fewer than 1%, whom they are speaking up for, saying that they should pay lower taxes than someone such as a nurse. If the member cares about the most vulnerable in this country, why do the Conservatives vote against measures to support Canadians while protecting their wealthy friends at every turn?

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Madam Speaker, I could go into a policy debate, but the reality is that while the government has been in power for the last nine years, there are 55% more children in poverty. There are 0% GDP rates. People cannot afford houses and they cannot afford food, and there is a child care program that does not deliver child care. The Liberals have a food program that does not deliver food. They only know how to deliver for Liberal insiders.

Business of Supply

[Translation]

Ms. Andr anne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Madam Speaker, speaking of people who need help, my colleague just mentioned families. However, another group that needs help is seniors, and something that they are calling for is the passage of Bill C-319, which his party supported both in the House and in committee.

There are people who need extra help, and that includes seniors. Of course, families need help, but seniors are also asking to be treated fairly. The government decided to only increase the pensions of seniors aged 75 and up, but financial insecurity does not wait for people to turn 75. Seniors are asking for a little more old age security income.

Does my colleague still support this bill, as his party has from the start?

• (1930)

[English]

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Madam Speaker, I have absolute agreement with the member on the fact that seniors are not doing well. They suffer the most when we have high rates of inflation. As my colleagues across the way pointed out, the reality is that the rate of inflation has increased, but all the costs in that high inflation are still baked in, and other programs have not kept up with that.

The best thing we can do for seniors is to make sure that we have a tight monetary policy to keep inflation under control so that their expenses do not get out of control. We need to bring down housing costs for seniors. We need to look at every possible solution to help those who built this great country.

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Madam Speaker, my colleague says we need to do everything possible to help people with affordability. The NDP has fought for the grocery rebate, fought for dental care and fought for pharmacare, which, for people with diabetes, can cost \$1,000 a month. We have fought for affordable housing.

Unfortunately, Conservatives blocked every single one of those bills that the NDP brought forward when we were pushing the government to do the right thing for people. I am a bit surprised. Conservatives are saying on the one hand that we have to use all these tools, and on the other hand they are blocking all the tools that help people.

Why will Conservatives not join with the NDP and make sure that people are being taken care of? Thousands of people have benefited, in Conservative ridings, from the dental care program. Why does the member not support these important initiatives?

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Madam Speaker, the reality is that history has proven over the last 100 years that socialism fails every time it is tried. We see it here in Canada. We see people going to food banks in record numbers. We see children in record levels of poverty. Canadians have never been poorer. They cannot afford a house. They cannot afford food.

What will it take for the member to realize that socialism has failed?

Mr. Dave Epp (Chatham-Kent—Leamington, CPC): Madam Speaker, my colleague bookended his speech with a truism quote

from Margaret Thatcher. I have been wrestling with another quote, one that comes from Napoleon Bonaparte, who said we should never ascribe to conspiracy that which can be attributed to incompetence.

I wrestle with this. On the one hand, we have all of the spending scandals, the corruption and the crime that the government has inflicted upon the budgets and our economy. On the other hand, we see, through the capital gains measures it has proposed, the incompetence of that piece of legislation.

Could my hon. colleague comment on whether this is competence, incompetence, conspiracy, corruption or any other C he can think of?

Mr. Philip Lawrence: Madam Speaker, I thank the member for the tough but fair question.

I can confirm that the government is both corrupt and incompetent.

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinong , BQ): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with my distinguished colleague from Rimouski-Neigette—T miscouata—Les Basques. That is unfortunate though, because I have so much to say.

I am going to break free from the populist, accusatory cycle where each person accuses another of having done this or that. I am going to offer some actual substance. In the last few minutes, people have been talking about the cost of groceries. That is what I am going to talk about. I am going to talk about feeding the people. I am going to talk about agriculture and agri-food.

Of course, there are a number of things missing from the government's budget. My colleague referred to seniors and old age security, which the government stubbornly refuses to increase starting at the age of 65, even though people need it. The government could consider making unconditional health transfers to the provinces, rather than inventing new pan-Canadian programs, claiming that it has the knowledge and is going to tell the provinces what to do. It is introducing a new program that will be added on top of what Quebec is already doing. What is more, in their emotional speeches, they have the nerve to tell us that they are inspired by Quebec, which is ahead of the rest of Canada on the social front. I have a confession to make: We are not just ahead of the game socially; we are ahead in a lot of areas.

I would like to see a federal government that looks after its responsibilities, that has the ability to issue passports on time and get work permits to our temporary foreign workers. These workers end up in a very vulnerable situation when their one and only employer, who was expected to employ them for a year or three, lays them off after three months. They are left with nothing. Our federal government is not competent enough to issue work permits in a timely manner. The government recently made a commitment to issue permits within 30 days. I look forward to that. I want to believe it. These temporary foreign workers have no choice but to work illegally, so they are exploited. That makes no sense. We do not have to put up with that in a G7 country. It is terrible.

Business of Supply

Shoreline erosion is another issue that I work on a lot in my riding. We ask for funds but get none, even though the issue is caused by shipping on the St. Lawrence, which makes it a federal responsibility.

A while ago, I spoke with the President of the Treasury Board about defence. Canada is a junior member of NATO, yet it is still not investing the necessary funds, despite the current climate of uncertainty. Why?

I just mentioned all those things, and now I will get into my speech. This speech is for the folks at home. It is for people who live in Quebec City, Montreal, Rimouski, Saint-Félix-de-Valois, Louiseville, Trois-Rivières and everywhere else in Quebec. It is for folks in Laval who are tuning in, sitting in front of the television in their basement. It is for Hugues and his son, Noah, who are watching us and wondering if we are going to help them and make sure grocery prices go down. Let us be serious. What I am seeing in the government's measures is that Canada is still spending less than 1% on support for agriculture and agri-food. I think that is totally ridiculous. I think the government needs to wake up and put some money into that.

I want to talk about that and address the people at home because I also want to draw their attention to the fact that most people take the agriculture and agri-food sectors for granted. This week, there was a press conference with produce growers, strawberry and raspberry producers, berry producers. They came to explain to the Minister of Agriculture why he urgently needs to launch the AgriRecovery initiative that he never seems to get around to launching. We keep being told that the officials are doing the math. I would like them to work overtime because this aid has to go out. It is needed. For almost a year now, our farmers have been asking for an emergency fund, for support to help them cope with interest rates. The Government of Quebec took action. Announcements were confirmed. However, that is not enough. Let us not forget that half of our money is here in Ottawa and that agriculture is a shared jurisdiction. Talks should start without delay.

● (1935)

We have been talking all day about a government that was forced to release a document because this motion was about to be moved and everyone knew it was going to be adopted. That is why the government released the document, but if there had not been a motion, it would not have done so. This government is always like that.

I wish it would not wait for food shortages before taking action. It made a strange decision recently in the agri-food and agriculture sector, one that is highly open to criticism. A decision was made to reduce the percentage of foreign workers in processing plants from 30% to 20%. Someone will say that it was just a pilot project to see what would happen. All right, but we know that we need these individuals. There are not a lot of people. Only 7% of the population has even the slightest interest in agriculture and agri-food, especially processing plants, but people need to eat. We need these workers. Our industries are in jeopardy because of a serious labour shortage.

There are measures for skilled trades, of course, but the government should think more carefully before taking such action, especially since we have heard a rumour that it is thinking of reducing

that number to 10%. Good luck with that. Let us be serious. These are key sectors. When will there be an investment fund, an incentive for businesses to modernize their facilities without going deep into debt and putting themselves at risk in the coming years?

Unfortunately, we saw an example of that in recent weeks with Saladexpress, which just closed. The company renovated its plant two years ago, but because of supply chain issues, inflation and problems with imports, it had to close its doors because it was so far in debt. The government needs to be there.

Various studies by the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food show that there are gaps when it comes to infrastructure investments. The government needs to do more to help our farmers and to recognize what they are doing. For years, I have been pushing the idea of providing financial compensation for positive environmental actions, because when farmers protect waterways, everyone benefits. That is taking a long time to get off the ground.

The whole day has been spent talking about taxation and more negative impacts, so to speak. Can something positive also happen? I think we have to trust the people on the ground, the people who are going to innovate the first chance they get. We just need to give them the space to do it.

I want to talk about risk management programs. We asked for an emergency program to help farmers, but nothing has happened. It has been seven months since the Quebec government asked for this program, which is supposed to come to the rescue when no other program has worked. It is called AgriRecovery. Farmers have been asking for it for a year, but it has not been offered yet. We need something faster than that. We need something responsive.

Speaking of responsiveness—I have talked to the minister about this so much that I am probably nagging him—I would invite the government members to sit down with industry representatives and immediately start thinking about how we as a society are going to share the risks collectively for farmers.

The sustainable Canadian agricultural partnership will end in 2028, but the government should not wait until 2027 to start working on this. Let us not forget that the previous negotiations were held up for months because some provinces did not want to participate.

It might also be time to start accepting the fact that one-size-fits-all measures for all of Canada do not make sense. We do not all have the same climate or the same soil. We are not all the same size. Adaptation is necessary, and that means decentralizing decisions. Again, I know the good old centralizing government will not like what I am about to say, but it will have to agree to transfer funds and accept that people on the ground are best equipped to make decisions.

Business of Supply

Eating and drinking is not optional. No matter what people do with their lives, they all eat and drink every day. Let us remember that and respect the people who get up early in the morning and go to bed late at night because they feed our people.

• (1940)

Mr. Richard Lehoux (Beauce, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I thank and congratulate my colleague for his excellent speech and his comments that are always appropriate. We sit together at the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food, and I realized that he shared my view on this budget: There is almost nothing in it for agriculture. If we want people to be fed, we might want to take care of that.

Bill C-234 came back to the House because it was amended. In fact, it was gutted of all substance by the Senate. My colleague from Foothills proposed an amendment to restore the bill to its original form. I would like to know if my colleague would be in favour of the amendment proposed by my colleague from Foothills for Bill C-234 to revert to its original form. We must not forget that heating buildings is just as important as drying grain.

Mr. Yves Perron: Mr. Speaker, it is funny that he should mention that, because I raised it earlier in the day. I do not know if he heard my speech.

What I would like to say is that we have two choices. We have a bill that has been amended by the Senate. We can choose to accept the amendments and immediately give our grain producers a win, since they would be able to get the exemption this fall, and then do something different for the rest of the buildings. I hope that my colleague understands that this bill has never applied to Quebec since we first started debating it. In supporting this bill, the Bloc Québécois was simply making an effort to do the right thing.

The message I would like to send to members of the Conservative Party is that they should stop getting speakers to fill up the entire hour of debate. We know where everyone stands now. We could move on to a vote and score a victory for people for the fall, but the Conservatives would rather score political points on the backs of the farmers they claim to defend.

• (1945)

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I always enjoy listening to my colleague. There is one thing I am a little confused about, though, and that is the Bloc Québécois's position on the pharmacare program that the NDP has put forward here in the House.

This bill will of course require additional spending. The reality is that there is a broad coalition of nearly two million Quebeckers affiliated with the major unions, including health care professionals, the Union des consommateurs and others, who are calling on all members from Quebec to vote in favour of this NDP bill to implement the pharmacare program, which will cover diabetes medication and contraception to begin with.

However, the Bloc Québécois members voted against it. A broad coalition is calling for members to support this bill, so I do not understand why the Bloc Québécois members, who should of course listen to Quebeckers, are saying no. Could my colleague explain why they voted against the interests of Quebeckers?

The Speaker: I see some impatience to answer the question, but I want to let the member know that this question was the same length as the previous one.

The hon. member for Berthier—Maskinongé.

Mr. Yves Perron: Mr. Speaker, I was impatient because I was so excited to answer. What a great question. I am certainly getting spoiled this evening.

We are not against pharmacare. Let us ask these union representatives the question and give them the choice. Let us tell them this: The federal government is increasing health transfers and we can put more money into our Quebec pharmacare program, which has been around for many years and which should serve as a model and inspiration for Canada, instead of having Canada come in once again to crush our system with its pan-Canadian version.

That is exactly what I was talking about at the beginning of my speech. The NDP did not run for politics in the right Parliament. I would invite them to read the famous contract that they signed behind our backs one night in 1982. Ironically enough, the Bloc Québécois is the only one that abides by that contract because we have no other choice. We respect the institutions. We came here to defend our people and we are stuck with a contract that was forced upon us. However, it seems as though we are the only ones who have read it.

Health care falls to Quebec and the provinces. Give us our money. We have a program. What I find most shocking about all this is that we have a public system in Quebec and now they want to replace it with a private company that is going to line its own pockets. It was the same thing with ArriveCAN and all the goddamn Liberal scandals that have come to light since this government came to power.

The Speaker: Before we resume debate, I know that people are very passionate in the House, but I ask members to be very careful about the language they use here.

The hon. member for Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques.

M. Maxime Blanchette-Joncas (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals never stop asking us for more money. They always want more, more, more. We can agree on some things, but they have to be good and serve the needs of the people. It should not just be more money to buy a new pipeline. Oil and gas companies are already making billions of dollars in profits. They can buy their own pipelines.

I would like to remind those tuning in about something very important. The largest infrastructure project in Canadian history is not designed to support health or education. No, it is a pipe for producing more oil for export to foreign markets. Canada, this great big, beautiful country, is an oil monarchy.

Business of Supply

Now, let me get back to the matter at hand. Before proposing further additional spending every three months, I would encourage this government to think about whether it needs to spend money on things that could be described as unnecessary or low priority. I am talking about spending that is not really in step with the needs and necessities brought on by the kinds of crises facing people in this country.

We know that the supplementary estimates provide an overview of spending requirements that were not necessarily fleshed out when the main estimates were prepared, or that were clarified after the main estimates were tabled to take into account any changes that had occurred in certain programs and services. Either the Liberals planned their budget poorly with their colleagues, or they see us as cash cows and think we will pass all their future budgets, or else they are negotiating a little agreement on the back of a napkin to make sure that their government survives. I think the last option is the most likely scenario.

These estimates present \$12.7 billion in additional spending, raising budgetary expenditures for the year 2024-25 from \$449 billion to over \$461 billion. Voted budgetary spending will increase by \$11.2 billion, or 5.8%, to \$202.8 billion in voted appropriations alone. This does not include statutory expenditures.

Those include a \$1.9-billion increase in public debt charges, primarily due to higher projected interest rates and higher borrowing requirements, broken down as follows: a \$764-million increase in interest on unmatured debt and \$1.1 billion in other interest costs.

It is a crazy amount of debt that exploded under this government. Why does the government continue to propose costly public policies in areas that do not even fall under its responsibility? The federal government is incapable of providing good, effective public services, with programs in areas under its own responsibility. Nevertheless, it keeps funding projects that contribute to global warming. Again, Trans Mountain cost \$34 billion. The goal is to extract more oil and help oil and gas companies that do not need help because they are billionaires.

Let us get into a detailed breakdown of these supplementary estimates. Basically, we can say that we agree with the way 80% of this roughly \$11 billion will be used, because it will go toward providing first nations, among others, with better health services, social services and better access to drinking water. Yes, I did indeed say drinking water. It is 2024, and Canada, an industrialized country that is part of the G7 and that has the largest reserve of drinking water in the world, is still incapable of providing people living on Canadian soil with drinking water. That is shameful.

In contrast, we strongly criticize allocating \$22 million for national honours to mark the transition of the Crown in Canada. Some people might think that there is a lot of support for the monarchy. However, over 70% of Quebecers are against the monarchy. This government, which supports an archaic and undemocratic institution, is asking for an additional \$3 million in funding to give out little crowns and medals bearing the image of a king. Apparently, a top priority for this government is handing out little medals adorned with the effigy of someone who does not even live here and who was not democratically elected.

• (1950)

This country is not serious. It is completely out of touch with reality. I do not want Quebecers to have to pay out of their own pockets for things that have very little impact on their reality and that are low on their list of priorities. I would like to remind the House that over 70% of Quebecers think it is time to reconsider our ties with the monarchy and that the Quebec National Assembly has already ended the requirement to take an oath to the King. As we know, Canada and Quebec are two very different nations and will eventually be two very different countries.

My Conservative colleagues say that they support common sense, but they are all about the monarchy. Members will recall that the former Harper government even renamed Her Majesty's ships. These people's offices are full of monarchy memorabilia: framed pictures, posters, calendars, playing cards. Here is some common sense: \$25 million supported by the Liberal and Conservative parties. The NDP has the word "democratic" in its party name. However, we do not hear the NDP members speaking out against the monarchy. I am wondering why they are supporting an additional \$3 million for medals. I guess that is also a priority for the NDP.

On top of all that, there is an additional \$66.8 billion that was not included in the estimates. That, along with other adjustments, bring total federal budget spending to \$534.6 billion. I would like to highlight some increases that seem significant. At least, that is what the government says.

Let us talk about science and evidence. Some parties are thought to be more or less supportive of science. Others say science is important, but apparently only when it suits them. Let me give the facts. There is \$8 million for the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council and \$400,000 for the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, which is not insignificant. However, these are small amounts. It is one step closer to the promise made by this government in light of a report tabled by the House of Commons Standing Committee on Science and Research about the Government of Canada's graduate scholarship and post-doctoral fellowship programs in particular.

Business of Supply

Is everybody sitting down? Twenty years is how long it has been since the federal government increased graduate scholarships by a single penny. We are not talking about painting walls in schools. For 20 years, students with the highest potential have been told that not one more penny is available for them. Science certainly must be a priority if scientists and future researchers could not get a penny more for 20 years. Despite it all, these two parties tell us that science and evidence are important. What a joke. When something is a priority, increasing financial support for it does not take 20 years. That is not what got them moving, despite all the pressure. However, historic progress has been made thanks to the work of the Bloc Québécois and my colleagues on the Standing Committee on Science and Research. We finally managed to increase the indexation of graduate scholarships.

I would say in closing that there are some positives, if we look for them. The good things that will be improved also need to be acknowledged. Canada has been lagging way behind on research investment for the past 20 years. It was at the back of the pack in the G7 on investment as a share of GDP. The consequences are serious, particularly for graduation rates at the graduate level, but also for the students, the researchers who want to stay here in Canada. The proof is that Canada is the only G7 country to have lost researchers since 2016.

There are certainly things we can accept in the supplementary estimates. There are other things that are not considered a priority. It is clear, once again, that the priorities are not always part of the current government's reality.

• (1955)

Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to the debate. Perhaps it is the late hour, but I find that the Conservatives, as well as the Bloc Québécois, are resorting to slogans and easy solutions. They are overlooking certain realities to convey a simplistic message.

It is true that the federal debt is much higher than it was before the pandemic. Relative to GDP, the federal debt is still at a decent level compared to other G7 and G20 countries. The debt is quite high because of the expenses incurred during the pandemic, but also because of certain expenses that Quebeckers really appreciate. I am talking about dental care. The federal government sent money to the provinces, including Quebec, for child care. We know that—

• (2000)

The Speaker: I invite the hon. member for Lac-Saint-Louis to ask his question.

Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia: Mr. Speaker, does my colleague oppose the fact that the federal government made these expenditures during the pandemic? Does he oppose the money transferred to Quebec for child care?

Mr. Maxime Blanchette-Joncas: Mr. Speaker, it is not late for me. I am wide awake and alert, even without coffee.

I will answer my colleague from Lac-Saint-Louis's very simple and easy questions. He did not mention that Quebec has had its own child care program for 25 years. We did not wait for the federal government to give us money to do that. Now, he is waking up 25 years later and thinks this is important. If it were so important,

why did the federal government not invest any money in this area over the past 25 years?

My colleague is talking about a dental care program. He is leaving himself wide open again. The Régie de l'assurance maladie du Québec already provides a dental care program. Yes, it could be improved. However, it has already been around for over 10 years. We did not wait for the federal government to implement that program. We could also talk about the pharmacare program. My colleague did not mention it, but Quebec has had a pharmacare program for 30 years.

If my colleague from Lac-Saint-Louis wants to convince me, then he will have to prove to me that the Canadian government can do things that the Quebec government cannot.

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I always enjoy working with my colleague, but I do not understand the Bloc Québécois at all.

