



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 148 • NUMBER 292 • 1st SESSION • 42nd PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Friday, May 4, 2018

—

Speaker: The Honourable Geoff Regan

CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, May 4, 2018

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayer

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1005)

[*English*]

OIL TANKER MORATORIUM ACT

The House resumed from May 3 consideration of the motion that Bill C-48, an act respecting the regulation of vessels that transport crude oil or persistent oil to or from ports or marine installations located along British Columbia's north coast, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Randy Hoback (Prince Albert, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Saskatoon—Grasswood.

I would like to thank my colleagues across the aisle for accommodating me this morning. Sometimes I think we should issue a press release whenever goodwill shows up between parties, because all Canadians see in this chamber is something other than that, which is unfortunate, because we do work together many times to get things done.

I am rising today to talk about Bill C-48 and the importance of making sure that we get this right. I am also going to talk about the concerns that we in Saskatchewan have about how this is being handled.

I sit on the trade committee. When the Liberals came into power, they wanted to review the TPP. They said that proper consultations had not happened. They said that the consultations had to be redone before the agreement was signed by the Liberal government.

The trade committee went across Canada. It redid all the work that the previous government had done and then some. Committee members made sure they talked to first nations and to business communities. They talked to people right across Canada. A lot of people said it was the third or fourth time they had talked about the TPP and it was being done again. The Liberals were telling us that we had to consult, that we had to do our homework, that we had to make sure everybody was aware of it, and that we had to be aware of all circumstances before going forward with that trade deal.

I look at this bill and I say the same thing. When we look at the impact this legislation would have on western Canada and Canada as a whole, we know we need to talk to a lot of people before this can be done.

I am from Saskatchewan. Some may ask why people in Saskatchewan would care about a tanker ban. A lot of people in Saskatchewan work in the oil and gas sector and their jobs will be impacted by this ban.

Let us not fool ourselves. This is not a tanker ban. This is to stop development in the resource sector and to stop shipping products to the west coast. It is nothing more than that. It is what the Liberals really planned to do from day one, and this bill is how they are going to achieve it. That is very disappointing.

If the Liberals wanted to make this major change, where were the committee meetings? When did the committee travel out there and talk about this with the various people who would be impacted? When did the Liberals talk to the premiers? When did they talk to the Premier of Saskatchewan and tell him this is what the government had planned? They did not do that.

This is the Prime Minister personally saying that he is going to ban tanker traffic because he thinks it is bad. Where is the science? What is his logic for doing this? Is there a problem with tankers? Are tankers unsafe? Is there a problem with the currents and other things in that area? The science that we have says no.

If tankers were unsafe, why would we allow them down the St. Lawrence River? Why would we allow them off the coast of Atlantic Canada? As we speak, tankers around the world are shipping oil out of places like Saudi Arabia and Venezuela. They do this every day and we hear nothing about it.

What is it about this coastline that is so unique and special that Atlantic Canada does not get the same special consideration? Why is Atlantic Canada or the St. Lawrence not treated the same way? If we are concerned about the west coast, why are we not concerned about the St. Lawrence and Atlantic Canada? It does not make sense.

Government Orders

Some from western Canada may ask why the Prime Minister is doing this. It comes back to what he said before. He does not want the resource sector to be developed. He wants to shut it down. This bill is one of the corner pieces of the puzzle that would actually do that. What does that mean for the people of Saskatchewan, the people of Alberta, and the people of northern British Columbia? It means lost economic opportunity and lost jobs. What is left for the families that are employed in this sector, who are in good, well-paying jobs, who are in a good situation and are able to give their kids a good quality of life?

People in western Canada right now are taking part in rallies. I was on Facebook last night and watched a rally in Fort Nelson. Families are saying, "Enough is enough." They have had enough. They want their MPs to represent them. They want their MPs to tell them that they care. They want their MPs to understand that the resource sector is not bad. They want us to understand that people need fuel in their cars and they would love to provide it. They want us to understand that they provide it in the most environmentally friendly fashion in the world.

What is the deal? Where is the problem? It comes back to one thing: the Prime Minister does not like the resource sector.