The NDP forced the government to bring in a dental care program. Quebec is where the program is the most popular. The vast majority of dentists who joined this program are located in Quebec. In Canada, the largest group of people already using these dental care services are Quebeckers. The new program has only been operating for a few weeks, but it is popular. Tens of thousands of Quebeckers have already received dental care through the program.

Why does the Bloc Québécois oppose a program that Quebeckers want?

Mr. Maxime Blanchette-Joncas: Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to answer my colleague's questions.

The New Democratic Party says it is democratic, but it defends the privatization of certain programs and approved a dental care program that is run by a private company, Sun Life. That was done with the support of the NDP.

In the meantime, what we in the Bloc Québécois are asking for is not to not help the people who need supplementary dental care. We already have a program for that. The Régie de l'assurance maladie du Québec runs that program. What we are asking for is to have our money to run our own program. We are not saying that it is not good to do this, but we want jurisdictions to be respected. Care, social services and health fall under the responsibility of Quebec and the provinces. It is easy to understand. My colleague should understand that. A Constitution is something that is supposed to be democratic. I would remind the member that Quebec never signed it.

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, hallelujah, the Bloc Québécois has seen the light. Its members have realized that it is important to read the supply documents.

Does my Bloc Québécois colleague regret not voting against the previous budget allocations?

The Speaker: The hon. member for Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques has 15 seconds to respond.

Business of Supply

Mr. Maxime Blanchette-Joncas: Mr. Speaker, 15 seconds is not enough time to demonstrate that the common-sense plan makes no sense.

When I asked a question earlier, the Conservative Party completely avoided talking about the monarchy and the \$3 million being spent to hand out some little medals. I would like my colleague from Mégantic—L'Érable to ask his constituents if they support that.

[English]

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to split my time with the wonderful member for New Westminster—Burnaby.

Tonight we debate a supply bill, and for those Canadians who may be watching, this is an important parliamentary vehicle that authorizes the spending of money to pay for government programs and services. It has been said that it is the primary duty of parliamentarians to scrutinize and authorize executive spending, and that is what we are doing here tonight.

I would like to start with a few general observations about the economy and government. In the New Democrats' view, the economy is not a sterile entity. It is not a vague concept removed from human contact. It is instead a vital expression of our social activity. In other words, it is not something that we are to serve. The economy is something that, in New Democrats' view, should serve people and the citizens who make up our great country, and a budget is an expression to us of priorities.

As President Joe Biden famously said before he was president, "Don't tell me [your values]. Show me your budget, and I'll tell you [your values]." I think those are wise words. There are very different values expressed in this Parliament.

For the NDP, government is a positive force in society that is in place to serve Canadians. Among other things, one of the most important jobs of government is to deliver programs, services and resources that people need but are unable to provide on their own and that the marketplace is unable to deliver. To others, notably Conservatives in the House, government is something to be distrusted. It is something to be feared. It is something to be reduced to the greatest extent possible.

To the NDP, the economy is something to be incentivized, to be nurtured and to be developed to serve people. That is the end of having a healthy economy. To others in the House, and I am thinking primarily of my Conservative colleagues, people's interests are often subservient to the economy, especially to corporations whose interests are generally to prevail over individuals, with the faith that, if we let corporations have their way, somehow or other, ordinary citizens will magically benefit.

To the NDP, the budget is to spend the people's money in the best way possible to benefit Canadians and their families. To others, again, particularly Conservatives, spending is bad, and they believe that, essentially, people should be left to sink or swim on their own. The supply bill invokes several of these underlying concepts.

The supply bill is part of broader appropriation acts this year that so far will propose to spend some \$191 billion this year. Major ex-

penditures of that \$191 billion would include the following: \$80 billion would be spent on Canada's seniors in elderly benefits; about \$52 billion would take the form of health transfers to provinces so that Canadians can go to hospitals and their doctors to get the health care they need when they need it; and about \$8 billion would be spent on indigenous reconciliation, services and justice. As my honourable colleague from Nunavut points out so powerfully in the House all the time, that is a fraction of the money that is needed to deal with the huge indigenous infrastructure deficit in this country.

The supply bill that we are debating tonight would authorize approximately \$128 billion of spending. What are some of the priorities that Canadians will get for that money? We can start with dental care. We made the dental care plan a condition of support of the Liberal government, and make no mistake, this is not a shared priority between the NDP and Liberals. The Liberals voted against dental care every chance they got until the NDP forced the Liberals to bring it in as a condition of our support for the government.

So far, over two million Canadian seniors have enrolled in that dental care plan. Over 100,000 seniors have already gone to the dentist. I was in a denturist office just yesterday when I was told moving stories of seniors who had not been to the dentist in many years. They had had terrible pain and suffering in their mouths, and they were getting, for the first time, their dentures they needed to help them have proper nutrition and to take care of their health.

● (2005)

On June 28, in a matter of two weeks, every child under the age of 18 in this country, in families that make under \$90,000 a year and do not have the benefit of a private employer dental care plan, just as every person in the House has, will be able to sign up for this plan, including people living with disabilities. That will add millions more Canadians to the Canadian dental care plan.

Ultimately, we are seeing the beginning of the first, most expansive expansion of public health in this country in half a century. This will see nine million Canadians able to get the primary oral health care they need and deserve, which they have not had for six years. I would tell my Bloc colleagues that provinces, including Quebec, have not proven competent in providing this service to Canadians, even though there are certain programs in provinces. Obviously, millions of Canadians are not covered for this, and the NDP has made sure those people will have the same access as members do.

This bill would provide \$1.5 billion for pharmacare. As I pointed out, this is a historic first in this country. For the first time ever, through a single-payer system, Canadians will be able to walk into pharmacies and walk out with the diabetes medication and devices and contraception devices and medication they need without paying for them directly, just like all of our other necessary and essential health care costs.

Business of Supply

In terms of diabetes medications, pretty much every single medication necessary for a type 1 diabetic and almost everything for a type 2 diabetic would be covered by this plan, as well as continuous glucose monitors, insulin pumps, test strips and syringes and needles. For contraceptives, it is not only contraceptive medications by prescription, but also devices, including IUDs. That is an extraordinary measure that would help liberate women, providing them with free agency and control over their health.

There is \$1 billion over five years that will be established for a school nutrition program. Canada is the only G7 country that does not have some form of universal access to school nutrition, and this, by the way, is not anywhere near enough. This plan would only cover a fraction of the children that go to school from grades 1 to 8 in this country, but it is a start. This is something the New Democrats also demanded.

I want to turn to housing. The housing crisis is robbing young people in this country of their hope for the future, and we are saddling our children with challenges that the generations before them did not face. Owning a home seems increasingly unattainable. Building a life and a family of their own appears increasingly unaffordable. To New Democrats, our children deserve a world of promise and possibility. The Prime Minister claimed before that housing is not his responsibility, but has failed to acknowledge the fact that it was the Liberals who walked away from this federal responsibility in the first place, and it was Conservatives who removed social spending from the CMHC out of housing a generation ago.

Today, Canada's stock of non-market housing is among the lowest across the OECD peers, at just 3.5% of total dwellings. As a consequence of successful Conservative and Liberal neglect, Canada now finds itself decades behind. Because the Conservatives and Liberals have abandoned the federal government's position in housing, encampments are expanding across the country at record levels. The financialization of housing has left one-third of all seniors' housing in Canada in the hands of institutional investors, as well as 30% of purpose-built rental buildings.

Young people are being shut out of the housing market, renters are losing hope of ever owning a home, and rent and mortgage payments are devouring an unbelievably high share of people's incomes. We need to build some nine million homes over the next 10 years. International evidence demonstrates that it is only with direct financing of non-market housing, such as co-operative, non-profit and public housing, that we will meet this challenge. This budget goes some distance in addressing that need. By the way, public spending on housing is anti-inflationary. It expands supply and puts downward pressure on prices across the housing market.

I will conclude by saying that New Democrats are supporting this budget and supply bill because we believe the federal government needs to invest in Canadians and provide the conditions so that all Canadians can thrive and prosper in this economy. That is core to New Democrat values, and we are proud of those values.

● (2010)

Mr. Dave Epp (Chatham-Kent—Leamington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in his intervention, the member referenced the spending of people's money. I understand that to the extent of present Canadian

taxpayers. We can talk about the amounts, but my question is about the present federal debt of \$1.255 million and the ongoing deficits.

Who are the people whose money is being spent? My four children are all taxpaying citizens right now. Is he referring to my grandchildren who are not paying taxes yet? Are those the people he is referring to?

● (2015)

Mr. Don Davies: Mr. Speaker, it is always somewhat ironic when a Conservative rises in the House and talks about responsible government spending. In 2008, the Department of Finance analyzed the spending of every government of every hue and at every level in Canada since 1867, and found that it was New Democratic governments that balanced their budget the highest percentage of times. That is not an ideological statement; it is a matter of fact that the member can check.

I was in the House from 2008 to 2015, when there were eight consecutive Conservative deficits in a row, so I do not think we will take any lectures from Conservatives about responsible government spending or the impact of deficits and debt on Canadians. It is the New Democrats who actually have the best record in that regard.

Hon. Robert Oliphant (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in listening to the member's statement, I was struck a number of times really about the concept of the privilege of paying taxes. I want to echo the fact that I believe that we should pay our taxes and that they should be paid in the fairest way possible based on the income and assets we have.

I want to get the member's understanding of how fairness in our tax system is our privilege to have what we have to share with others.

Mr. Don Davies: Mr. Speaker, I have always thought that the phrase "Taxes are [the price] we pay for [living in a] civilized society" is quite apt.

I would say that for New Democrats, there are a number of really important concepts that underpin our approach to taxes. One is that they should be progressive, which means that if we have to raise money for the government we should do so in a fair way and according to the ability of people to pay. That means having a sliding scale and taking proportionally more money from those who are wealthy.

Business of Supply

The other concept is this: The 1966 Carter commission famously said, “A buck is a buck [is a buck].” That means we should be taxing income fairly. Therefore I believe that it is unfair for a nurse, a mechanic or a teacher to be taxed on 100% of their income and pay a higher tax rate than someone who makes their money by trading stocks and bonds or selling capital projects and pays tax on only a portion of their income. That is why I support the measures taken in the budget to address that.

[Translation]

Mr. Maxime Blanchette-Joncas (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to my colleague's speech. I want to make one important point clear to him right off the bat. A dentist called me last week and said that the federal dental care program was a flop. He cannot get reimbursed, so he is going to drop out of the program. He has spoken with some colleagues who told him that no one was using the program because it is not working.

Canada health transfers, which should normally be at 50%, are currently at 22%. In my colleague's opinion, should Ottawa not have kept them at 50%, allowing us to improve an existing structure, namely the Régie de l'assurance maladie du Québec? Is that not what should have been done instead of outsourcing a dental care program to a private company, Sun Life?

[English]

Mr. Don Davies: Mr. Speaker, I share my hon. colleague's position that the federal government should be shouldering its fair share of health care in this country. Successive Conservative and Liberal governments have whittled it down to about 22%. I agree with him that the slide should be reversed and that we should be going back up toward the 50% federal-provincial agreement that underpinned the formation of medicare.

I will tell the member that dental care is not a flop. I will give him 100,000 reasons if he wants, because that is the number of people who have been to the dentist under the plan. He should tell them that it is a flop. He should tell the 10,000 dental professionals in this country who have signed up for the plan that it is a flop. When people can get their teeth fixed and take care of their mouth, that is an incredible accomplishment in this country. It is something that New Democrats are proud of and that I think will stand the test of time. We will be looking back at this time 10, 20 or 30 years from now with the same pride as when the New Democrats started health care in this country.

[Translation]

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to follow my colleague from Vancouver Kingsway. He mentioned that NDP governments have the best financial management track records, and that is important. The NDP also delivers results. We are not the party of tax havens or billionaires. We are the party that invests in ordinary people.

I found my Bloc Québécois colleague's last comment a bit ridiculous because the dental care program has been the most successful in Quebec. More people in Quebec are benefiting from the dental care program than anywhere else in Canada, and more dentists in Quebec are participating in the program than anywhere else. The Bloc Québécois can say that the dental care program is not

working, but the facts say otherwise. To date, 200,000 people, particularly seniors in Quebec, have received dental care.

The reality is that the NDP is the party that has gotten the most results in Parliament in recent months. Members of the Bloc Québécois have not accomplished much. The NDP got pharmacare. This bill is now in the Senate. When we look at dental care, the grocery rebate and affordable housing, we see that the NDP caucus has been far more effective than any of the other parties in the House.

The members of the NDP are the real worker bees in the House of Commons. We do things to help people and we are seeing results in Quebec, of course, but also in British Columbia and across the country.

• (2020)

[English]

The main estimates are an opportunity to talk about financial management. As my colleague for Vancouver Kingsway said so eloquently, the NDP does have the best record of managing money and paying down debt with NDP provincial governments. We have not formed a federal government yet, but that that is coming. NDP provincial governments have simply outperformed, in fiscal management, Conservative and Liberal governments, and even governments like those of the Parti Québécois.

The reality is that is our record, and we are proud of it. More importantly, the NDP gets its good fiscal management record by not giving away money to billionaires, banks, oil and gas CEOs and lobbyists, which is, critically, what Liberals and Conservatives have done since Confederation. The NDP takes a different approach, which is why we are so effective in helping people.

The main estimates are also a report card for all members of Parliament to basically report back on what they have done since we started the session in the fall, because when we get to the main estimates, we know that there are only a few days left in the session. Let us talk about that. What can Conservative MPs say that they have done for their constituents over the course of the last nine months? It is not much. In fact, a Conservative member would have difficulty pointing to a single accomplishment that Conservative MPs have done for their constituents.

Let us talk about what the New Democrats have done. We got the grocery rebate, which has made a difference for about 11 million lower-income Canadians, as part of a doubling of the GST rebate. That has made a difference for constituents.

Business of Supply

We can also talk about the school lunches, part of the recent budget and something the NDP campaigned on, that the member for Vancouver Kingsway campaigned on. As a result of it, hundreds of thousands of school children who could not learn because they went to school hungry will be getting school lunches. That is another accomplishment of the NDP.

We can talk about the anti-scab legislation that helps workers in the federal jurisdiction who are fighting for better wages and better health and safety conditions. Up until now, they have consistently had Conservatives and Liberals refusing to put in place legislation to ban replacement workers. If they were locked out or went on strike, they had no recourse. However thanks to the NDP, there is now anti-scab legislation in this country.

How about dental care? It is the biggest hit of any government program in years, with over 200,000 seniors having already accessed dental services. We can do the math: It means that in each and every Conservative riding, there are 500 or 600 seniors who have already gotten dental care, and not thanks to the Conservatives, because the Conservatives did everything they could to block those programs, but thanks to the NDP.

Yes, those seniors will be thinking, “Why am I electing a Conservative MP when they do not do anything for me? The NDP has been fighting for me. The member for Burnaby South has been fighting for me and maybe I should be looking at the NDP.” Of course, they would be showing good judgment in doing that because the reality is that the NDP delivered dental care. This is something that Conservatives and Liberals refused to do.

In fact a few years ago, Conservatives and Liberals voted against the dental care program that the NDP put forward, but in a minority Parliament, the member for Burnaby South and the entire NDP caucus fought, and now hundreds of thousands of seniors have had dental care already. Millions of seniors have signed up, and we know that in about a week and a half, people with disabilities and families with kids under 18 will be able to access dental care as well. By the beginning of July, all dentists will be eligible to be part of the program.

Wow, what an accomplishment that is. Can Conservative MPs point to anything they have done over the last 10 months? No, but the NDP can also point to that.

How about clean energy jobs? Members will recall that Conservatives fought, tooth and nail, the clean-energy jobs program of the NDP that we fought for and got through the House. As a result, good, well-paying, unionized jobs in the clean energy sector will be coming in the coming months because of the NDP.

How about pharmacare? People with diabetes are often paying \$1,000 to \$1,500 a month for their diabetes medication and devices. Conservatives said, “Oh, we do not give a damn about them.” However, Canadians want to have the program, and the NDP fought hard. Now the pharmacare bill is through the House and is in the Senate. We are pushing senators in the other place to please adopt the legislation because it would mean that up to six million Canadians who have diabetes would have their medication covered.

There are Canadians who need contraception. For women's reproductive rights and freedoms, this is absolutely crucial. They would have access to contraception, and again this is because of the NDP.

How about affordable housing? Well, affordable housing is something that Conservatives slashed. Over the dismal, terrible Harper regime, the worst government in Canadian history, food bank lineups doubled. Housing prices doubled. People would say that the same things happened under the Liberals, who continued a lot of Conservative policies, and that is true. However, Conservatives are responsible for half the problem and they should be standing up and apologizing to Canadians for not doing what was required then, as Liberals should be apologizing for not doing what is required now.

However, in a minority Parliament, the NDP forced the government finally to invest in affordable housing, and we know that affordable housing units are starting to be built now. In the coming months, there will be more and more affordable housing that is based on 30% of income as opposed to the massive rental prices people are paying. Affordable housing will be coming to neighbourhoods right across the country.

Regarding health care funding, the terrible, horrible, no good, very bad Harper government slashed health care funding, which has led to the crisis that we are seeing today because Liberals, when they came to power, decided they were not going to restore the health care funding that Conservatives cut. Thanks to the NDP, we are now seeing an increase in health care funding across the country, and that is going to make a difference in the quality of life of our health care professionals and of Canadians who have health care issues and go into the hospital.

● (2025)

As I mentioned earlier, the fact that we now have in place the first steps of universal single-payer pharmacare means that when patients leave acute care hospitals, they will actually have access to their medication. Members of the Canadian Federation of Nurses Unions tell us that hundreds of Canadians die every year because they cannot afford to pay for their medication.

Every other country that has universal health care has universal pharmacare. Thanks to Tommy Douglas and the NDP, we have universal health care. Thanks to the current leader, the member for Burnaby South, and the NDP, we are now looking at the start of universal pharmacare, which means patients will be able to continue to live long and healthy lives.

Therefore school lunches, grocery rebates, anti-scab legislation, dental care, clean-energy jobs, pharmacare, affordable housing and health care funding are all thanks to the NDP.

Business of Supply

• (2030)

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Democratic Institutions and Intergovernmental Affairs (Cybersecurity), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague spoke a lot about dental care, something that is in the estimates we are debating here now. Earlier this evening, I asked Conservatives if they would cut dental care out of the estimates, and they claimed that dental care does not exist, that thousands of Canadians who have had access to a dentist just do not exist.

How does the hon. member feel about Conservatives wanting to take away this critical health care from our seniors?

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, this is all part of the delusions of the member for Carleton. "It is all a mirage", they are saying to Canadians across the country, as hundreds of thousands of seniors are getting dental care, often for the first time. The member for Carleton says that it is all a mirage, that they are not getting dental care, as they sit in the dentist chair, as they actually have the dentist provide them with the care, as the oral hygienist provides them with care, as the dentist provides them with care.

The Conservatives' response and the member for Carleton's response is that it is all a mirage, that they are not living in reality and that they should live the Conservative reality, where dental care does not exist.

I prefer to live in real life.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Maxime Blanchette-Joncas (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Mr. Speaker, listening to my colleague is always a pleasure, but we know that history repeats itself. That is usually the case.

Quebec's motto is "Je me souviens" or "I remember". We remember one important thing the NDP did: It signed the Sherbrooke declaration. I would remind my colleague that the Sherbrooke declaration of 2005 respected the autonomy of Quebec and the provinces, and it even supported decentralization. Now the New Democratic Party champions centralized government. That is not decentralization.

I would like my colleague to tell me why, today, he is not honouring this supposedly democratic declaration that his own democratic party signed on to.

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, we have tremendous respect for Quebecers. We respect the fact that Quebecers are the largest group in the country to have signed up for the NDP's dental care program.

The largest number of subscribers in Canada are in Quebec. The largest number of dentists who signed up for the program and the largest number of seniors who have received dental care are all in Quebec.

The same goes for pharmacare. The largest coalition in the history of Quebec is calling on the Bloc Québécois to support the NDP's pharmacare plan.

Is the Bloc Québécois respecting Quebec?

I do not believe it is when it tells Quebecers no.

[*English*]

Mr. Dave Epp (Chatham-Kent—Leamington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in the beginning few moments of the member's interventions, he lauded the history of provincial NDP governments when it came to fiscal responsibility. I have a simple question for him. Would that history include the record of the 1990-95 Bob Rae government in Ontario, as I lived through that period?

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, I am actually not quoting myself. I am actually quoting the federal Ministry of Finance, which I think the member would agree is not a hotbed of social democrats. The federal Ministry of Finance issues the fiscal period returns, and it has been telling us, year after year, for the last 40 years, that the best governments at managing money, paying down debt and providing services are NDP governments. That is a quote from the Ministry of Finance.

Ms. Lori Idlout (Nunavut, NDP): *Uqaqtittiji*, I would like to thank my colleague with the NDP for his excellent speech. He highlighted that it has been thanks to the NDP that we have been able to get so much more for Canadians. Our small and mighty party has indeed gotten a lot more, including extending Jordan's principle and the Inuit child first initiative.

I wonder if the hon. member can share with us what an NDP government would do for indigenous peoples much more than what we see from the Liberals.

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say *qujannamiik* to my colleague from Nunavut, who has been an extraordinary advocate for Nunavut and for indigenous peoples. She, as we know, was granted the award for best constituency politician because of that.

As she is well aware, an NDP government would take a strong approach, a robust approach, of reconciliation with indigenous peoples.

• (2035)

Mr. Peter Fragiskatos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are debating the estimates tonight, and I want to focus my attention on housing, which finds much support in the estimates. We have a variety of federal initiatives that are given further support or created anew where they did not exist before.

The first, which I think it is fair to say is the signature program of the federal government with respect to housing policy, is the housing accelerator fund. The fund has been topped up by the amount of \$400 million. The fund is ultimately about working with municipalities. We cannot address the housing crisis, and we have to call it that, call it what it is, if we do not do so through partnership, working with municipal councillors, with mayors in particular and with public servants at the local level to see critical changes that will address what ultimately underpins the housing crisis, and that is a crisis in supply.

Business of Supply

When there is a lack of supply, inevitably costs go up. That is true for anything, and it is true for housing. Let us be clear about something: We are all diminished by that. Whether it is young people or people across the demographic spectrum, when they cannot afford a home, we are all less. When they do not have a roof over their head, that is particularly tragic. That is something we are all especially diminished by.

What the federal government has said is that if cities and towns are willing to move forward in an ambitious way and make the necessary changes to zoning, for example, which we know is absolutely critical when it comes to getting more homes built, and if cities in particular are more open to densification, then there are federal dollars that can flow to cities.

For instance, there is putting in place zoning changes that will allow for more missing middle homes to be built. We are talking about duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, mid-rise apartments and row houses. That is what is meant by “missing middle homes.” When those zoning changes come, we see a green light given to developers and builders that they can build more homes that way. When densification is embraced, we get the same outcome.

Already the government has concluded no less than 179 agreements in this regard, and we will continue. This supplementation of \$400 million would allow the program to do exactly that, to continue. It is there for municipalities, in return for making those kinds of changes. It is not simply federal dollars that go to municipalities without any expectation. There is an expectation here. The expectation is that if those changes get put in place, federal dollars can go to a variety of things that will create more incentives, a greater push for housing to be built.

We are talking about permit modernization. All too often, I hear in my capacity, not just as parliamentary secretary responsible for housing but from colleagues across the aisle, about cumbersome permitting processes in municipalities, large and small, that extend the length of a building project. What we are seeing is that with federal funding that comes through the housing accelerator fund, part of that funding can go to modernizing permits, including through the use of artificial intelligence. There is a whole debate, obviously, transpiring across democracies about the place of AI, and that is an important debate to have. There are many negatives, of course, that come with it, but there are also positives that can be embraced as well. A modernized permitting system is something that can have a very good impact.

We are seeing in Kelowna, for example, through funds secured through the housing accelerator fund, permitting modernized with the help of AI. It is cutting down on application approvals, not just by months, but even better than that. What used to take years could potentially take just days and maybe even just a few hours. We are seeing Kelowna just start this. It is a pilot project, but let us see where it goes. There are other cities that have embraced that kind of vision as well.

Housing accelerator funding can also go to community-related infrastructure. Local roads, bridges, sidewalks, lighting, bike lanes and even fire halls are eligible for financial support through this program. Again, this is if cities and towns step up and decide to be ambitious with what I talked about before, the necessary zoning

changes and densification in municipalities that should be embraced.

● (2040)

Transit, for example, where it connects to housing, can be funded through this particular program and, of course, non-market housing, which colleagues in various parties, not in the Conservative Party unfortunately, have brought up.

Just yesterday, I was in my community of London, where \$2 million was allocated for a supportive housing project that will see 50 fellow community members, who unfortunately have experienced homelessness, taken off the street with the support of a not-for-profit and given access to wraparound supports on site. Those wraparound supports include mental health support, addiction support, employment training and a variety of other basic supports that will allow them to transition to something better.

Opposed to the housing accelerator fund is the Conservative Party. Just a couple of weeks ago, one of the longest-serving members of the Conservative Party, who I believe is the dean of the Conservative caucus, the member for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, made clear her view, and I think she spoke for her party when she did so, that the federal government has no role to play in housing policy. She said it is outside of federal jurisdiction to worry about housing. It explains, for example, why the Conservatives' so-called housing plan is so weak. There are no details in their plan on how to get more homes built. There are a few details, but nothing substantive. That is the reason why I do not believe they think that the federal government has any meaningful role to play.

How else would we explain the fact, and it is a fact, that the Leader of the Opposition, at every opportunity, has found ways to insult mayors and has found ways to insult councillors, instead of wanting to work? Yes, difficult conversations have to sometimes take place around issues like zoning, around the culture of NIMBY. All of these things do play a role, but constructively we can overcome them. The Leader of the Opposition has found ways to create difficulties, to create a difficult relationship already with municipal leaders, with mayors in particular. That is not acceptable, certainly for someone who aspires to be prime minister. We know what is at stake, and that is why we are pushing back against it.

Business of Supply

Also in the estimates, there is \$6 billion for the Canada housing infrastructure fund. That funding will go to what is called housing-enabling infrastructure, namely water, waste-water, stormwater and solid waste infrastructure. We cannot talk about housing without talking about the enabling infrastructure that makes housing possible, that makes communities possible. As part of this, as part of ensuring that communities have the infrastructure they need to ensure that housing happens, we have attached conditions to make sure that more housing gets built.

I raised a point earlier about missing middle housing. The condition that we are leading with is that provinces have to sign on to agree on four-unit buildings as of right. In other words, fourplexes, for example, do not have to go through a cumbersome bureaucratic process at the municipal level to get approval. We have seen this before, where builders want to put up a fourplex, and where the members of the community want to put up a fourplex, but there are all sorts of local restrictions and bureaucracy in place that prevent that from happening. As part of the conditionality that we have attached to infrastructure funding, we are saying that as of right, these kinds of projects need to be given approval.

Conservatives, again, are opposed. I am not saying anything that we do not already know. They are on the record, but it bears emphasis for a party that talks a lot. I will give Conservatives this credit. They talk a lot about housing. They talk a lot about problems that exist in our democracy. We have challenges. We have a housing crisis, as I said before. However, they never offer solutions. Like any good right-wing populist party, I suppose, they never have solutions to the problems they identify.

What we are saying is that if one is serious about getting more homes built, then attaching this kind of conditionality is important. What did we see? Just a few weeks ago, the deputy leader of the Conservative Party stood on a yacht and declared that missing middle housing is not a priority, that we do not need to see more homes built. That is not an acceptable position, not for a deputy leader, not for a leader, not for any member of Parliament.

Furthermore, in the estimates, we can see \$1.5 billion for affordable housing. This is the affordable housing fund that will help to fund non-market housing in this country. We do need to see more non-market housing in Canada. There is no question about that. Currently, it is estimated that around 4% of the overall housing stock is made up of non-market housing. We need to go beyond that.

● (2045)

As I said, 4% of the overall housing stock is made up of non-market housing. The OECD average is around 8%. We certainly need to meet at least that average, and I believe that a measure like this can help us get there.

It is not enough to focus only on market solutions. Our government is doing that. We understand that there is a place for market solutions to incent the private sector, and the building sector specifically, to get more homes built. Months ago, we lifted the GST from the construction of purpose-built rentals, and it took a while to get it through the House because of unfortunate Conservative filibustering. Those are rental apartments that will be for the middle

class or for lower-income Canadians who are working hard to join the middle class.

In an environment where we have high interest rates, where we have high construction costs and where we have high costs related to labour as well, we have to think outside the box. We have to do things we have not done before, and lifting GST is something that we have done to incent the private sector, recognizing that market-based housing—in this case, apartments—has a place. That private sector has seen a green light already. I think any member of Parliament in this House who has engaged with builders in their community will say that this is exactly a green light.

Builders are quite excited by this prospect, but the Conservatives have a so-called “housing plan” that does not include this vision at all. They want to attach the GST. They want to keep it in place for the purposes of putting up rental apartments. It makes no sense.

Deeply related to this, when we are talking about ensuring that people have a roof over their heads, we have to look at non-market options. I talked before about the vision for supportive housing that programs like the accelerator fund make possible. This affordable housing fund also makes that possible. It allows people to find something better, a new path, a path with dignity, and already we have seen 71,000 people taken off the street through the national housing strategy. We have seen 125,000 people who were very close to being homeless but are not homeless and have a roof over their head.

Every year, as we saw in a recent report by the Parliamentary Budget Officer, 50,000 Canadians are supported through our affordable housing programs that exist right now. This supplements those programs, but the Conservatives, in their housing plan, never mentioned homelessness, not once.

There is \$1.5 billion for co-operative housing as well. This is another affordable option. Of course, it is a perfectly good example of affordable housing.

What are co-ops? They are not-for-profits. At a co-op, residents own jointly and manage jointly their homes. Surplus dollars go toward the upkeep of the co-op. The form varies. They be large apartments or smaller townhouses. In either case, they provide a sense of community and a sense of democratic decision-making. So much is the Leader of the Opposition insulted when he sees visions like this come to fruition that he called it Soviet-style housing just a few months ago.

Business of Supply

That is something that the 250,000 Canadians who live in co-ops have not forgotten. He was criticized roundly, and not just in this House of Commons. Even this morning, I was sitting with the Housing Advocate in the House of Commons committee that is responsible for housing, and we do have a Housing Advocate in this country. It is an important role. It is something that this government created to ensure that we had monitoring of the overall housing situation, and that includes understanding where we are with respect to non-market housing.

Madam Houle made it clear that the position of the Conservative leader is an unacceptable one when it comes to co-op housing. In the 1970s and 1980s, we saw thousands of co-op homes built. In the 1990s, different governments of various partisan persuasions—not just Conservative governments, but Liberal ones too—decided to invest elsewhere, or not at all, with respect to housing. As such, we saw far fewer co-ops, but just a few days ago, the federal government put forward an initiative that would invest \$1.5 billion, as I mentioned already. That is the single largest investment in co-op housing that we have seen in the past 30 years. That is transformational when it comes to getting more homes built.

● (2050)

Again, the co-op model offers a lot. It is not an example of Soviet-style housing at all. The Leader of the Opposition says he is a student of history; he really ought to go back and look at that history. Co-op housing is something that allows for people to live with dignity, and that is why Liberals have embraced that vision for housing, along with other visions.

There is \$1.5 billion in the estimates for the Canada rental protection fund. We see that grants and loans will be provided to not-for-profits so that they can purchase apartments and keep rates of rent affordable. Rental rates in Canada have gone up. We know that. They have gone up dramatically in many cases. That is not an acceptable situation.

We are incenting the private sector. I already talked about the GST waiver the government introduced, and we are incenting the private sector in other ways, such as with low-interest loans facilitated through the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, CMHC, to allow builders to have another option. When we look at what CMHC can provide in terms of a low-interest loan compared to what the big banks would provide, the CMHC option is much more affordable. It gives builders the opportunity to build and add more apartments to the market.

When we have a situation like the one we have, a supply crisis, it makes sense to work with not-for-profits to give them the resources they need, either in the form of grants or loans, to go out and purchase apartments and keep that rental rate at an affordable level.

Having only a market-based solution as a vision is not recognizing that there is a continuum that we need to understand with respect to housing. We need social housing on the one side, all the way to market-based options on the other. Rental options and options for prospective homeowners all have to come together in policies to address the continuum that is housing. That is the vision on housing that the government has put forward.

Let me also talk about other measures that go hand in hand with that vision for housing.

I said earlier that we are all diminished when people do not have a roof over their heads. We are all diminished when people cannot afford to buy a home or rent a home. These are all questions of well-being. That is what we ought to be pursuing: the politics of well-being and the policies that allow for people to live with dignity.

Hand in hand with that kind of approach is a vision that allows people to get access to health care in ways that they have not had before. We talk about oral health care. Going to the dentist is as important as any type of health care. We cannot talk about healthy people without talking about housing. We cannot talk about people living in a healthy way unless they have access to dental support. That is why \$8.4 billion is in these estimates to go toward people in a middle-income situation and in particular a lower-income situation.

Just on the weekend, I had the opportunity to speak to seniors in my community. I was approached by two seniors when I was out in London who thanked me for the federal initiative. I will have to thank the government and the Minister of Health in particular for their vision on this. The seniors will get dentures for the first time in a decade. In fact, in one case, it was over a decade. Imagine the dignity that flows from that. Imagine the pride that they can have now. In fact, I do not have to imagine it because they shared it with me. It was really quite moving to hear, and that is why the government believes in programs exactly like this.

We can add to that a vision on child care, a vision on pharmacare and a national school food program. They are all examples of the kinds of programs this government is championing, is going to fund and is funding already.

Finally, the Canada child benefit attaches to that. Hundreds of thousands of children and 2.3 million families have been lifted out of poverty as a result of that particular benefit. To my estimation, that is the most important advent in social policy that we have seen since the introduction of public health care in the 1960s. It has ensured, as I said before, a dignified life for everyday Canadians. That is something that all of us have the responsibility to work toward.

● (2055)

Mr. Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for his talk.

Obviously, we are going to disagree on a lot of things, but one thing I want to bring up is the most recent Auditor General report on housing on reserves.

Business of Supply

The Auditor General noted many things with regard to CMHC. CMHC was relying on data that was 20 years out of date. CMHC had been warned, but it refused to get updated data, which left Alberta, Manitoba and several other provinces severely underfunded. The reserves with the poorest housing conditions were given the least amount of funding per capita, because CMHC was not following up to get proper data.

The application process, even though CMHC had been warned since 2017 that it was too onerous on smaller, poorer reserves, was ignored, and this onerous application process was continued. Then CMHC did not track whether the work done on the housing actually met building codes.

These items noted by the Auditor General had all been going on for a long time, yet somehow the government managed to find millions and millions in bonuses to reward the failure of this parliamentary secretary's department. Why?

Mr. Peter Fragiskatos: Mr. Speaker, 35,000 homes on reserve have either been renovated or built anew because of actions taken by this government.

Is it good enough? No, it is not good enough. However, I have worked with the member before on the public accounts committee. I do respect him and I know he takes these issues seriously. In fact, I would hope that he takes them so seriously as to go back to his caucus and ask for their leader to put forward a serious vision on housing that includes a vision on indigenous issues and a reconciliation agenda, not just in terms of the housing challenges that we find on reserve but also in the urban situation as well.

Our government is doing that. We have an urban, rural and northern housing strategy that we have worked on that is moving forward hand in hand with indigenous peoples, and in fact is led by indigenous peoples.

I would also note, and it is not an irrelevant point, that the Leader of the Opposition said something years ago, and I wonder if he still feels this way. He probably does. He said that if indigenous peoples wanted to see a better outcome, then they should work harder. Those are the words of the Leader of the Opposition, someone who aspires to be prime minister. That is unacceptable.

Mr. Branden Leslie (Portage—Lisgar, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague for what was actually a very good speech—

The Speaker: I will interrupt the hon. member, and I will stop the clock.

I want to let hon. members know that because it was a 20-minute speech, there is a 10-minute question-and-answer period, so each party recognized in the House will probably be able to get two minutes of questions in total.

The hon. member for Portage—Lisgar was up. He has about 19 seconds left before his time for questions expires.

The hon. member.

Mr. Branden Leslie: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, I do commend the member on his oratorical skills.

It seems as though many members on that side live in a world where everything is okay, but that is not the world in which my constituents are living. I feel that it is probably not the world his constituents are living in.

My question to the member is this: Does he really believe that everything is okay economically, and that in fact the propositions being put forward by this government are working?

Mr. Peter Fragiskatos: Mr. Speaker, I did not say that in my speech.

We can do much better in this country, but I would ask the member this: What would his government cut? We do not know what the Conservatives would do. They have not been very specific at all, and they probably will not be, but they have not been shy about embracing an austerity agenda, so what would they cut? Would they cut the Canada child benefit that I just talked about? Would they cut dental care or child care? Would they cut any meaningful initiatives on dealing with the climate crisis? Would they cut programs to support home building in Canada?

They would cut all of that.

We need to do better in Canada, and there is no question about it, but the alternative that we are talking about is a pathway that would take us back not just to the Harper years but to something even worse.

• (2100)

[Translation]

Ms. Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in his speech, my colleague talked a lot about housing.

I cannot help but think about the people at the Association québécoise de défense des droits des personnes retraitées et préretraitées, or AQDR. It is an association in my home town of Granby. This week it organized a protest against the commodification and financialization of housing. Unfortunately, I was unable to attend. They are calling on the federal government to invest in solutions to the housing crisis, which is crucial for them. I also had the opportunity to talk about it with my colleague from Longueuil—Saint-Hubert. It was an important event.

Yes, my colleague talked about housing but, more specifically, how is his government proposing to tackle this critical issue? This touches on a fundamental human right, that of housing. Housing should not be treated as a commodity.

Mr. Peter Fragiskatos: Mr. Speaker, there is a housing crisis. It is necessary for our government, as well as every member of the House, to come up with ideas to address this crisis. Our government is working with organizations, as well as provincial and municipal governments, and that work needs to continue.

*Business of Supply**[English]*

I would add that market options have a place in the discussion. However, I think the member is talking about non-market options for community members in her constituency, in my constituency and all our constituencies who need support. That supportive housing model, which I think is really a signature of that, comes as a result of initiatives put forward by the government in different ways. We can and should do more; however, we are acting in a meaningful way.

Ms. Lori Idlout (Nunavut, NDP): *Uqaqtittiji*, I am quite disappointed that, in a 20-minute speech on housing, the member never mentioned anything with respect to the needs of first nations, Métis or Inuit.

The Auditor General reported at one point that the need for housing just for first nations is at \$135 billion, yet the government only budgeted \$4 billion over seven years. This will keep indigenous peoples completely marginalized in overcrowded and mouldy housing units.

I would like to give the member an opportunity to talk more about how the Liberals plan to meet the housing infrastructure needs, because the gap is so huge. What will the government do not only to acknowledge that more needs to be done but also to go beyond lip service and actually make sure that indigenous peoples are getting the housing they need so they can thrive?

Mr. Peter Fragiskatos: Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me say that the member has contributed enormously to this discussion of housing and infrastructure, in particular with respect to her community, the challenges that we find in the north and the challenges that are experienced by indigenous peoples across the country.

I pointed out just a few minutes ago, perhaps the member did not hear me, what the government has done and said that more needs to be done. We see a situation that is not acceptable in Canada. She pointed to the infrastructure gap. There are initiatives in place to help address that gap, but it cannot be met only by government. The Canada Infrastructure Bank is taking more of a focus when it comes to these kinds of issues, namely, addressing the gap and the required investment that would have to take place to incent the private sector to be part of the solution. I think that can move forward. I think it is moving forward because of a different vision articulated by the Infrastructure Bank. I know the Conservatives do not like the Infrastructure Bank, but if we look at what it has carried out recently with respect to a policy vision, it does offer a constructive approach to the matter raised by the member.