The Prime Minister went to Paris. He wanted to be the big guy in town, so he made commitments. He came back to Canada and he took the Conservative targets. He brings in things like a carbon tax, which he is going to shove down the throats of Canadians. People in Saskatchewan are looking at that carbon tax and they know it is really going to hurt them because they cannot pass those costs on.

A farmer cannot pass a carbon tax on. He cannot take the cost of fuel for his tractors, his combines, and his machinery and put it in the price of a commodity that is traded on the world market. However, he is still forced to compete against Americans who do not have a carbon tax. The Australians removed their carbon tax. Other countries are not going down this road.

What is even sadder about carbon is Saskatchewan has a really good game plan that does not involve a carbon tax, which would actually meet our commitments, and the Liberals will not agree to that. Why is that? What is the issue there? If their goal is to reduce carbon and there is a game plan that will not impact the economy and will actually achieve that goal, why not take it? It goes back to one thing: lack of respect.

The Liberals want to shut down the resource sector. We are hearing stories now that they want to shut down the coal sector. In Saskatchewan, we have carbon capture off our coal power plants. With this technology, those power plants have five times less emissions than natural gas. However, the Liberals say, "Let us get rid of coal." What does that mean? Is that really crazy? I think so.

If there is technology to make coal clean and to reduce its carbon footprint, why would we not embrace the new technology and still use this fuel source? No, we are going to get rid of it. We are to ignore the science because, heaven forbid, cabinet knows best. That is what is happening. All the regulations and science are being thrown out the window, and it goes back to cabinet, and its members are going to say "Do I like this guy or not?", or "I have a toothache

so I'm going to vote no." What about the science? Science needs to trump that.

In Bill C-48, where is the science to say it requires this type of ban? It is not there. There is no science.

There have been no consultations. It is something that is going to drastically change the lives of families across western Canada, if not all of Canada, yet the Liberals just march ahead. They put the earplugs in and just do what they do. Then they wonder why people are protesting in western Canada. They wonder why families are concerned and upset. They cannot understand why they do not love them. There needs to be respect. The Liberals need to talk to them. The Liberals need to understand why this is important to people. They need to show common sense, because there is no common sense in bringing oil from Saudi Arabia and Venezuela when we have oil right here in Canada. It is actually clean oil. It is more environmentally friendly than any oil we would receive from other parts of the planet.

This bill is a bad piece of legislation. It should be thrown away. If the Liberals want to talk about protecting the environment in that region, or maintaining areas in that region in their natural state, let us have that discussion. I have no problem with that. There might be areas where we see that through. However, to say there will be no more tankers in the whole region is absolutely crazy. It is ludicrous.

People in western Canada just cannot understand the government. It has so many things at its fingertips to make this economy run really well and still meet all its environmental commitments and the government keeps chopping off the hand that feeds it. It is so sad.

I will not be voting in favour of the bill. It is a bad piece of legislation. It sets a bad precedent. It does not meet the commitment Liberals made to voters about consulting before making legislation. It does not meet the commitment about working with opposition parties and other groups at committee to have good pieces of legislation. It does not meet any of those criteria. However, the Liberals will still ram it through. It is unfortunate they are going to do that because they are making a huge mistake.

I will leave it at that, and I will entertain some questions.

• (1010)

Mr. Ken Hardie (Fleetwood—Port Kells, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first, the Enbridge line through northern B.C. would have gone through territory that had not seen pipelines. It is a highly ecologically sensitive area. That was the first concern. It was a concern of our party. It was a concern of the Supreme Court of Canada when it overturned the process the previous government had used to try to get that pipeline built.

Government Orders

There are alternatives. I wonder if the member would like to comment on the advent of processes to render bitumen into, basically, hockey pucks that could be shipped in bulk, so we would not be dealing with what they call a persistent oil. These are oils that will not evaporate if they hit the water. These hockey pucks float, and they can be easily recovered. Has the member examined the option of refining the product more on the Canadian side, in Alberta, before it gets to the west coast? Then if it becomes a non-persistent oil, if it is something that would evaporate if it hits the water, as I understand it, that would be allowed under this tanker moratorium.