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in his speech, the member talked a lot about housing, massive investments and connections with the municipalities. Is he aware that, in Quebec at least, the money for municipalities has to go through Quebec? It is a law that exists in Quebec.

Is he aware that Ottawa imposing conditions, trying to set requirements and starting to get involved in municipal zoning, when it is so far from local communities, makes no sense? Does he agree to transfer the money to Quebec unconditionally?

● (2105)

Mr. Peter Fragiskatos: Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of respect for my colleague. Yes, I understand this approach very well. There is an agreement between the Government of Canada and the Government of Quebec on this issue of housing. If we are to deal with this crisis, this challenge, we also need to be ambitious.

[English]

I know that communities across the country, not just in the member's province, want to embrace a vision of ambition saying that zoning changes have been extremely restrictive and are, in part and perhaps largely, responsible for the challenges that we find with respect to supply. They are limiting the options available for prospective homebuyers, young people in particular, and limiting rental options. All of this drives up costs. Doing things differently and being more ambitious is something that municipalities are turning towards. We see that because we have almost 200 agreements concluded with municipalities across the country in the housing accelerator fund, and that is going to continue. As I said, there is \$400 million in the estimates to top up that original fund.

Ms. Bonita Zarrillo (Port Moody—Coquitlam, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the member talked about CMHC financing. He knows well that there is a REIT right now, Starlight Investments, that is evicting tenants in Thorncliffe Park and that is refusing to come to committee, even though it has been asked twice.

I want to let the member know that CMHC financing to billionaire REITs is resulting in low-income tenants being evicted. Starlight alone is boasting \$425 million in low-interest CMHC debt, and it is actually using it as a selling feature to unload properties for profit. Is this what the Liberal government thinks CMHC should be used for?

Mr. Peter Fragiskatos: Mr. Speaker, this is another member I have a great amount of respect for. We have worked closely on the House of Commons committee responsible for housing.

On this matter, we will simply disagree. I support Starlight's coming before the committee. I voted in favour of that just a few days ago, as the member absolutely knows. However, I also know that when an Order Paper question went in with respect to Starlight's relationship with CMHC, nothing came back. In other words, CMHC has not had a relationship with Starlight, so I am not sure where the confusion is on that.

We do need more rental housing. Low-interest loans facilitated through the CMHC are a way to get there. Market options are important, but as to our non-market options, the member and I certainly agree on that.

Business of Supply

Mr. Dan Muys (Flamborough—Glanbrook, CPC): Mr. Speaker, let me just say, right off the top, that I will be splitting my time with my friend, the hon. member for Edmonton West, which is the home of the world-renowned West Edmonton Mall.

We are here tonight to debate estimates and the out-of-control inflationary spending by the Liberals that is driving up the cost of literally everything for all Canadians. After nine years, there are a couple of things that we already know about these levels of obese government spending. First, the budget does not, in fact, balance itself.

An hon. member: What?

Mr. Dan Muys: It is surprising, yes.

Second, Mr. Speaker, when one does not think about monetary policy, this has an impact on the fiscal and economic situation of the country and makes it even worse.

In the recent NDP-Liberal budget, we saw another \$61 billion in inflationary spending piled on to the backs of Canadians. That was on top of the \$20 billion in inflationary spending piled on in the fall economic statement. That was on top of the billions piled on over the past nine years. The result is that Canadian taxpayers are now paying \$58 billion in interest on the debt, which is more than the federal government sends to the provinces in health transfers.

Everyone knows that one cannot run a household on a credit card forever. Neither can one run a government by maxing out the credit card year after year. There are real-world consequences to this insatiable appetite for spending. First of all, it actually costs all of us. It is called taxes. If we think back to April of this year, common-sense Conservatives called upon the Liberal-NDP government to spike the hike, to not increase the carbon tax by 23% on April 1, on its way to quadrupling.

We also know, according to a Fraser Institute study, that nine out of 10 middle-class families are now paying more in income tax. These tax increases are certainly the very last thing that Canadians need at a time when they are already facing a cost of living crisis.

Of course, the Liberals, aided by their costly coalition partners in the NDP, need money because they have spent so much. They need to increase these taxes to fuel their addiction to spending. Because they cannot prioritize spending and demand better results for the money that the federal government spends, and because they think money grows on trees, or that one just prints or borrows more, what happens is that Canadians suffer. Canadians now have to prioritize spending in their daily lives. That means doing without, cutting corners on groceries and going to the food banks because the federal government cannot rein in spending. We have seen the numbers of those going to food banks reach record-smashing levels.

Another real-world consequence of all this spending is interest rates and mortgage rates. We know from the Scotiabank report that 2% of the rate increase is attributable to overspending by the government. Other banks have agreed. This hurts Canadians renewing their mortgage. It also hurts Canadians who rent, who have seen record heights in rental prices across the country. It hurts those paying car loans and credit cards.

On a daily basis, I hear from people in the suburban communities in my riding who live in fear of those mortgage renewals. These are young families or, in some cases, seniors who have downsized. They have moved out of the GTA for a slightly more affordable house a little farther west. Those who have variable rate mortgages are telling me that they are facing, already, increases of \$1,000, \$1,500 or \$2,000 per month. Can one even imagine the hole that would blow in one's household budget?

Those who are on fixed rate mortgages are beginning to feel that gut punch as well. It is about to get even worse as more of those renewals come up. That is all because these Liberals have a spending problem.

Again, rising rents, credit card payments and mortgage payments are the last thing Canadians can afford in the time of a cost of living crisis.

● (2110)

There are other compounding consequences of this reckless spending and the taxes that result. How is it that Canada has the worst performing economy in the industrialized world? That is a consequence of this wildly out-of-control spending and all of the things that creates.

I will cite some recent statistics that paint this picture. According to the Fraser Institute in May, Canada is on track for the worst decline in the standard of living in 40 years. That is after nine years of the Prime Minister. Worse still, Canada has the worst growth in income per capita than at any time under any prime minister since the 1930s.

In fact, while our friends to the south in the United States have seen their GDP per capita increase by 8% since 2019, Canada is pedalling backward. We have seen a decline of 2%. We are the basement of the G7; we are the worst. Business investment in our economy is down. Productivity is down. This is quantified at \$20,000 less per person than in the United States. I could go on because there are numerous recent figures. Canada has the worst performing economy in the G7 and the OECD, all because spending and taxes are chasing away private sector investment from our economy.

There is another point we as parliamentarians should consider, which is that all the money being spent is the tax money of Canadians. It is very disrespectful to Canadians, who work very hard and who are smart and good people, when governments like these Liberal governments spend money beyond their means. That is the hard-earned tax dollars of Canadians they are spending. Canadians work hard for that money, and they do not want to see it being wasted on Liberal-connected consultants such as McKinsey, on Liberal-connected insiders and on scandal after scandal.

Business of Supply

On top of these tax increases, the mortgage increases, groceries, home heating and all of the other cost of living aspects they are faced with, this is just another reason why hard work does not pay in Canada after nine years of the Prime Minister. All this obese government spending is making it impossible for Canadians to believe they can actually get ahead.

One of the things I hear most often that makes Canadians most upset is that this is a country where it is no longer possible to dream big. My omas and opas came from the Netherlands after World War II, and Opa Muys worked as part of the Dutch resistance to fight the Nazis. They had nothing in their pockets and came to Canada seeking hope, opportunity and freedom. At that time, as in the history of Canada up to nine years ago, it did not matter where one came from; it mattered where one was going. It did not matter if one came here with nothing. It mattered that one could work hard, save up, buy a home, start a family and succeed in Canada. However, after nine years of the Prime Minister, it is no longer possible to dream big. People are quite upset about that.

It does not have to be this way in Canada. We have everything the world wants: LNG, critical minerals, nuclear expertise, manufacturing expertise and smart, good people. The government has squandered those advantages with reckless spending, reckless taxes and regulation that is driving private sector investment out of Canada to other countries.

The good news is that hope is on the way. Only common-sense Conservatives, under the leadership of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, have a plan to bring home the country we know and love. We have all the advantages. We can succeed in Canada when the next common-sense Conservative government rolls up our sleeves and gets to work. We are going to axe the tax, build the homes, fix the budget and stop the crime.

That is why Conservatives will be voting against these estimates this evening. Canadians deserve much better. Now let us bring it home.

● (2115)

Mr. Vance Badawey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to speak about the foreign investment and private investment that has come into our country. As many in the House know, the city of Port Colborne has just announced a \$1.6-billion investment from a Japanese company, Asahi Kasei, which will be putting in place a big project. That just simply would not have happened without a lot of people and an all-hands-on-deck approach from all levels of government, including the federal government. It included a lot of incentives that were contained within the budget.

With the support that the federal government has contained within this budget, is the member prepared to support our budget and, therefore, support our community?

Mr. Dan Muys: Mr. Speaker, the OECD has reported that Canada will have the lowest private sector investment in our economy this decade and then, as a result, in subsequent decades. It is because of taxes. It is because of spending and regulation that is chasing away that investment, and while the member points to one example where there was heavy government subsidies, that does not preclude the macroeconomic picture that I spoke about.

I had the opportunity to knock on doors in the hon. member's riding fairly recently, and he may want to try that sometime soon and hear from his constituents. Without a doubt, the cost of living, the carbon tax and their mortgage increases are what I heard about over and over again at the doors in Niagara Centre.

● (2120)

Ms. Heather McPherson (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, one of the things that I hear when I knock on the doors of the good people of Edmonton Strathcona, Edmonton Centre and across Alberta is that people are deeply worried that our health care system is becoming privatized by Conservative premiers such as Danielle Smith. We know that the Conservatives have already said that they would privatize. In fact, I believe the health critic has said that he wants to be the last health care minister because he does not think the federal government has a role to play in that.

Public health care is the number one issue I am hearing about from my constituents. It is the number one thing that people are worried about, whether they are seniors, university students or whoever they are. I am wondering what he says about not supporting a budget that could conceivably help to make our health care system stronger.

Mr. Dan Muys: Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity to visit the member's riding, and there are many great places there. On the subject of health care, over the years of the Harper government, we saw increases to health care spending during that tenure, and health care is important. I know this very personally and directly.

My father had heart surgery five or six weeks ago. There were some complications, and he spent a number of weeks in hospital recovering. My mom was a nurse in the hospital system in Hamilton for 50 years, so we absolutely support health care. What is important for health care is a strong economy that generates the revenue so that we can actually afford to invest in health care.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Maxime Blanchette-Joncas (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to my colleague's speech. He spoke about the importance of growing the economy. When the Progressive Conservative Party was in office, Brian Mulroney increased the capital gains inclusion rate to 75%. That was in 1990.

Business of Supply

In 2024, the Conservative Party is saying that that is not a good idea. At the time, Mr. Mulroney justified that decision by saying that the goal was to stimulate the economy, so I would like my colleague to explain why it was a good idea to increase the capital gains inclusion rate to 75% in 1990, but today he is opposed to increasing it from 50% to 66%.

[English]

Mr. Dan Muys: Mr. Speaker, I think that farmers, seniors, home builders and small business people in Quebec would agree that this capital gains tax increase would kill jobs. Regarding what happened 40 years ago, the hon. member is a young fellow. I am not sure he was born quite yet in 1984. That was a different time. I am very proud that we are standing against this job-killing tax increase, which is going to absolutely destroy investment and entrepreneurship in this country.

Mr. Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to rise on the main estimates. One of my favourite parts of being an MP in Ottawa is the estimates process. Some MPs have other priorities when they are in Ottawa, such as speaking endlessly in the House, like my friend from Winnipeg North, or perhaps taking the family on the taxpayer's dime to Quebec, but for me, it is the estimates.

King Edward, when calling the model Parliament in 1295, started the original estimates process. He stated, "what touches all should be approved by all, [and it is also clear] that common dangers should be met [with measures] agreed upon in common." King Edward was the first estimates geek, and I am very pleased to follow in that tradition. He put forward a plan basically asking permission to spend taxpayers' money. At the time, it was to go to war with the Scots and the French, which may or may not have been great ideas, but he at least brought forward the plan to start seeking permission from the common people before spending their money.

Today's estimates process is the modern equivalent. It is broken down into four parts. There is the government expenditure plan; the main estimates; the departmental plans, which lay out the government's priorities for the money it is asking for; and, of course, the departmental results, which measure the results after the money is spent. The departmental plans, as I mentioned, lay out the justifications for all the money that is spent. The results are obviously what the government achieved or, with this government, did not achieve with the money spent.

The most recent year that we have departmental results for shows the government failed to achieve 49.7% of its targets. We think of the rapid growth in spending by the government, yet it failed 50% of the time, but that is a big improvement for the government when, over two years ago, it failed 51% of the time.

I want to go over some of the departmental results, some of the plans of the government and what it is seeking in the estimates this year. Public safety, for example, is seeking \$1.6 billion. The departmental results show that, last year, it achieved 46% of its targets, which makes one wonder how it can justify asking for continual money from taxpayers when it failed Canadians so badly. I will give some examples.

On the percentage of the population that thinks the government of Canada respects individual rights and freedoms, it set a goal of

70%, but it was only 46% of Canadians. On the percentage of partners that believe Public Safety Canada provides effective policy leadership and operational coordination on national security, keeping in mind we are in a foreign interference crisis right now, it missed by about 40%. As I mentioned earlier, on the police-reported crime rate per 100,000 of population, it had it at 5,200 per 100,000 and it came in at 6,600, which is 27% higher. As part of the estimates process, the government presents the departmental plans and says how it is going to spend taxpayers' money, but it is clear the government is failing.

On indigenous services, it is asking for \$21 billion in the estimates. The results for last year was that it achieved 16.9%. If we think of the crisis and the issues regarding indigenous peoples, it achieved 16.9% of its goals, a failure rate well above 80%. I have a couple of examples. On the percentage of first nations housing that is adequate as assessed and reported annually by first nations, it had a target of 70%. The result from the government was unspecified. It does not even know the result of its spending.

On the percentage of recommended number of sampling weeks of public water systems in first nations communities that were monitored for bacteria, it missed its goal by 11%. On the percentage of cultural and recreation assets inspected in the last three years with a greater than fair condition rating, the goal was 55%. It achieved 39%. However, the government paid out 94% in bonuses for their executives and managers. There were \$3.65 million in bonuses for an 83.1% failure rate.

● (2125)

Public Safety paid out 92% of its executives to fail over 50% of its targets. The CRA spent \$17 billion and failed on 51% of its targets. This is the same CRA that the Auditor General noted failed badly in the oversight of pandemic benefits. It paid out \$27 billion of taxpayer money to ineligible businesses. We have the government doing a tax grab right now with the capital gains tax, which is going to cripple small businesses and farmers to raise \$20 billion over four years, but here we have \$27 billion paid out to large businesses and corporations that were ineligible.

Business of Supply

There are other failures. For complainants answered within five business days of the receipt of their complaint, the target was 95%, and 61% was achieved. For the percentage of taxpayer service complaints that CRA resolved within one month, the target was at least 80% and the result was 37%. I know every MP in this building has a constituency office that is overrun with complaints that people cannot get through to the CRA. However, that is okay because the government paid out 98% of the CRA's executives with bonuses for the failure. For the percentage of low complexity objections resolved within 180 calendar days, the target was 85%, and 39% was achieved.

National Defence had \$31 billion in spending. Departmental results met were 27.8%. For the percentage of force elements that are ready for operations in accordance with targets, the target was 100%, which is great, but the result was 61%.

This one is staggering. For the percentage of personnel who were victims of discrimination, there was actually a goal set. We would think it would be zero tolerance for discrimination. There was a goal set to have 9% of its staff be discriminated against, but it managed to achieve 15.7%. That is about one in every eight people within DND feeling that they were discriminated against. However, the Liberals paid out bonuses to 91% of executives in DND.

Anyone who has worked in the private sector would know that, for harassment, they do not set a goal of having at least 9% of their staff harassed. They set a goal of zero. It may be impossible to achieve 0%, but they do not set a goal of having one out of every 11 employees discriminated against and then pay out 91% of the executives for achieving that. However, that is the Liberal government.

ESDC spent \$98 billion and failed 51% of its targets. For the percentage of travel documents and other passport services processed within standards, it missed by 22%. The percentage of in-person passport applications processed within 20 days was missed by 36%. The percentage of passport applications submitted by mail and processed within 20 business days was missed by 7%. However, the percentage of other Randys who received elicited government contracts was 100%. The executives got 93.3% bonuses paid out.

Health Canada was almost \$9 billion. It failed 51% of the time. For the percentage of domestic consumer product recalls communicated to Canadians in a timely manner, the target was at least 90%, and the result was 71%, which means, for 30% of recalls that are related to health, the government does not communicate in a timely manner. In this stage of the Internet, they could just post it on Twitter. However, that is too much for the government, but it is not too much to pay 95% of the executives bonuses.

I will just touch very quickly on one of my favourites. Environment Canada had \$2.7 billion. The government failed 60% of the time, although it almost achieved a 100% cover-up rate for the carbon tax cost. The department was exposed by the Auditor General for making up fantasy numbers for the net-zero projections for hydrogen projections. What did it do? It paid out bonuses to 94% of the executives.

There are plenty more reasons I will not be supporting the main estimates. Paying out bonuses for failure is not the way to go.

• (2130)

Mr. Vance Badawey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am going to ask this question again because unfortunately the member did not answer it earlier. There is a \$1.6 billion investment for the city of Port Colborne in the region of Niagara. Asahi Kasei is going to create almost 1,000 jobs. The budget does contain incentives. It also contains monies for secondary planning to satisfy infrastructure requirements.

With that said, a “no” vote by the Conservatives for the 2024 budget means there is not support by the Conservatives for this project. Once again, yes or no, are the Conservatives prepared to support this budget and, therefore, prepared to support the city of Port Colborne and the company, Asahi Kasei, which is going to come in and invest \$1.6 billion in the community?

Mr. Kelly McCauley: Madam Speaker, I am glad the parliamentary secretary for Transport Canada asked that question. It gives me a chance to comment about Transport Canada, where 97.8% of their executives got bonuses.

ICAO, which is the international body that oversees safety at our airports and transport safety, has ranked Canada below Somalia for safety at the airports. We used to have the highest airport safety in the world. We now, under this member's leadership, actually have airport safety lower than Somalia's, but the government pays out 97% bonuses; that is the Liberal government at work.

An hon. member: Oh, oh!

• (2135)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order. I want to remind members that they have an opportunity to ask questions, so if they have other things to add, they should wait.

I want to ask the honourable parliamentary secretary to withdraw the last word that he said about the hon. member.

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

[*Translation*]

Ms. Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Madam Speaker, in his speech, my colleague talked a lot about the importance of the sound management of public money. Obviously, we agree with that. We are trying to make sure that the money is invested wisely.

We saw the scandals involving McKinsey. The government uses outside firms a lot. Recently, in committee, I asked the government a question. Given that the government hired more public servants, it should be able to find the resources to provide services to citizens internally, but it is still using outside firms more. Why is that?

Business of Supply

It is rather odd for the government to say that it is using outside firms because the expertise was not available internally, when it is hiring more public servants.

I would like my colleague to comment on that.

[English]

Mr. Kelly McCauley: Madam Speaker, one of the items brought up in the Auditor General's study on McKinsey was a concern that she brought forward, that the government had actually trained public sector employees to do a certain task, and then it ignored those trained employees, only to go out and sole-source a contract to McKinsey.

The system under the current government is clearly broken, whether it is paying off McKinsey, Liberal friends at Deloitte or KPMG, while at the same time ignoring the in-house talent. It is silly, and it should stop. The government should do a full review on every penny spent and given out to those management contractors. Instead of shovelling out taxpayers' dollars, it should be serving taxpayers and not its friends at McKinsey.

Ms. Lori Idlout (Nunavut, NDP): *Uqaqtittiji*, I appreciated the member's question earlier when a Liberal MP failed to talk about indigenous housing, but I do want to talk about taxation. For example, rich oil and gas CEOs are getting richer. Many of the oil and gas companies are exempt from carbon tax. Suncor only pays one-fourteenth of the carbon tax, compared to Canadians.

I wonder if the member agrees that oil and gas companies like Suncor should be taxed so that we can make sure that those kinds of investments coming into the general revenue could go towards projects like the Kivalliq Hydro-Fibre Link project, which is a very important project that would help Nunavut communities get off dirty diesel.

Mr. Kelly McCauley: Madam Speaker, the government wastes so much money. Very easily, we could look after the needed project that the member mentioned. Whether it is cutting back government money to Liberal friends at McKinsey or to the green slush fund, or, as the Auditor General noted, the \$7.8 billion for green projects to corporations that were not eligible and did not qualify but got the money anyway. We have projects that need to be looked after, and if the government could manage its house better, we could certainly find the resources to cover the project that the member mentioned.

Mr. Ryan Turnbull (Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and to the Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry, Lib.): Madam Speaker, maybe we will just start on a very collaborative note with, I am sure, a comment that all members in the House will be unified on. I want to say, "go, Edmonton Oilers". They have tied it up in the Stanley Cup, in the third game of the series. It is good to see the Oilers score a goal and tie it up. I am really hoping that they come out on top tonight.

I am very pleased to rise in the House to discuss the main estimates for 2024-25 and the supplementary estimates (A) 2024-25. This year's main estimates present a total of \$449.2 billion in budgetary spending, with \$191.6 billion to be voted on. Non-budgetary expenditures of \$1.2 billion are also presented.

The voted amounts represent maximum "up to" ceilings or estimates and may not be fully spent during the course of the year. Actual expenditures will be included in the public accounts after the end of the fiscal year. The estimates family of documents, which include main estimates, supplementary estimates, departmental plans and departmental results reports, in conjunction with the public accounts, provide Parliament with detailed information about spending plans, expenditures and achieved results. The main estimates support the government's request for Parliament's approval of expenditures that were already planned for in previous decisions, including federal budgets.

The main estimates are followed by the supplementary estimates, which seek incremental approvals that are typically tabled three times a year: in May, in late October or early November, and in February. The financial information in the estimates is presented to support an appropriation bill that seeks parliamentary approval for expenditures that will be incurred throughout the year.

Through the supply bill, the government requests Parliament's approval for the planned spending proposals that are detailed in the estimates.

Before I continue, Madam Speaker, let me just remind you that I am splitting my time.

This year's main estimates call for a total of \$449.2 billion in budgetary spending, of which \$191.6 billion will be in the form of grants. Of the 129 organizations presenting funding requirements in the main estimates, 11 are seeking more than \$5 billion in voted budgetary expenditures. Here are a few examples.

There is \$10.9 billion for Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada to modernize Government of Canada structures to enable indigenous people to build capacity and to support their vision of self-determination, and to lead the Government of Canada's work in the north.

There is also \$6.2 billion for Veterans Affairs Canada for the care, treatment and re-establishment, in civil life, of veterans, and for the care of their dependents and their survivors.

There is \$5.9 billion for Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada to improve conditions for investment, to enhance Canada's innovation performance, to increase Canada's share of global trade and to build a fair, efficient and competitive marketplace.

There is \$5.8 billion to the Office of Infrastructure Canada, and this covers a whole range of infrastructure. I have seen quite a lot of investments in my community, and I know the member for Pickering—Uxbridge would also agree that our region has gotten a lot of benefit out of the active transportation routes that connect our region. Having those routes and the investments in those routes have really been a blessing for our communities, and we hear about it from our stakeholders; I know I do. The trail system at the waterfront in Whitby has gotten a complete revamp, which is great to see.

With respect to public transit, we have a bus rapid transit route that has had major investments that members on the government side, in our region, have fought hard for. Those investments are connecting our region with a public transit system that is modernized and rapid, and it allows people to get across our region seamlessly. Those active transportation routes that I mentioned also connect with the public transportation routes, so of course, people can ride their bicycles, can get on a bus and can go right across Durham region. They can even connect with the GO Transit and can get right to downtown Toronto, which is great to see. I thought I would just highlight those as key investments in our region.

• (2140)

There is \$5.6 billion for the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation for much-needed housing infrastructure. This is another area in which we have seen considerable investment in our region, and it is dramatically contributing to solving the affordable housing challenges that we see all across Canada.

Funding in these main estimates allows the government to provide a wide variety of programs and services to Canadians, as well as supporting other levels of government, organizations and individuals through transfer payments. The majority of expenditures in the 2024-25 main estimates are transfer payments, payments made to other levels of government, other organizations and individuals. Certainly, we know those transfer payments are important for many of the health care services, social services and many other services that Canadians take advantage of all the time. Transfer payments make up approximately 63% of expenditures, or \$283 billion. Operating and capital expenditures accounts for approximately 26.6% of expenditures, or \$119.7 billion, while public debt charges are approximately 10.4% of expenditures, or \$46.5 billion.

Forecasts of statutory spending are included in these estimates to provide additional information on departments' total estimated expenditures. Of these forecasts, \$257.6 billion is for budgetary expenditures, including the cost of servicing the public debt. This amount does not include benefits paid for the employment insurance operating account or expenditures legislated through the Income Tax Act, such as the Canada child benefit. The 2024-25 main estimates reflect updated forecasts published in the 2023 fall economic statement.

Significant changes in statutory budgetary spending from the 2023-24 main estimates include an increase in public debt charges from \$37.8 billion to \$46.5 billion; increases in major transfer payments, most notably elderly benefits, which have gone from \$76.6 billion to \$81.1 billion; the Canada health transfer, which has gone

Business of Supply

from \$49.4 billion to \$52.1 billion; and fiscal equalization, which has gone from \$24 billion to \$25.3 billion.

There is an increase in the Canada carbon rebate, formerly called the climate action incentive payment, from \$9 billion to \$11.4 billion. This would obviously be distributed to all the federal backstop provinces, and Canadians will get those rebates. There is an increase in the payments for the AgriInsurance program, which has gotten significantly bigger, growing from \$243 million to \$1 billion. Net statutory expenditures of \$1 billion are forecast for loans, investments and advances, reflecting an increase in net loans dispersed under the Canada Student Financial Assistance Act.

There has also been a major initiative to refocus government spending. Canadians expect transparency from their government, and they have a right to know how public funds are spent. Through our financial reporting, our government is committed to spending taxpayers' money transparently, efficiently and prudently while getting results. The government has been reporting on its efforts to refocus government spending since fall 2023, beginning with supplementary estimates (B), which presented reallocations in government spending of \$500 million based on previous spending in travel and professional services.

The main estimates continue to report on the amounts that are being reallocated in the next three years, providing a total for each department and for the government overall. Departmental plans include further details on the ongoing reductions, including implementation plans by department. In fact, it is one of the most important things we do as a government, which is why we undertook a spending review within the main estimates and supplementary estimates.

In budget 2023, we made a commitment to refocus government spending and to ensure prudent fiscal management, and that is exactly what we are doing today. I hope all members of the House will quickly support the main estimates and supplementary estimates.

• (2145)

Mr. Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC): Madam Speaker, the estimates are generally put together around January and, of course, tabled later. Between January and when the most recent supplementary estimates (A) came out, the government found out that it owed an extra \$1.9 billion in interest on the debt, so it has come to Parliament asking for this money.

Business of Supply

How is it that the government is so out of touch and so bad at math that, within just a short two-month period, it miscalculated \$1.9 billion in interest payments on the debt?

• (2150)

Mr. Ryan Turnbull: Madam Speaker, I know that Conservatives often have trouble understanding that the world changes and things evolve over time.

I would answer the member's question by saying this: Our government has paid a lot of attention to refocusing government spending, which amounts to a refocusing of \$15.8 billion in spending by 2027-28. That is a pretty significant amount of refocused government spending, which I think we can all agree is a good thing. It is good, prudent fiscal management to look at how the government is spending its money and to ensure that we are refocusing those funds in areas where we can get better results for Canadians. That should be acknowledged by all parties as a positive thing.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Madam Speaker, my colleague talked about many things, obviously, including international trade. He talked about the importance of improving our performance in international trade and increasing our markets. That is good. There is Canada's Indo-Pacific strategy. I think it is important to make every effort to diversify our markets.

My question has more to do with respecting existing international trade agreements. It is good to invest money in developing markets, but when we sign agreements, it is also important to stake one's claim and stand up for oneself when things are not working.

For many years, the agreement with Europe put us at a disadvantage with respect to agriculture, when supply-managed quotas were being offered freely. At that time, we were supposed to make gains, by selling meat, beef and pork. However, that did not happen because the Europeans do not accept our way of cleaning the carcasses even though it amounts to what they do over there.

Will his government finally come up with something tangible, not just fine words, to free up these markets? The situation is outrageous.

[*English*]

Mr. Ryan Turnbull: Madam Speaker, I appreciate the question from the member opposite. We both served on the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food for quite some time, and I always appreciated working with him.

At the time, we had talked about international trade and the impacts on the supply-managed sector. I note that, in the study we did, we saw that there was very little impact at the time. I think there was some concern with respect to the dairy industry, which did not amount to being a whole lot of impact, but we did a study on it. I know the member felt strongly about that work, and we undertook that work together.

It is important that we protect our supply-managed sector for sure. Obviously, Canada is one of the top countries in the world in terms of having the most international trade relationships and agreements. I think this serves us all well with respect to being able to access those markets.

Ms. Heather McPherson (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Madam Speaker, one thing my colleague talked about was the health transfer to the provinces. Health care is something I am hearing about from my constituents more than anything else, and they are worried about its privatization.

The original plan under the Canada Health Act was that the federal government would pay 50% and the provinces would pay 50%. It has been a long time since that has been the case, yet the member is making it sound as though it is a really great thing that we are hitting 26% or 30%. That is not what we were supposed to do.

Is there a plan within the government to increase the health transfers so we can make sure that health care remains a public, universally delivered program?

Mr. Ryan Turnbull: Madam Speaker, I will say that our government certainly stands behind wanting to preserve a publicly funded health care system. Obviously, we have renegotiated the Canada health transfer, which was increased quite significantly, to the tune of approximately \$200 billion. It is a significant increase from past iterations of that agreement. I note that we also signed bilateral agreements with provinces and territories, which added additional funds on top of that, with four main priorities. I could go into those if the member wanted.

I would just say that we are very much aligned with the intentions of the member's remarks, and we look forward to seeing provinces and territories use those funds—

• (2155)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Resuming debate, the hon. member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan.

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, as we approach the end of this session, I am reflecting on where we were nine years ago.

I was a Conservative candidate in Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan. We only had one child; how easy life was then. Moreover, we were getting ready for a fall election. At the time, Stephen Harper was prime minister. He was a steady hand, an economist in office, but Liberals were promising real change. Well, it turned out that real change was the only promise that the Prime Minister kept.

After nine years, how different our country looks. There are tent cities everywhere; there is crime, chaos and a dramatic increase in drugs, as the government pursues radical and dangerous policies that give away taxpayer-funded drugs to those struggling with addiction. The national debt has more than doubled. There has been dramatic growth in public spending both inside the public service and on external contracting.

There was a time, nine years ago, when it was unheard of for a prime minister to be convicted of breaking ethics laws. Now we are at a point where RCMP investigations into government corruption seem to be the norm. After nine years under the Prime Minister, with the escalation in violent crime, in debt, in a dramatic growth in inflation and costs that people face, yes, indeed, he brought real change. However, it is not the kind of real change that anyone wanted.

The Liberals are trying to create fear around what a new government would mean. Would a new government mean lower taxes or a return to common-sense criminal justice policies? Would it mean restoring Canada's principled stands and respect in the world, where we do not just make announcements but actually follow through on commitments to our allies? I think Canadians are now looking for a principled government that restores common sense and reverses the dramatic, debilitating real change agenda of the extreme Prime Minister.

Members across have asked what the Conservatives would cut. We would cut McKinsey, the green slush fund and arrive scam. We would cut the corrupt middlemen who are taking money for doing nothing. We would cut Canadians' taxes so that they could keep more of their hard-earned money. We would reverse the government's extreme tax-increase agenda. We would make taxes lower, simpler and fairer. This is what we would cut: We would cut the crime, we would cut the corruption, and we would cut Canadians' taxes. This is exactly what a Conservative government would deliver.

After nine years of the extreme, radical, so-called real change agenda of the Prime Minister, which has doubled our debt, increased violent crime and undermined our credibility in the world, we need a restoration of common sense in this country. We need it now more than ever.

I am pleased to be voting against the government's agenda and looking forward to another election where we can restore the Conservative common sense that this country had nine years ago.

● (2200)

[Translation]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Before continuing, I would like to thank the pages for being here this evening. Without them, we would be a very sorry lot.

[English]

I also want to thank the Journals staff who are helping, IT helping to keep our voting app going, and catering.

[Translation]

We cannot forget the interpreters, whom I would like to thank. Then there is the security personnel and maintenance staff. Without them, we could not function.

[English]

As well, I want to thank anybody else I may have forgotten who keeps us going, some of the staff.

We need to give them a round of applause for sure.

Business of Supply

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): 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.

Call in the members.

* * *

● (2230)

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—GOVERNMENT'S ECONOMIC ANALYSIS ON CARBON PRICING

The House resumed consideration of the motion and of the amendment.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The first question is on the amendment to the opposition motion relating to the business of supply.

● (2245)

(The House divided on the amendment, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 815)

YEAS

Members

Aboutaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Angus	Arnold
Ashton	Bachrach
Baldinelli	Barlow
Barrett	Barron
Berthold	Bezan
Blaney	Block
Boulerice	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Calkins	Cannings
Caputo	Carrie
Chambers	Chong
Collins (Victoria)	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho
Davidson	Deltell
d'Entremont	Desjarlais
Doherty	Dowdall
Dreeshen	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Ellis	Epp
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)
Fast	Ferreri
Garrison	Gazan
Généreux	Genuis
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gourde
Gray	Green
Hallan	Hoback
Idlout	Jeneroux
Jivani	Johns
Julian	Kelly
Khanna	Kitchen
Kniec	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kurek
Kusie	Kwan
Lake	Lantsman
Lawrence	Lehoux
Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb

Business of Supply

MacGregor	Maguire	Iacono	Ien
Majumdar	Martel	Jaczek	Joly
Masse	Mathysen	Jones	Jowhari
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	Mazier	Kayabaga	Kelloway
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLean	Khalid	Khera
McPherson	Melillo	Koutrakis	Kusmierczyk
Moore	Morantz	Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Morrice	Morrison	Lamoureux	Lapointe
Motz	Muys	Larouche	Lattanzio
Nater	Patzer	Lauzon	LeBlanc
Paul-Hus	Perkins	Lebouthillier	Lemire
Poilievre	Redekopp	Lightbound	Long
Reid	Rempel Garner	Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
Roberts	Rood	MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)
Ruff	Scheer	MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney
Schmale	Seeback	Martinez Ferrada	May (Cambridge)
Shields	Shipley	McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty
Singh	Small	McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Soroka	Steinley	McLeod	Mendès
Stewart	Strahl	Medicino	Miao
Stubbs	Thomas	Michaud	Miller
Tochor	Tolmie	Morrissey	Murray
Uppal	Van Popta	Naqvi	Ng
Vidal	Vien	Noormohamed	Normandin
Viersen	Vis	O'Connell	Oliphant
Vuong	Wagantall	O'Regan	Pauzé
Warkentin	Waugh	Perron	Petitpas Taylor
Webber	Williams	Powlowski	Qualtrough
Williamson	Zarrillo	Rayes	Robillard
Zimmer— 139		Rodriguez	Rogers
		Romanado	Rota
		Sahota	Sajjan
		Saks	Samson
		Sarai	Savard-Tremblay
		Scarpaleggia	Schieffe
		Serré	Sgro
		Shanahan	Sheehan
		Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
		Simard	Sinclair-Desgagné
		Sorbara	Sousa
		Ste-Marie	St-Onge
		Sudds	Tassi
		Taylor Roy	Thériault
		Thompson	Trudel
		Turnbull	Van Bynen
		van Koevenden	Vandal
		Vandenbeld	Vignola
		Villemure	Virani
		Weiler	Wilkinson
		Yip	Zahid
		Zuberi— 179	

NAYS

Members

Alghabra	Ali
Anand	Anandasangaree
Arseneault	Arya
Atwin	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Bergeron	Bérubé
Bibeau	Bittle
Blanchette-Joncas	Blois
Boissonnault	Bradford
Brière	Brunelle-Duceppe
Carr	Casey
Chabot	Chagger
Chahal	Champagne
Champoux	Chatel
Chen	Chiang
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Cormier
Coteau	Dabrusin
Damoff	DeBellefeuille
Desbiens	Desilets
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Dong
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fortin	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Fry	Gaheer
Gainey	Gaudreau
Gerretsen	Gill
Gould	Guilbeault
Hajdu	Hanley
Hardie	Hepfner
Holland	Housefather
Hussen	Hutchings

PAIRED

Members

Blair	Gallant
Plamondon	Wilkinson— 4

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I declare the amendment defeated.

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The next question is on the main motion.

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

Mr. Luc Berthold: Madam Speaker, I request a recorded division.

● (2255)

[English]

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

(Division No. 816)

YEAS

Members

Abouttaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Angus	Arnold
Ashton	Bachrach
Baldinelli	Barlow
Barrett	Barron
Barsalou-Duval	Beaulieu
Berthold	Bérubé
Bezan	Blanchette-Joncas
Blaney	Block
Boulerice	Bragdon
Brassard	Brock
Brunelle-Duceppe	Calkins
Cannings	Caputo
Carrie	Chabot
Chambers	Champoux
Chong	Collins (Victoria)
Cooper	Dalton
Dancho	Davidson
DeBellefeuille	Deltell
d'Entremont	Desbiens
Desilets	Desjarlais
Doherty	Dowdall
Dreeshen	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Ellis	Epp
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)
Fast	Ferreri
Fortin	Garrison
Gaudreau	Gazan
Généreux	Genuis
Gill	Gladu
Godin	Goodridge
Gourde	Gray
Green	Hallan
Hoback	Idlout
Jeneroux	Jivani
Johns	Julian
Kelly	Khanna
Kitchen	Kmiec
Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Kurek	Kusie
Kwan	Lake
Lantsman	Larouche
Lawrence	Lehoux
Lemire	Leslie
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Liepert	Lloyd
Lobb	MacGregor
Maguire	Majumdar
Martel	Masse
Mathysen	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
Mazier	McCaulley (Edmonton West)
McLean	McPherson
Melillo	Michaud
Moore	Morantz
Morrice	Morrison
Motz	Muys
Nater	Normandin
Patzer	Paul-Hus
Pauzé	Perkins
Perron	Poilevre
Redekopp	Reid

Rempel Garner
Roberts
Ruff
Scheer
Seeback
Shiple
Sinclair-Desgagné
Small
Steinley
Stewart
Stubbs
Thomas
Tolmie
Uppal
Vecchio
Vien
Vignola
Vis
Warkentin
Webber
Williamson
Zimmer — 167

Business of Supply

Richards
Rood
Savard-Tremblay
Schmale
Shields
Simard
Singh
Soroka
Ste-Marie
Strahl
Thériault
Tochor
Trudel
Van Popta
Vidal
Viersen
Villemure
Wagantall
Waugh
Williams
Zarrillo

NAYS

Members

Alghabra	Ali
Anand	Anandasangaree
Arseneault	Arya
Atwin	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Battiste	Beech
Bibeau	Bittle
Blois	Boissonnault
Brière	Carr
Casey	Chagger
Chahal	Champagne
Chatel	Chen
Chiang	Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Damoff
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Dong
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fragiskatos	Fraser
Freeland	Fry
Gaheer	Gainey
Gerretsen	Gould
Guilbeault	Hajdu
Hanley	Hardie
Hepfner	Holland
Housefather	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Ien	Jaczek
Joly	Jones
Jowhari	Kayabaga
Kelloway	Khalid
Khera	Koutrakis
Kusmierczyk	Lalonde
Lambropoulos	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Lattanzio
Lauzon	LeBlanc
Lebouthillier	Lightbound
Long	Longfield
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacDonald (Malpeque)	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney	Martinez Ferrada
May (Cambridge)	McDonald (Avalon)

Business of Supply

McGuinty	McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod
Mendès	Mendicino
Miao	Miller
Morrissey	Murray
Naqvi	Ng
Noormohamed	O'Connell
Oliphant	O'Regan
Petitpas Taylor	Powlowski
Qualtrough	Rayes
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rogers	Romanado
Rota	Sahota
Sajjan	Saks
Samson	Sarai
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sorbara	Sousa
St-Onge	Sudds
Tassi	Taylor Roy
Thompson	Turnbull
Valdez	Van Bynen
van Koeverden	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Virani
Weiler	Wilkinson
Yip	Zahid
Zuberi— 151	

PAIRED

Members

Blair	Gallant
Plamondon	Wilkinson— 4

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I declare the motion carried.