Perhaps he would like to comment on what the options may look like.

Mr. Randy Hoback: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the member's openness in saying we should look at technology to see if we can do this better and more safely. That is a wise approach. However, the Liberals are not doing that here. They are not doing that with coal, for example. They are just getting rid of it. They are saying that there is no technology, so get rid of it and do not allow anyone to use it. That is wrong. If there are new technologies that should be embraced, let us embrace them. If there are things that will make it safer, let us embrace them too. However, to impose a moratorium right across the west coast and say no is wrong. That is what this bill is doing.

They have not talked about the consultations. They have not talked about the impact it is going to have on western Canada or Canada as a whole. We are talking about a new technology that has come into play. Let us look at that new technology. I do not think the government is willing to accept new technologies, because if it did, it would mean it would allow the oil and gas sector to grow a bit, and that would be a problem for it. We in western Canada cannot understand why that is a problem.

I would encourage the government to look at new technologies. I would encourage it to find new ways of doing things. If there is a problem, it should address the problem, but it should not take a sledgehammer to it and say it got rid of the problem by just making sure that it is impossible to do.

•(1015)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Nantel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for Prince Albert for his heartfelt speech. It is clear that he is an honest man who is doing a good job of representing his riding by raising concerns about what he sees as a holdup.

Everyone looked up when the member opposite asked his question about alternative ways of distributing the resource in a more solid, more liquid, or more refined form. That is exactly what a debate like today's is meant to achieve. We can all learn something new. If any other members have similar knowledge, I hope they will share it with us, because the debate on this subject is usually like the blind leading the blind.

My colleague mentioned earlier that our oil is the most environmentally friendly oil in the world. Funnily enough, we are constantly being told the opposite. I do not know how many times I have read that using steam to extract oil from sand produces waste

water. I have also read that this steam is generated using natural gas and that the natural gas emissions create a massive carbon footprint.

If there are any alternatives, we should talk about them. I quite agree with him. I am thinking specifically of the work of Paul Painter, who used ionic liquids to separate sand from oil. Let us talk about alternatives before we talk about distribution and increasing extraction.

[*English*]

Mr. Randy Hoback: Mr. Speaker, that is why the Liberals need to have proper consultations. That is why they need to say to the public that this is what they are thinking and this is the problem. They would be surprised by what would come up as solutions. There are solutions to the problems. If they do not want to hear the solutions, they do stuff like this. They shove it down people's throats and get it done so they do not have a chance to present a solution. That is what they are doing in this case.

I will remind the House that there are still going to be tankers going up and down the west coast. However, they will not be Canadian tankers, and they will not be hauling Canadian oil.

We can look at all these new processes and new technologies and embrace them. I encourage us to embrace them. However, the government will not embrace them. It does everything but that. Instead, we see things like Bill C-48, which takes a sledgehammer to it and bans it outright. It takes all the development and throws it away, when there are probably opportunities here to make it better so that it works for everyone involved. That is so disappointing.

Mr. Kevin Waugh (Saskatoon—Grasswood, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today I rise to speak on Bill C-48, the oil tanker moratorium act. The name of the bill is actually quite curious, because when we look at the facts, we see that this piece of legislation has very little to do with banning oil tankers from the B.C. north coast and everything to do with continuing the government's hurtful campaign against pipeline and oil development throughout this country, and in particular in western Canada. Little is surprising in this regard. The Liberals arbitrarily shelved the northern gateway pipeline in 2016, forced the cancellation of the energy east pipeline in 2017, and continued to do as little as possible to support the development of the Trans Mountain expansion pipeline, which has been put on life support now, certainly in this month of May.

First, let us examine what the Liberals are saying this bill would do. Time and time again, we have heard in this chamber that Bill C-48 is about environmental protection, that by imposing this moratorium, the northern coast will be better protected, specifically against oil spills. They argue that a moratorium is the only way to safeguard against the problem and that this legislation is therefore the way forward. There are numerous and significant flaws with this jurisdiction, which mark it as both hollow and ill-advised.