* * *

[Translation]

MAIN ESTIMATES 2024-25

Hon. Anita Anand (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2025, less the amounts voted in the interim supply, be concurred in.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

Mr. Luc Berthold: Madam Speaker, I request a recorded division.

- (2310)

[English]

Before the Clerk announced the results of the vote:

Ms. Heather McPherson: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately there are two members from Alberta, the member for Foothills and the member for Banff—Airdrie, whose photos are not showing, so we will not be able to count their votes.

The Speaker: That is unfortunately the case, and they do not seem to be online. I am afraid their votes will have to be withdrawn.

[Translation]

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

(Division No. 817)

YEAS

Members

Alghabra	Ali
Anand	Anandasangaree
Angus	Arseneault
Arya	Ashton
Atwin	Bachrach
Badawey	Bains
Baker	Barron
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Bergeron	Bérubé
Bibeau	Bittle
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney
Blois	Boissonnault
Boulerice	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings
Carr	Casey
Chabot	Chagger
Chahal	Champagne
Champoux	Chatel
Chen	Chiang
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Damoff
DeBellefeuille	Desbiens
Desilets	Desjarlais
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Dong
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fortin	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Fry	Gaheer
Gainey	Garrison
Gaudreau	Gazan
Gerretsen	Gill
Gould	Green
Guilbeault	Hajdu
Hanley	Hardie
Hepfner	Holland
Housefather	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Idlout	Ien
Jaczek	Johns
Joly	Jones
Jowhari	Julian
Kayabaga	Kelloway
Khalid	Khera
Koutrakis	Kusmierczyk
Kwan	Lalonde
Lambropoulos	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Larouche
Lattanzio	Lauzon
LeBlanc	Lebouthillier
Lemire	Lightbound
Long	Longfield
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacDonald (Malpeque)	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney
Martinez Ferrada	Masse
Mathysen	May (Cambridge)

Business of Supply

May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McPherson
Mendicino
Michaud
Morrice
Murray
Ng
Normandin
Oliphant
Pauzé
Petitpas Taylor
Qualtrough
Rodriguez
Romanado
Sahota
Saks
Sarai
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Singh
Sousa
St-Onge
Tassi
Thériault
Trudel
Valdez
van Koeverden
Vandenbeld
Villemure
Weiler
Yip
Zarrillo

McDonald (Avalon)
McKay
McLeod
Mendès
Miao
Miller
Morrissey
Naqvi
Noormohamed
O'Connell
O'Regan
Perron
Powlowski
Robillard
Rogers
Rota
Sajjan
Samson
Savard-Tremblay
Schiefke
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sinclair-Desgagné
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Sudds
Taylor Roy
Thompson
Turnbull
Van Bynen
Vandal
Vignola
Virani
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi— 202

Martel
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Melillo
Morantz
Motz
Nater
Paul-Hus
Poilievre
Redekopp
Rempel Garner
Rood
Scheer
Seeback
Shipley
Soroka
Stewart
Stubbs
Tochor
Uppal
Vecchio
Vien
Vis
Wagantall
Waugh
Williams
Zimmer— 115

Mazier
McLean
Moore
Morrison
Muys
Patzner
Perkins
Rayes
Reid
Roberts
Ruff
Schmale
Shields
Small
Steinley
Strahl
Thomas
Tolmie
Van Popta
Vidal
Viersen
Vuong
Warkentin
Webber
Williamson

PAIRED

Members

Blair
Plamondon

Gallant
Wilkinson— 4

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

[*English*]

Hon. Anita Anand moved that Bill C-74, An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the federal public administration for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2025, be now read the first time.

(Motion deemed adopted and bill read the first time)

Hon. Anita Anand moved that the bill be read the second time and referred to a committee of the whole.

The Speaker: The question is on the motion.

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

Hon. Ruby Sahota: Mr. Speaker, I believe if you seek it, you will find agreement to apply the results of the previous vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting yea.

Hon. Andrew Scheer: Mr. Speaker, there were two members' votes that the NDP have said should not count because of technical difficulties, so if we start applying all these votes, those members' votes will not count, is that correct?

The Speaker: I will consult with the Table. That is indeed correct.

Is the hon. member for Regina—Qu'Appelle requesting a recorded division?

Hon. Andrew Scheer: Mr. Speaker, if the two members' votes that the NDP objected to will not count, then we will have to have a recorded division.

NAYS

Members

Abouttaif
Albas
Arnold
Barrett
Bezan
Brassard
Calkins
Carrie
Chong
Dalton
Davidson
d'Entremont
Dowdall
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Epp
Falk (Provencher)
Ferrerri
Genuis
Godin
Gourde
Hallan
Jeneroux
Kelly
Kitchen
Kram
Kurek
Lake
Lawrence
Leslie
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lloyd
Maguire

Aitchison
Allison
Baldinelli
Berthold
Block
Brock
Caputo
Chambers
Cooper
Dancho
Deltell
Doherty
Dreeshen
Ellis
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Généreux
Gladu
Goodridge
Gray
Hoback
Jivani
Khanna
Kmiec
Kramp-Neuman
Kusie
Lantsman
Lehoux
Lewis (Essex)
Liepert
Lobb
Majumdar

Business of Supply

The Speaker: To apply the vote from the previous vote, it would be as if the vote had stood, which means that the two members' votes would not be counted in this vote.

• (2325)

Ms. Heather McPherson: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not enjoy doing this, but really the guardrail of using the app is that we can identify the members who have voted or who have not. We do not have photos, I believe, and I will ask the clerks to check, for the member for Foothills and the member for Banff—Airdrie. If their photos do not come up, we cannot guarantee that it is they who voted, and I would ask that those votes not count.

The Speaker: I would happily like to inform the House that the photo for the member for Banff-Airdrie did come through. It is only the picture for the member for Foothills that did not come through, so his vote will have to be withdrawn.

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

(Division No. 818)

YEAS

Members

Alghabra	Ali
Anand	Anandasangaree
Angus	Arseneault
Arya	Ashton
Atwin	Badawey
Bains	Baker
Barron	Barsalou-Duval
Battiste	Beaulieu
Beech	Bergeron
Bérubé	Bibeau
Bittle	Blanchette-Joncas
Blaney	Blois
Boissonnault	Boulerice
Bradford	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings
Carr	Casey
Chabot	Chagger
Chahal	Champagne
Champoux	Chatel
Chen	Chiang
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Damoff
DeBellefeuille	Desbiens
Desilets	Desjarlais
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Dong
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fortin	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Fry	Gaheer
Gainey	Garrison
Gaudreau	Gazan
Gerretsen	Gill
Gould	Green
Guilbeault	Hajdu
Hanley	Hardie
Hepfner	Holland
Housefather	Hughes
Hussen	Hutchings

Iacono	Idlout
Ien	Jaczek
Johns	Joly
Jones	Jowhari
Julian	Kayabaga
Kelloway	Khalid
Khera	Koutrakis
Kusmierczyk	Kwan
Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Larouche	Lattanzio
Lauzon	LeBlanc
Lebouthillier	Lemire
Lightbound	Long
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacAulay (Cardigan)	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
O'Regan	Pauzé
Perron	Petitpas Taylor
Powlowski	Qualtrough
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rogers	Romanado
Rota	Sahota
Sajjan	Saks
Samson	Sarai
Savard-Tremblay	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Brampton East)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard
Sinclair-Desgagné	Singh
Sorbara	Sousa
Ste-Marie	St-Onge
Sudds	Tassi
Taylor Roy	Thériault
Thompson	Trudel
Turnbull	Valdez
Van Bynen	van Koeverden
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vignola	Villemure
Virani	Weiler
Yip	Zahid
Zarrillo	Zuberi— 202

NAYS

Members

Abouttaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barrett	Berthold
Bezan	Block
Bragdon	Brassard
Brock	Calkins
Carrie	Chong
Cooper	Dalton
Dancho	Davidson
Deltell	d'Entremont
Doherty	Dowdall
Dreeshen	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)

Ellis	Epp
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)
Ferreri	Généreux
Genius	Gladu
Godin	Goodridge
Gourde	Gray
Hallan	Hoback
Jeneroux	Jivani
Kelly	Khanna
Kitchen	Kmiec
Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Kurek	Kusie
Lake	Lantsman
Lawrence	Lehoux
Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Lloyd	Lobb
Maguire	Majumdar
Martel	Mazier
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLean
Melillo	Moore
Morantz	Morrison
Motz	Muys
Nater	Patzer
Paul-Hus	Perkins
Poilievre	Redekopp
Reid	Rempel Garner
Richards	Roberts
Rood	Ruff
Scheer	Schmale
Shields	Shipley
Small	Soroka
Steinley	Stewart
Strahl	Stubbs
Thomas	Tochor
Tolmie	Uppal
Van Popta	Vien
Viersen	Vuong
Wagantall	Warkentin
Waugh	Webber
Williamson	Zimmer— 106

PAIRED

Members

Blair	Gallant
Plamondon	Wilkinson— 4

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried. Accordingly, the bill stands referred to a committee of the whole.

I do now leave the chair for the House to go into 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)

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Stephanie Kusie (Calgary Midnapore, CPC): Madam Chair, can the President of the Treasury Board confirm that the main estimates bill is in its usual form?

Hon. Anita Anand (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Madam Chair, the presentation of this bill is identical to that used during the previous supply period.

[*English*]

The Deputy Chair: Shall clause 2 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Business of Supply

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 schedule 1 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Schedule 1 agreed to)

The Deputy Chair: Shall schedule 2 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Schedule 2 agreed to)

[*English*]

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)

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.

Business of Supply

(Bill agreed to)

The Deputy Chair: Shall I rise and report the bill?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Bill reported)

Hon. Anita Anand moved that the bill be concurred in.

● (2330)

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

Hon. Ruby Sahota: Mr. Speaker, I believe that, if you seek it, you will find agreement to apply the results from the previous vote on concurrence of the estimates to this vote, with Liberal members voting yea.

Hon. Andrew Scheer: Mr. Speaker, I agree, with Conservative members voting no.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Perron: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote, and we will be voting yes.

[*English*]

Ms. Heather McPherson: Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party also agrees, and we will be voting yes.

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, Greens agree to apply the vote, and we will be voting yea, in favour.

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

(Division No. 819)

YEAS

Members

Alhabra	Ali
Anand	Anandasangaree
Angus	Arseneault
Arya	Ashton
Atwin	Bachrach
Badawey	Bains
Baker	Barron
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Bergeron	Bérubé
Bibeau	Bittle
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney
Blois	Boissonnault
Boulerice	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings
Carr	Casey
Chabot	Chagger
Chahal	Champagne
Champoux	Chatel
Chen	Chiang
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Damoff
DeBellefeuille	Desbiens
Desilets	Desjarlais
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Drouin

Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Dzerowicz
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith	Fillmore
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fortin
Fragiskatos	Fraser
Freeland	Fry
Gaheer	Gainey
Garrison	Gaudreau
Gazan	Gerretsen
Gill	Gould
Green	Guilbeault
Hajdu	Hanley
Hardie	Hepfner
Holland	Housefather
Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Idlout
Ien	Jaczek
Johns	Joly
Jones	Jowhari
Julian	Kayabaga
Kelloway	Khalid
Khera	Koutrakis
Kusmierczyk	Kwan
Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Larouche	Lattanzio
Lauzon	LeBlanc
Lebouthillier	Lemire
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
O'Regan	Pauzé
Perron	Petitpas Taylor
Powlowski	Qualtrough
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rogers	Romanado
Rota	Sahota
Sajjan	Saks
Samson	Sarai
Savard-Tremblay	Scarpaleggia
Schieffe	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Brampton East)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard
Sinclair-Desgagné	Singh
Sorbara	Sousa
Ste-Marie	St-Onge
Sudds	Tassi
Taylor Roy	Thériault
Thompson	Trudel
Turnbull	Valdez
Van Bynen	van Koeverden
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vignola	Villemure
Virani	Weiler
Wilkinson	Yip
Zahid	Zarrillo

Business of Supply

Zuberi— 201

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barrett	Berthold
Bezan	Block
Brassard	Brock
Calkins	Caputo
Carrie	Chambers
Chong	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho
Davidson	Deltell
d'Entremont	Doherty
Dowdall	Dreeshen
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Ferreri	Généreux
Genuis	Gladu
Godin	Goodridge
Gourde	Gray
Hallan	Hoback
Jeneroux	Jivani
Kelly	Khanna
Kitchen	Kmiec
Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Kurek	Kusie
Lake	Lantsman
Lawrence	Lehoux
Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
Maguire	Majumdar
Martel	Mazier
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLean
Melillo	Moore
Morantz	Morrison
Motz	Muys
Nater	Patzer
Paul-Hus	Perkins
Poillievre	Redekopp
Reid	Rempel Garner
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	

PAIRED

Members

Blair	Gallant
Plamondon	Wilkinson— 4

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried. When shall the bill be read a third time? By leave, now?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Anita Anand moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

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

[*English*]

Hon. Ruby Sahota: Mr. Speaker, I believe that, if you seek it, you will find agreement to apply the results of the previous vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting yea.

● (2335)

Hon. Andrew Scheer: The Conservatives agree, and we will be voting no.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Perron: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote, and we will be voting yea.

[*English*]

Ms. Heather McPherson: Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party of Canada agrees, and we will be voting yea.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party agrees to apply the vote, and we will be voting yea.

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

(Division No. 820)

YEAS

Members

Alghabra	Ali
Anand	Anandasangaree
Angus	Arseneault
Arya	Ashton
Atwin	Bachrach
Badawey	Bains
Baker	Barron
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Bergeron	Bérubé
Bibeau	Bittle
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney
Blois	Boissonnault
Boulerice	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings
Carr	Casey
Chabot	Chagger
Chahal	Champagne
Champoux	Chatel
Chen	Chiang
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Damoff
DeBellefeuille	Desbiens
Desilets	Desjarlais
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Dzerowicz
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith	Fillmore

Business of Supply

Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Gaheer
Garrison
Gazan
Gill
Green
Hajdu
Hardie
Holland
Hussen
Iacono
Ien
Johns
Jones
Julian
Kelloway
Khera
Kusmierczyk
Lalonde
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
O'Regan
Perron
Powlowski
Robillard
Rogers
Rota
Sajjan
Samson
Savard-Tremblay
Schieffke
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sinclair-Desgagné
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Sudds
Taylor Roy
Thompson
Turnbull
Van Bynen
Vandal
Vignola
Virani
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi — 201

Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser
Fry
Gainey
Gaudreau
Gerretsen
Gould
Guilbeault
Hanley
Hepfner
Housefather
Hutchings
Idlout
Jaczek
Joly
Jowhari
Kayabaga
Khalid
Koutrakis
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lapointe
Lattanzio
LeBlanc
Lemire
Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Martinez Ferrada
Mathyssen
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McPherson
Mendicino
Michaud
Morrice
Murray
Ng
Normandin
Oliphant
Pauzé
Petipas Taylor
Qualtrough
Rodriguez
Romanado
Sahota
Saks
Sarai
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Singh
Sousa
St-Onge
Tassi
Thériault
Trudel
Valdez
van Koeverden
Vandenbeld
Villemure
Weiler
Yip
Zarrillo

NAYS

Members

Abouitaif
Albas
Arnold
Barrett
Bezan
Brassard
Calkins
Carrie
Chong
Dalton
Davidson
d'Entremont
Dowdall
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Epp
Falk (Provencher)
Ferreri
Genuis
Godin
Gourde
Hallan
Jeneroux
Kelly
Kitchen
Kram
Kurek
Lake
Lawrence
Leslie
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lloyd
Maguire
Martel
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Melillo
Morantz
Motz
Nater
Paul-Hus
Poilievre
Reid
Roberts
Ruff
Schmale
Shields
Small
Steinley
Strahl
Thomas
Tolmie
Van Popta
Vidal
Viersen
Wagantall
Waugh
Williams
Zimmer — 113

Aitchison
Allison
Baldinelli
Berthold
Block
Broek
Caputo
Chambers
Cooper
Dancho
Deltell
Doherty
Dreeshen
Ellis
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Généreux
Gladu
Goodridge
Gray
Hoback
Jivani
Khanna
Kmiec
Kramp-Neuman
Kusie
Lantsman
Lehoux
Lewis (Essex)
Liepert
Lobb
Majumdar
Mazier
McLean
Moore
Morrison
Muys
Patzner
Perkins
Redekopp
Rempel Garner
Rood
Scheer
Seeback
Shiple
Soroka
Stewart
Stubbs
Tochor
Uppal
Vecchio
Vien
Vis
Warkentin
Webber
Williamson

PAIRED

Members

Blair
Plamondon

Gallant
Wilkinson — 4

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.
(Bill read the third time and passed)

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (A), 2024-25

Hon. Anita Anand (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That the Supplementary Estimates (A) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2025, be concurred in.

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

[English]

Hon. Ruby Sahota: Mr. Speaker, I believe that, if you seek it, you will find agreement to apply the results of the previous vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting yea.

Hon. Andrew Scheer: Mr. Speaker, Conservatives agree, and Conservatives will be voting non-confidence, no.

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Perron: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting yea.

[English]

Ms. Heather McPherson: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote, and we will be voting yes.

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, the Greens agree to apply the vote, and we will be voting yes.

[Translation]

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

(Division No. 821)

YEAS

Members

Alghabra	Ali
Anand	Anandasangaree
Angus	Arseneault
Arya	Ashton
Atwin	Bachrach
Badawey	Bains
Baker	Barron
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Bergeron	Bérubé
Bibeau	Bittle
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney
Blois	Boissonnault
Boulerice	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings
Carr	Casey
Chabot	Chagger
Chahal	Champagne
Champoux	Chatel
Chen	Chiang
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Damoff
DeBellefeuille	Desbiens
Desilets	Desjarlais
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Dzerowicz
Ehsassi	El-Khoury

Erskine-Smith	Fillmore
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fortin
Fragiskatos	Fraser
Freeland	Fry
Gaheer	Gainey
Garrison	Gaudreau
Gazan	Gerretsen
Gill	Gould
Green	Guilbeault
Hajdu	Hanley
Hardie	Hepfner
Holland	Housefather
Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Idlout
Ien	Jaczek
Johns	Joly
Jones	Jowhari
Julian	Kayabaga
Kelloway	Khalid
Khera	Koutrakis
Kusmierczyk	Kwan
Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Larouche	Lattanzio
Lauzon	LeBlanc
Lebouthillier	Lemire
Lightbound	Long
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney	Martinez Ferrada
Masse	Mathysen
May (Cambridge)	May (Saarnich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod	McPherson
Mendès	Medicino
Miao	Michaud
Miller	Morrice
Morrissey	Murray
Naqvi	Ng
Noormohamed	Normandin
O'Connell	Olipphant
O'Regan	Pauzé
Perron	Petitpas Taylor
Powlowski	Qualtrough
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rogers	Romanado
Rota	Sahota
Sajjan	Saks
Samson	Sarai
Savard-Tremblay	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Brampton East)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard
Sinclair-Desgagné	Singh
Sorbara	Sousa
Ste-Marie	St-Onge
Sudds	Tassi
Taylor Roy	Thériault
Thompson	Trudel
Turnbull	Valdez
Van Bynen	van Koevorden
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vignola	Villemure
Virani	Weiler
Wilkinson	Yip
Zahid	Zarrillo
Zuberi— 201	

Business of Supply

Business of Supply

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Arnold	Baldinelli
Barrett	Berthold
Bezan	Block
Brassard	Brock
Calkins	Caputo
Carrie	Chambers
Chong	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho
Davidson	Delteff
d'Entremont	Doherty
Dowdall	Dreeshen
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Ferreri	Généreux
Genuis	Gladu
Godin	Goodridge
Gourde	Gray
Hallan	Hoback
Jeneroux	Jivani
Kelly	Khanna
Kitchen	Kmiec
Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Kurek	Kusie
Lake	Lantsman
Lawrence	Lehoux
Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
Maguire	Majumdar
Martel	Mazier
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLean
Melillo	Moore
Morantz	Morrison
Motz	Muys
Nater	Patzer
Paul-Hus	Perkins
Poillievre	Redekopp
Reid	Rempel Garner
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	

PAIRED

Members

Blair	Gallant
Plamondon	Wilkinson— 4

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

[*English*]

Hon. Anita Anand moved that Bill C-75, An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the federal public adminis-

tration for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2025, be now read the first time and printed.

(Motion deemed adopted and bill read the first time)

[*Translation*]

Hon. Anita Anand moved that the bill be read the second time and referred to a committee of the whole.

[*English*]

Hon. Ruby Sahota: Mr. Speaker, I believe that if you seek it, you will find agreement among the parties to apply the results of the previous vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting yea.

Hon. Andrew Scheer: Mr. Speaker, Conservatives agree and will be voting no.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Perron: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting yea.

[*English*]

Ms. Heather McPherson: Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party will agree to apply the votes, and we will be voting yes.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, the Greens agree to apply the vote and will be voting yea.

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

(*Division No. 822*)

YEAS

Members

Alghabra	Ali
Anand	Anandasangaree
Angus	Arseneault
Arya	Ashton
Atwin	Bachrach
Badawey	Bains
Baker	Barron
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Bergeron	Bérubé
Bibeau	Bittle
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney
Blois	Boissonnault
Boulerice	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings
Carr	Casey
Chabot	Chagger
Chahal	Champagne
Champoux	Chatel
Chen	Chiang
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Damoff
DeBellefeuille	Desbiens
Desilets	Desjarlais
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Dzerowicz
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith	Fillmore
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fortin

Business of Supply

Fragiskatos	Fraser	Albas	Allison
Freeland	Fry	Arnold	Baldinelli
Gaheer	Gainey	Barrett	Berthold
Garrison	Gaudreau	Bezan	Block
Gazan	Gerretsen	Brassard	Brock
Gill	Gould	Calkins	Caputo
Green	Guilbeault	Carrie	Chambers
Hajdu	Hanley	Chong	Cooper
Hardie	Hepfner	Dalton	Dancho
Holland	Housefather	Davidson	Deltell
Hussen	Hutchings	d'Entremont	Doherty
Iacono	Idlout	Dowdall	Dreeshen
Ien	Jaczek	Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Ellis
Johns	Joly	Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Jones	Jowhari	Falk (Provencher)	Fast
Julian	Kayabaga	Ferri	Généreux
Kelloway	Khalid	Genuis	Gladu
Khera	Koutrakis	Godin	Goodridge
Kusmierczyk	Kwan	Gourde	Gray
Lalonde	Lambropoulos	Hallan	Hoback
Lamoureux	Lapointe	Jeneroux	Jivani
Larouche	Lattanzio	Kelly	Khanna
Lauzon	LeBlanc	Kitchen	Kmiec
Lebouthillier	Lemire	Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Lightbound	Long	Kurek	Kusie
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	Lake	Lantsman
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)	Lawrence	Lehoux
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Maloney	Martinez Ferrada	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Liepert
Masse	Mathysen	Lloyd	Lobb
May (Cambridge)	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	Maguire	Majumdar
McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty	Martel	Mazier
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLean
McLeod	McPherson	Melillo	Moore
Mendès	Mendicino	Morantz	Morrison
Miao	Michaud	Motz	Muys
Miller	Morrice	Nater	Patzer
Morrissey	Murray	Paul-Hus	Perkins
Naqvi	Ng	Poilievre	Redekopp
Noormohamed	Normandin	Reid	Rempel Garner
O'Connell	Oliphant	Roberts	Rood
O'Regan	Pauzé	Ruff	Scheer
Perron	Petitpas Taylor	Schmale	Seeback
Powlowski	Qualtrough	Shields	Shiple
Robillard	Rodriguez	Small	Soroka
Rogers	Romanado	Steinley	Stewart
Rota	Sahota	Strahl	Stubbs
Sajjan	Saks	Thomas	Tochor
Samson	Sarai	Tolmie	Uppal
Savard-Tremblay	Scarpaleggia	Van Popta	Vecchio
Schiefke	Serré	Vidal	Vien
Sgro	Shanahan	Viersen	Vis
Sheehan	Sidhu (Brampton East)	Wagantall	Warkentin
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard	Waugh	Webber
Sinclair-Desgagné	Singh	Williams	Williamson
Sorbara	Sousa	Zimmer— 113	
Ste-Marie	St-Onge		
Sudds	Tassi		
Taylor Roy	Thériault		
Thompson	Trudel		
Turnbull	Valdez		
Van Bynen	van Koeverden		
Vandal	Vandenbeld		
Vignola	Villemure		
Virani	Weiler		
Wilkinson	Yip		
Zahid	Zarrillo		
Zuberi— 201			

PAIRED

Members

Blair
Plamondon

Gallant
Wilkinson— 4

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Accordingly, the bill stands referred to a committee of the whole. I do now leave the chair for the House to go into 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)

NAYS

Members

Abouttaif

Aitchison

Business of Supply

• (2340)

[English]

Mrs. Stephanie Kusie (Calgary Midnapore, CPC): Madam Chair, I wonder if the President of the Treasury Board could confirm that the supplementary estimates bill is in its usual form.

Hon. Anita Anand (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Madam Chair, I would like to assure my hon. colleague that, yes, indeed, the form of this bill is the same as that passed in the previous supply period.

[Translation]

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)

[English]

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 the short title carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Short title agreed to)

[Translation]

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)

The Deputy Chair: Shall I rise and report the bill?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Bill reported)

[English]

Hon. Anita Anand moved that the bill be concurred in.

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

Hon. Ruby Sahota: Mr. Speaker, I believe that if you seek it, you will find agreement amongst the parties to apply the results of the previous vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting yea.

Hon. Andrew Scheer: Mr. Speaker, Conservatives agree, and Conservatives will be voting no.

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Perron: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.

[English]

Ms. Heather McPherson: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees, and we will be voting yes.

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, the Greens agree, and we will be voting yes.

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

(Division No. 823)

YEAS

Members

Alghabra	Ali
Anand	Anandasangaree
Angus	Arseneault
Arya	Ashton
Atwin	Bachrach
Badawey	Bains
Baker	Barron
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Bergeron	Bérubé
Bibeau	Bittle
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney
Blois	Boissonnault
Boulerice	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings
Carr	Casey
Chabot	Chagger
Chahal	Champagne
Champoux	Chatel

Business of Supply

Chen
 Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
 Cormier
 Dabrusin
 DeBellefeuille
 Desilets
 Dhaliwal
 Diab
 Dubourg
 Duguid
 Ehsassi
 Erskine-Smith
 Fisher
 Fortier
 Fragiskatos
 Freeland
 Gaheer
 Garrison
 Gazan
 Gill
 Green
 Hajdu
 Hardie
 Holland
 Hussien
 Iacono
 Ien
 Johns
 Jones
 Julian
 Kelloway
 Khera
 Kusmierczyk
 Lalonde
 Lamoureux
 Larouche
 Lauzon
 Leboutillier
 Lightbound
 Longfield
 MacAulay (Cardigan)
 MacGregor
 Maloney
 Masse
 May (Cambridge)
 McDonald (Avalon)
 McKay
 McLeod
 Mendès
 Miao
 Miller
 Morrissey
 Naqvi
 Noormohamed
 O'Connell
 O'Regan
 Perron
 Powlowski
 Robillard
 Rogers
 Rota
 Sajjan
 Samson
 Savard-Tremblay
 Schiefke
 Sgro
 Sheehan
 Sidhu (Brampton South)
 Sinclair-Desgagné
 Sorbara
 Ste-Marie
 Sudds
 Taylor Roy

Chiang
 Collins (Victoria)
 Coteau
 Damoff
 Desbiens
 Desjarlais
 Dhillon
 Drouin
 Duclos
 Dzerowicz
 El-Khoury
 Fillmore
 Fonseca
 Fortin
 Fraser
 Fry
 Gaaney
 Gaudreau
 Gerretsen
 Gould
 Guilbeault
 Hanley
 Hepfner
 Housefather
 Hutchings
 Idlout
 Jaczek
 Joly
 Jowhari
 Kayabaga
 Khalid
 Koutrakis
 Kwan
 Lambropoulos
 Lapointe
 Lattanzio
 LeBlanc
 Lemire
 Long
 Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
 MacDonald (Malpeque)
 MacKinnon (Gatineau)
 Martinez Ferrada
 Mathysen
 May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
 McGuinty
 McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
 McPherson
 Mendicino
 Michaud
 Morrice
 Murray
 Ng
 Normandin
 Oliphant
 Pauré
 Petitpas Taylor
 Qualtrough
 Rodriguez
 Romanado
 Sahota
 Saks
 Sarai
 Scarpaleggia
 Serré
 Shanahan
 Sidhu (Brampton East)
 Simard
 Singh
 Sousa
 St-Onge
 Tassi
 Thériault

Thompson
 Turnbull
 Van Bynen
 Vandal
 Vignola
 Virani
 Wilkinson
 Zahid
 Zuberi— 201

Trudel
 Valdez
 van Koeverden
 Vandenbeld
 Villemure
 Weiler
 Yip
 Zarrillo

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
 Albas
 Arnold
 Barrett
 Bezan
 Brassard
 Calkins
 Carrie
 Chong
 Dalton
 Davidson
 d'Entremont
 Dowdall
 Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
 Epp
 Falk (Provencher)
 Ferreri
 Genuis
 Godin
 Gourde
 Hallan
 Jeneroux
 Kelly
 Kitchen
 Kram
 Kurek
 Lake
 Lawrence
 Leslie
 Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
 Lloyd
 Maguire
 Martel
 McCauley (Edmonton West)
 Melillo
 Morantz
 Motz
 Nater
 Paul-Hus
 Poilievre
 Reid
 Roberts
 Ruff
 Schmale
 Shields
 Small
 Steinley
 Strahl
 Thomas
 Tolmie
 Van Popta
 Vidal
 Viersen
 Wagantall
 Waugh
 Williams
 Zimmer— 113

Aitchison
 Allison
 Baldinelli
 Berthold
 Block
 Brock
 Caputo
 Chambers
 Cooper
 Dancho
 Deltell
 Doherty
 Dreeschen
 Ellis
 Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
 Fast
 Gagné
 Gladu
 Goodridge
 Gray
 Hoback
 Jivani
 Khanna
 Kmiec
 Kramp-Neuman
 Kusie
 Lantsman
 Lehoux
 Lewis (Essex)
 Liepert
 Lobb
 Majumdar
 Mazier
 McLean
 Moore
 Morrison
 Muys
 Patzer
 Perkins
 Redekopp
 Rempel Garner
 Rood
 Scheer
 Seebach
 Shipley
 Soroka
 Stewart
 Stubbs
 Tochor
 Uppal
 Vecchio
 Vien
 Vis
 Warkentin
 Webber
 Williamson

Business of Supply

PAIRED

Members

Blair Gallant
Plamondon Wilkinson—4

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

• (2345)

[*Translation*]

Hon. Anita Anand moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

[*English*]

Hon. Ruby Sahota: Mr. Speaker, I believe that if you seek it, you will find agreement to apply the results of the previous vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting yea.

Hon. Andrew Scheer: Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives agree to apply the vote and will be voting no.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Perron: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.

[*English*]

Ms. Heather McPherson: Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party of Canada members agree to apply the vote, and we will be voting yes.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mike Morrice: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party agrees to apply the vote and will be voting yes.

[*English*]

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

(*Division No. 824*)

YEAS

Members

Alhabra	Ali
Anand	Anandasangaree
Angus	Arseneault
Arya	Ashton
Atwin	Bachrach
Badawey	Bains
Baker	Barron
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Bergeron	Bérubé
Bibeau	Bittle
Blanchette-Joncas	Blaney
Blois	Boissonnault
Boulerice	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Cannings
Carr	Casey
Chabot	Chagger
Chahal	Champagne
Champoux	Chatel
Chen	Chiang
Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Collins (Victoria)
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Damoff
DeBellefeuille	Desbiens
Desilets	Desjarlais
Dhaliwal	Dhillon

Diab	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Dzerowicz
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith	Fillmore
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fortin
Fragiskatos	Fraser
Freeland	Fry
Gaheer	Gainey
Garrison	Gaudreau
Gazan	Gerretsen
Gill	Gould
Green	Guilbeault
Hajdu	Hanley
Hardie	Hepfner
Holland	Housefather
Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Idlout
Ien	Jaczek
Johns	Joly
Jones	Jowhari
Julian	Kayabaga
Kelloway	Khalid
Khera	Koutrakis
Kusmierczyk	Kwan
Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Larouche	Lattanzio
Lauzon	LeBlanc
Lebouthillier	Lemire
Lightbound	Long
Longfield	Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacAulay (Cardigan)	MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney	Martinez Ferrada
Masse	Mathysen
May (Cambridge)	May (Saarnich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald (Avalon)	McGuinty
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod	McPherson
Mendès	Mendicino
Miao	Michaud
Miller	Morrice
Morrissey	Murray
Naqvi	Ng
Noormohamed	Normandin
O'Connell	Oliphant
O'Regan	Pauzé
Perron	Petitpas Taylor
Powlowski	Qualtrough
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rogers	Romanado
Rota	Sahota
Sajjan	Saks
Samson	Sarai
Savard-Tremblay	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Brampton East)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simard
Sinclair-Desgagné	Singh
Sorbara	Sousa
Ste-Marie	St-Onge
Sudds	Tassi
Taylor Roy	Thériault
Thompson	Trudel
Turnbull	Valdez
Van Bynen	van Koevorden
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vignola	Villemure
Virani	Weiler
Wilkinson	Yip

*Adjournment Proceedings***ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS**Zahid
Zuberi— 201

Zarrillo

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albas
Arnold
Barrett
Bezan
Brassard
Calkins
Carrie
Chong
Dalton
Davidson
d'Entremont
Dowdall
Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Epp
Falk (Provencher)
Ferrerri
Genuis
Godin
Gourde
Hallan
Jeneroux
Kelly
Kitchen
Kram
Kurek
Lake
Lawrence
Leslie
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lloyd
Maguire
Martel
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Melillo
Morantz
Motz
Nater
Paul-Hus
Poilievre
Reid
Roberts
Ruff
Schmale
Shields
Small
Steinley
Strahl
Thomas
Tolmie
Van Popta
Vidal
Viersen
Wagantall
Waugh
Williams
Zimmer— 113

Aitchison
Allison
Baldinelli
Berthold
Block
Brock
Caputo
Chambers
Cooper
Dancho
Deltell
Doherty
Dreeshen
Ellis
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Généreux
Gladu
Goodridge
Gray
Hoback
Jivani
Khanna
Kmiec
Kramp-Neuman
Kusie
Lantsman
Lehoux
Lewis (Essex)
Liepert
Lobb
Majumdar
Mazier
McLean
Moore
Morrison
Muys
Patzner
Perkins
Redekopp
Rempel Garner
Rood
Scheer
Seeback
Shiple
Soroka
Stewart
Stubbs
Tochor
Uppal
Vecchio
Vien
Vis
Warkentin
Webber
Williamson

PAIRED

Members

Blair
PlamondonGallant
Wilkinson— 4

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.
(Bill read the third time and passed)

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

[English]

CORRECTIONAL SERVICE OF CANADA

Mr. Scott Reid (Lanark—Frontenac—Kingston, CPC): Mr. Speaker, on May 31, I asked the following question:

...with respect to the dairy barn at the Joyceville correctional institution that is scheduled to open in July, number one, what was the original budgeted cost? Number two, what is the actual cost? Number three, has dairy quota been made available by Dairy Farmers of Ontario? If so, what are the contract details and how much will that cost? Finally, will any of the milk that is produced be entered into the general supply for public consumption?

I will give some details. When the restoration of the Joyceville prison farm program was announced in 2018, Mr. Goodale, who was then the minister in charge of corrections, stated that the authorization came with three conditions, of which the first two were, “staying within the budget of \$4.3 million over five years, [and] being implemented in a timely fashion.” The first of these conditions was breached almost instantly. In May 2018, the cost was revised upwards by more than 100%, to \$9.75 million. In October 2018, this was changed to \$15.2 million, three times what it had been less than a year earlier, but that was just the beginning.

In July 2019, this estimate was again adjusted to \$18 million, and internal documents from the time contained a notation stating that this estimate required further review as each project's scope of work had yet to be confirmed. In January 2020, the estimate was again increased, this time to \$20 million, and in May 2020, it was increased to \$21.08 million. By September 2020, internal documents showed that costs would hit \$25.9 million, which, if anyone is keeping track, is five times the original estimate. Finally, in March 2021, the goat dairy that was driving many of these cost increases was put on hold, although, I will note, it was never formally cancelled, and it is still an open question, as to whether Correctional Service Canada intends to open a goat dairy as well.

Regarding the issue of dairy quota for cow's milk, I am aware that a few months ago, Correctional Service Canada said that there were only 12 dairy cows in the herd housed at Collins Bay, and at that time, CSC still did not have an agreement for the purchase of milk quota. The facility is designed to house 30 cows and, supposedly, is to be used for research quota. CSC has stated that this research would be shared between two universities and that the quota is currently being negotiated, but McGill University and the University of Guelph are unwilling to comment on this arrangement.

Therefore, can the minister confirm where the quota is coming from, how much it will cost and what it will be used for. Finally, can the minister guarantee that milk produced using inmate, labour-paid prison wages, which are far below the minimum wage, will never enter the regular milk supply stream for human consumption?

Adjournment Proceedings

• (2350)

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Democratic Institutions and Intergovernmental Affairs (Cybersecurity), Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am thankful for the opportunity to stand in the House today to speak to the rehabilitative benefits provided by Correctional Service of Canada's penitentiary agricultural program.

Since it was reopened in 2018, the penitentiary agricultural program at Joyceville and Collins Bay institutions have worked to help federal inmates gain employment skills to find meaningful employment in the community upon their safe, gradual release. I recently visited the institution with the minister, as well as the member for Kingston and the Islands.

The farm operations at these two sites provide on-the-job and vocational training that is both technical, as it relates to the agricultural industry, and transferable to other industries. In addition to employability skill development, which supports offenders in their reintegration, inmates at these farms perform activities building and renovating necessary infrastructure, as well as work to repair and rebuild farmland, in addition to working in crop production. These activities mirror the work that take place on agricultural lands all across the country, which employ tens of thousands of people at any given time. In addition, the Collins Bay and Joyceville farms work to enhance a safe reintegration of offenders in our community, when it is safe to do so, while also working to reduce recidivism.

I am proud to note that, through the programming provided at these farms and delivered through CORCAN more generally, Correctional Service Canada is recognized as an international leader in the development and delivery of correctional interventions. We know that inmates who participate in CORCAN employment programs while incarcerated, including at the farms, are more likely to obtain employment in the community, and offenders who find jobs in the community are three times less likely to return to custody for a new offence.

Considering the successes associated with the penitentiary agricultural program at Joyceville and Collins Bay Institutions, I am pleased to note that the implementation of the dairy barn is expected to be completed in July 2024, with dairy operations to begin in September 2024.

In response to the question from the member for Lanark—Frontenac—Kingston, I can confirm that products generated through the agricultural program, including milk, produce, crops and other potential byproducts of these operations, will be determined by internal use requirements prior to looking at external markets. This includes agreements and contracts signed as implementation occurs and products become available.

The Correctional Service of Canada continually re-evaluates its operations and takes into account elements such as sustainability and market availability, as dairy cow milk will be managed in accordance with Canada's system of supply management. With regard to the quota, CSC continues to negotiate an agreement with its partners. All revenues generated will be reinvested into the offender employment and employability program. To date, CSC has invested approximately \$20 million for facilities and incurred \$6 million in expenditures for the implementation and operations, which include

the penitentiary agricultural program, and this is in addition to the \$1.7 million invested in capital equipment.

• (2355)

Mr. Scott Reid: Madam Speaker, one of the questions I asked was whether the minister can confirm where the quota is coming from, how much it will cost and what it will be used for. I would like an answer to that question.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Madam Speaker, as I pointed out, this program is important for inmates in the employability program. It is to ensure that we reduce recidivism. The member opposite seems to have a real problem with CSC's work to help promote employability among the inmate population. We know that inmates who are able to find meaningful employment in their communities after they serve their sentence are three times less likely to commit another offence.

While we invest in programs to help create safer communities, the member opposite stands from a place of privilege and does not want to help support reducing recidivism.

HOUSING

Mrs. Tracy Gray (Kelowna—Lake Country, CPC): Madam Speaker, before I begin my question tonight, I would like to take a moment to say that Kelowna lost a great community leader, Gerald Geen, on June 7.

Gerald was an orchardist, horticulturalist, teacher and realtor, and he gave back to and served our community in many ways. I knew Gerald to be intellectual and generous, a class act who always had a grin and a sparkle in his eyes. My heart goes out to his wife Kay and all his family and those who knew him. He will be dearly missed.

Now, to the question at hand, I am here tonight to speak to an issue that is important to residents of my community in Kelowna—Lake Country and to all Canadians, and this is Canada's housing crisis.

I would like to quote some numbers from a recent RBC housing affordability report, which stated that as of October 2023, a household earning a median income needed to spend 63.5% of it just to cover the cost of owning an average home. In 2015, that number was 39.3%, and that is lower than even the long-term average of 41.4%.

Upon looking at the chart for the Vancouver area, I see that it is about 140% of household earnings for a single detached home. In Vancouver, it now takes 106.4% of a median household income to own a home. These numbers are staggering. It is no wonder that young people across Canada are losing hope of ever owning a home.

Since 2015, rents have doubled, mortgage payments have doubled and the amount that someone would need to save for a down payment has more than doubled. The CMHC states that housing starts are down and will continue to be down for the foreseeable future.

Adjournment Proceedings

As well, we now hear that chronic homelessness is up 38%, and the federal housing advocate referred to homeless encampments as “a physical manifestation of exactly how broken our housing and homelessness system is” across Canada. The Liberals put Infrastructure Canada in charge of the government's program for reducing and ending chronic homelessness. However, Infrastructure Canada has not adopted reducing or ending chronic homelessness as a performance indicator for its homelessness program, which is listed as one of its core responsibilities.

We are conducting a study right now at the housing committee. Many witnesses have come and spoken to this committee. One example is a roofing contractor expert, who said that costs are through the roof. Many other witnesses have laid out how the Liberals' housing plan to build 3.87 million homes by 2031 is not achievable and that the numbers are not reasonable.

We know that the Bank of Canada has confirmed that Canadians will see a steep jump in payments as millions of Canadians renew their mortgages over the next few years. This just makes it more difficult for people to keep their home or for those who want to get into a home. This is an important issue that we need to keep talking about in this place.

• (2400)

Mr. Peter Fragiskatos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing, Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I work with the hon. colleague on the House of Commons committee responsible for housing. We disagree on fundamental issues relating to housing policy, but I will say that she has the respect of our colleagues on that committee, including myself. The way she began her speech tonight shows the passion she has for her community and the job she does in the House of Commons.

The member mentioned young people, for example; here is where the disagreements begin. She talked about down payments. The current government has recognized that it is difficult for young people, in particular, to put together a down payment to buy a home; therefore, we have created a tax-free account, where up to \$40,000 can be put toward buying a first home. In fact, 750,000 Canadians have opened up an account to do exactly that.

The Conservatives do not approve of that approach. They voted against that specific action. When it comes to apartments, young people are in search of apartments, for example, as are many Canadians. Rent is expensive. We need more supply of apartments, in particular, to bring down the cost of rent. The government has waived the GST off the construction of apartments for the middle class, for young people, but the Conservatives opposed that.

In fact, she mentioned the housing committee and the work it is doing. We heard from a witness the other day, and she knows this very well, that the approach is not in line with doing what is needed to add supply in the housing crisis we face. They want to maintain GST on the construction of apartments. It makes no sense.

When it comes to building more homes, we have to embrace a vision of missing middle housing. By that I mean duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, row houses and mid-rise apartments.

The deputy leader of the Conservative Party made clear, on a yacht no less, that they do not have that vision. I shared that in the

House of Commons during question period a few weeks ago. They do not embrace a vision of building more homes, of building the missing middle homes. They want to side with the not-in-my-backyard types, the NIMBYs. It is an unacceptable approach if one is serious about addressing the housing crisis.

Finally, the colleague talked about challenges Canadians will have with renewing their mortgage. I worry about that as well, but where is the Conservative Party to offer the types of supports we are actually able to offer? The Bank of Canada sets interest rates, and I am glad to see that it recently introduced a rate cut. I hope that will follow; I think it will. We will see.

However, where is the Conservative Party on offering the types of supports the government can actually control on child care, dental care, pharmacare and a national school food program? There are still 400,000 kids going to school hungry every day. That is not acceptable. The Conservatives propose nothing but cuts to address that situation, that challenge; that is unacceptable in this country. Their approach is not serious. They do not care.

Mrs. Tracy Gray: Madam Speaker, I want to bring up that housing is incredibly important here in Canada. We know we are in a housing crisis. This has been identified. We are doing this housing study right now at the housing committee, and Conservatives are committed to continuing to work on this through the summer.

Is the hon. member's government, his Liberal group on the committee, going to be supporting the motion I put forth today, along with my Conservative colleagues, calling on our committee to sit over the summer? I will not read it in detail, but the motion basically outlines how we could have meetings. We have been very flexible with the dates so that it can work for everyone and so that we can continue this conversation about the housing crisis over the summer. It is very important.

• (2405)

Mr. Peter Fragiskatos: Madam Speaker, as the member knows, I am always happy to speak about housing and to work on that committee, so I look forward to working with the member on these issues. Of course, the specific matter she raises is a matter for the committee to take up. Speaking of that committee, the committee has also heard about challenges relating to getting homes built, specifically on things such as permitting.

Adjournment Proceedings

I raise this because of the housing accelerator fund, which that party stands against and, unfortunately, the member has voted against; this meant that the funding support Kelowna needs to see would not have flowed if Conservatives were in power. It did flow because we made the decision to fund Kelowna's application under the housing accelerator fund. Kelowna gets funding to modernize its permit application, using AI to get fast approvals. She is against that, evidently.

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 12:08 a.m.)

CONTENTS

Thursday, June 13, 2024

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS		Income Tax Act	
House of Commons Calendar		Ms. Collins (Victoria)	24849
The Speaker	24847	Bill C-403. Introduction and first reading	24849
Commissioner of Lobbying		(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	24849
The Speaker	24847	National Conversion Therapy Awareness Day Act	
Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner		Mr. Gerretsen	24849
The Speaker	24847	Bill C-404. Introduction and first reading	24849
Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner		(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	24850
The Speaker	24847	Petitions	
Veterans Ombudsman		World Health Organization	
Mr. Sarai	24847	Mrs. Gallant	24850
Government Response to Petitions		Justice	
Mrs. Lalonde	24847	Mrs. DeBellefeuille	24850
Nature Accountability Act		Human Rights	
Bill C-73. Introduction and first reading	24847	Mr. Ehsassi	24850
Mr. Guilbeault	24847	Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship	
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	24847	Ms. Kwan	24850
Committees of the House		Public Safety	
Canadian Heritage		Mr. Mazier	24851
Ms. Fry	24848	Correctional Officers	
National Housing Strategy Act		Mr. Vis	24851
Ms. Kwan	24848	Questions on the Order Paper	
Bill C-398. Introduction and first reading	24848	Mrs. Lalonde	24851
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	24848		
Department of Citizenship and Immigration Ombud Act			
Ms. Kwan	24848		
Bill C-399. Introduction and first reading	24848		
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	24848		
Framework on the Access to and Use of Cash Act			
Mr. Falk (Provencher)	24848		
Bill C-400. Introduction and first reading	24848		
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	24849		
Income Tax Act			
Mr. Hanley	24849		
Bill C-401. Introduction and first reading	24849		
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	24849		
Marine Liability Act			
Ms. Barron	24849		
Bill C-402. Introduction and first reading	24849		
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	24849		

Mr. Simard	24860	Mayor of Mississauga	
Mr. Angus	24861	Mr. Fonseca	24883
Mr. Kelly	24862	Yannick Le Mouël	
Ms. Larouche	24862	Ms. Normandin	24883
Ms. Sinclair-Desgagné	24862	Long-Term Care	
Mr. Gerretsen	24864	Mrs. Lalonde	24883
Mr. Melillo	24864	Small Business	
Mr. Angus	24864	Mr. Lawrence	24883
Privilege		2024 Summer Olympics	
Record of the Proceedings of the House		Mr. Sidhu (Brampton East)	24883
Mr. Morrice	24864	Performing Arts	
Ms. Gazan	24865	Ms. Fry	24884
Business of Supply		Third Link	
Opposition Motion—Government's Economic Analysis on Carbon Pricing		Mr. Gourde	24884
Motion	24865	Graduating Class of 2024	
Mr. Angus	24865	Mr. Turnbull	24884
Mr. Dalton	24866	Carbon Pricing	
Mr. Gerretsen	24867	Mrs. Roberts	24884
Mr. Beaulieu	24867	Taxation	
Ms. Kwan	24867	Mr. Redekopp	24885
Mrs. Gray	24868	Harold Herbert	
Mr. Collins (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	24868	Mr. Schiefke	24885
Mr. Desilets	24869	Persons with Disabilities	
Ms. Gazan	24869	Ms. Barron	24885
Mr. Deltell	24869	Paul Arcand	
Mr. Gerretsen	24871	Mr. Champoux	24885
Mr. Lemire	24871	Taxation	
Ms. Barron	24871	Mr. Davidson	24886
Mr. Kelly	24871	St. Anne's Anglican Church	
Mr. Gerretsen	24873	Ms. Dzerowicz	24886
Mr. Desilets	24873		
Ms. Barron	24873		
Mr. Gerretsen	24873		
Mr. Mazier	24875		
Mr. Beaulieu	24875		
Ms. Barron	24875		
Ms. Taylor Roy	24876		
Mr. Motz	24877		
Ms. Gazan	24878		
Mr. Beaulieu	24878		
Mr. Kram	24878		
Mr. Mazier	24879		
Ms. Taylor Roy	24880		
Ms. Kwan	24880		
Mr. Leslie	24880		
Mr. Scarpaleggia	24882		
Ms. Kwan	24882		

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Senator Joseph Day	
Mr. Long	24882
Bill C-41	
Mr. Genuis	24882

ORAL QUESTIONS

Carbon Pricing	
Mr. Poilievre	24886
Mr. Guilbeault	24886
Mr. Poilievre	24886
Mr. Guilbeault	24886
Mr. Poilievre	24886
Mr. Guilbeault	24886
Mr. Poilievre	24887
Mr. Guilbeault	24887
Mr. Poilievre	24887
Mr. Wilkinson	24887
Finance	
Mr. Therrien	24887
Mrs. St-Onge	24887
Mr. Therrien	24887
Mrs. St-Onge	24887

Infrastructure	
Mr. Boulerice	24888
Mr. Rodriguez	24888
Indigenous Affairs	
Ms. Idlout	24888
Ms. Hajdu	24888
Carbon Pricing	
Ms. Lantsman	24888
Mr. Wilkinson	24888
Ms. Lantsman	24888
Mr. Guilbeault	24888
Ms. Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	24888
Mr. Wilkinson	24889
Ms. Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	24889
Mr. MacKinnon	24889
Mr. Berthold	24889
Mr. MacKinnon	24889
Mr. Berthold	24889
Mr. Guilbeault	24889
Public Services and Procurement	
Ms. Michaud	24889
Ms. O'Connell	24890
Ms. Michaud	24890
Ms. O'Connell	24890
Canada Border Services Agency	
Ms. Bérubé	24890
Ms. O'Connell	24890
Carbon Pricing	
Mr. Calkins	24890
Mr. Champagne	24890
Mr. Calkins	24890
Mr. MacKinnon	24891
Mrs. Gallant	24891
Ms. Hajdu	24891
Labour	
Mr. Green	24891
Mr. Sheehan	24891
Foreign Affairs	
Ms. McPherson	24891
Ms. Joly	24891
Labour	
Mr. Fisher	24891
Ms. Anand	24891
Taxation	
Mr. Patzer	24892
Mr. MacKinnon	24892
Mr. Patzer	24892
Mr. MacKinnon	24892
Mr. Lehoux	24892
Mr. MacKinnon	24892
Mr. Lehoux	24892
Mr. Champagne	24892

Natural Resources	
Ms. Pauzé	24892
Mr. Wilkinson	24893
Mr. Lemire	24893
Mr. Wilkinson	24893
Health	
Mrs. Kramp-Neuman	24893
Mr. Holland	24893
Mrs. Kramp-Neuman	24893
Mr. Holland	24894
Mr. Godin	24894
Mr. Holland	24894
Housing	
Mr. Schiefke	24894
Mrs. St-Onge	24894
Mr. Jivani	24894
Mr. Fragiskatos	24894
Mr. Jivani	24894
Mr. Fragiskatos	24895
Mr. Gourde	24895
Mr. MacKinnon	24895
Mr. McKinnon	24895
Mr. Wilkinson	24895
The Environment	
Mr. Cannings	24895
Mr. Guilbeault	24895
Employment	
Mr. Vuong	24895
Mr. Turnbull	24896
Paul Arcand	
Mr. Champoux	24896
Motion	24896
(Motion agreed to)	24896
Republic of Cyprus	
Ms. Ashton	24896
Motion	24896
(Motion agreed to)	24896

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Countering Foreign Interference Act	
Bill C-70. Third reading	24896
Motion agreed to	24898
(Bill read the third time and passed)	24898
Business of the House	
Mr. Scheer	24898
Mr. MacKinnon	24898
Motion	24898
(Motion agreed to)	24898
House of Commons	
The Speaker	24898

Business of Supply**Opposition Motion—Government's Economic Analysis on Carbon Pricing**

Motion	24898
Mrs. Brière	24898
Mr. Dalton	24899
Mrs. Gray	24900
Ms. Idlout	24900
Ms. O'Connell	24900
Ms. O'Connell	24900
Mr. Kelly	24901
Mr. Trudel	24902
Mr. Van Popta	24902
Mr. Ellis	24902

Privilege**Record of the Proceedings of the House**

Ms. O'Connell	24903
---------------------	-------

Business of Supply**Opposition Motion—Government's Economic Analysis on Carbon Pricing**

Motion	24903
Mr. Ellis	24903
Ms. O'Connell	24904
Mr. Trudel	24904
Ms. Blaney	24905
Mr. Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	24905
Amendment	24906
Mr. Berthold	24906
Ms. O'Connell	24907
Ms. Bérubé	24907
Ms. McPherson	24907
Mr. Sorbara	24908
Mr. Van Popta	24909
Mr. Thériault	24910
Ms. Idlout	24910
Mr. Rogers	24910
Mr. Steinley	24911
Mr. Perron	24911
Ms. McPherson	24911
Ms. O'Connell	24912
Mr. Steinley	24912
Ms. O'Connell	24913
Mr. Perron	24913
Ms. Blaney	24914
Mr. Barlow	24914
Mr. MacDonald	24915
Mr. Trudel	24916
Ms. McPherson	24916
Mr. Barsalou-Duval	24916
Mrs. Brière	24917
Mr. Dalton	24918
Ms. Blaney	24918
Mr. Guilbeault	24918
Mr. Perron	24918
Mr. Mazier	24920
Ms. McPherson	24920

Mr. Mazier	24920
Mr. Scarpaleggia	24922
Mr. Perron	24922
Ms. McPherson	24923
Ms. Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	24923
Division on motion deferred	24924

Main Estimates 2024-25

Ms. Anand	24924
Motion for concurrence	24924
Mr. McCauley	24926
Mr. Perron	24926
Ms. McPherson	24926
Ms. O'Connell	24926
Mr. McCauley	24928
Ms. Bérubé	24928
Mr. McCauley	24928
Ms. Idlout	24929
Mrs. Kusie	24929
Ms. O'Connell	24930
Mr. Blanchette-Joncas	24930
Mr. McCauley	24931
Mr. Lawrence	24931
Ms. O'Connell	24932
Ms. Larouche	24933
Mr. Julian	24933
Mr. Epp	24933
Mr. Perron	24933
Mr. Lehoux	24935
Mr. Julian	24935
M. Blanchette-Joncas	24935
Mr. Scarpaleggia	24937
Mr. Julian	24937
Mr. Berthold	24937
Mr. Davies	24938
Mr. Epp	24939
Mr. Oliphant	24939
Mr. Blanchette-Joncas	24940
Mr. Julian	24940
Ms. O'Connell	24942
Mr. Blanchette-Joncas	24942
Mr. Epp	24942
Ms. Idlout	24942
Mr. Fragiskatos	24942
Mr. McCauley	24945
Mr. Leslie	24946
Ms. Larouche	24946
Ms. Idlout	24947
Mr. Perron	24947
Ms. Zarrillo	24947
Mr. Muys	24948
Mr. Badawey	24949
Ms. McPherson	24949
Mr. Blanchette-Joncas	24949
Mr. McCauley	24950
Mr. Badawey	24951
Ms. Larouche	24951
Ms. Idlout	24952

Mr. Turnbull	24952
Mr. McCauley	24953
Mr. Perron	24954
Ms. McPherson	24954
Mr. Genuis	24954

Business of Supply

Opposition Motion—Government's Economic Analysis on Carbon Pricing

Motion	24955
Amendment negatived	24956
Motion agreed to	24958

Main Estimates 2024-25

Ms. Anand	24958
Motion for concurrence	24958
Motion agreed to	24959
Bill C-74. First reading	24959
(Motion deemed adopted and bill read the first time)	24959
Second reading	24959
Motion agreed to	24961
(Bill read the second time and the House went into committee of the whole thereon, Mrs. Carol Hughes in the chair)	24961
(On clause 2)	24961
Mrs. Kusie	24961
Ms. Anand	24961
(Clause 2 agreed to)	24961
(Clause 3 agreed to)	24961
(Clause 4 agreed to)	24961
(Clause 5 agreed to)	24961
(Schedule 1 agreed to)	24961
(Schedule 2 agreed to)	24961
(Clause 1 agreed to)	24961
(Preamble agreed to)	24961
(Title agreed to)	24961
(Bill agreed to)	24962
(Bill reported)	24962
Motion for concurrence	24962
Motion agreed to	24963
Third reading	24963
Motion agreed to	24964

(Bill read the third time and passed)	24964
---	-------

Supplementary Estimates (A), 2024-25

Ms. Anand	24965
Motion for concurrence	24965
Motion agreed to	24966
Bill C-75. First reading	24966
(Motion deemed adopted and bill read the first time)	24966
Second reading	24966
Motion agreed to	24967
(Bill read the second time and the House went into committee of the whole thereon, Mrs. Carol Hughes in the chair)	24967
(On clause 2)	24967
Mrs. Kusie	24968
Ms. Anand	24968
(Clause 2 agreed to)	24968
(Clause 3 agreed to)	24968
(Clause 4 agreed to)	24968
(Clause 5 agreed to)	24968
(Schedule agreed to)	24968
(Short title agreed to)	24968
(Preamble agreed to)	24968
(Title agreed to)	24968
(Bill agreed to)	24968
(Bill reported)	24968
Motion for concurrence	24968
Motion agreed to	24970
Third reading	24970
Motion agreed to	24971
(Bill read the third time and passed)	24971

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Correctional Service of Canada

Mr. Reid	24971
Ms. O'Connell	24972

Housing

Mrs. Gray	24972
Mr. Fragiskatos	24973

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>