Government Orders

First, there is an issue of consistency. Why are the Liberals targeting the B.C. north coast for a ban on oil tankers while they apparently ignore the presence of oil tankers along many other of our coasts in this country? Why are they making the arbitrary decision to limit the transport opportunities for oil along the north coast and not the south? This kind of moratorium does not exist along the St. Lawrence Seaway or in the Great Lakes, and it does not exist along the coast of Newfoundland and Labrador, Nova Scotia, or New Brunswick. It does not exist around Vancouver. The fact that Bill C-48 quite arbitrarily applies only to the B.C. north coast sheds serious doubt on the Liberal claim that the intention of this bill is environmental protection.

Second, this environmental jurisdiction fails to consider that a voluntary exclusion zone of 100 kilometres for oil tankers travelling from Alaska to Washington State has been in place since 1985. These preventive measures have already been taken, prior to any sort of moratorium being put in place by the government. Additionally, oil tankers operating at this distance from the coastline would continue to be unaffected by this legislation. Once again, we struggle to find any support for the arguments being put forward by the Liberals in favour of this bill.

Third, the Liberal argument that the oil tanker moratorium is the only way to protect the environment completely ignores the current and extensive regulatory framework that exists for oil tankers today travelling within our waters. Canada's oil tanker safety procedures and processes still remain one of the best in the world.

We recall 2014. The former Conservative government introduced and implemented many innovative measures to ensure that oil tankers operated under strict regulations and environmental protections. These measures included modernizing Canada's navigation system, enhancing area response planning, building increased marine safety capacity in first nation communities, and ensuring that polluters pay for any spills and damages since 2010.

Every large crude-oil tanker that operates in Canadian waters must be equipped now with a double hull, so any tanker in our waters is covered by two full layers of water-tight surfaces to ensure safety and environmental protection. Oil tankers are consistently monitored by our national aerial surveillance program, and our data-sharing and communication technologies rigorously guide oil tanker traffic across this country to reduce the risk of collisions.

• (1020)

Do these kinds of regulations and protections exist for tankers exporting oil from, let us say, Venezuela or Saudi Arabia? There is no way. Given the strong and extensive regulations that exist for oil tankers travelling through Canadian waters, it is very clear that any jurisdiction for a moratorium on oil tankers for environmental reasons is completely unfounded.

What, then, is this bill all about? The answer, of course, is that it is about the Liberals' ideological objective to restrict Canadian pipeline and energy development as much as possible. The bill can most accurately be described as a moratorium on any and all pipeline development along the coastline of northern B.C., and as a result, this legislation would kill any economic opportunities communities in this region would otherwise have due to the increased energy investment in that area. We are already seeing that. This ban would

seriously hurt many, and I say many, first nation groups that have stood to gain from a pipeline in their area.

The Eagle Spirit pipeline is a \$16-billion project that would stretch from Bruderheim, Alberta, to Grassy Point, along the northern coast of B.C., which would be forced to reroute to Hyder, Alaska, and its end point. If this pipeline ban is imposed, the Eagle Spirit pipeline project, directed by more than 30 first nations across northern B.C. and Alberta, and their communities stand to lose a major economic opportunity due to the Liberal government's ideological and political posturing.

Bill C-48 has been brought forward without any true or meaningful consultation with first nation communities, which would be severely impacted by the implementation of a pipeline ban in northern British Columbia.

I will quote Calvin Helin, the chairman of Eagle Spirit and a member of the Lax Kw'alaams first nation, who said, "First Nations are completely opposed to government policy being made by foreigners when it impacts their ability to help out their own people [on reserve]. The energy industry is critical to Canada's economy", which no doubt it is, "and by some reports we are losing [an unbelievable] \$50 million a day."

We are losing \$50 million a day. That could be many schools and hospitals that we could build in Canada every single day.

It is simply unacceptable that the government refuses to consult with these groups to allow them to develop energy infrastructure, which would create significant economic opportunities in these communities. However, this behaviour coming from the Liberals is also unfortunately unsurprising, considering that it is the Liberal government that has overseen the largest decline in Canadian energy investment in the past 70 years. We have talked a lot in the House about \$80 billion-plus taken out of the economy, along with jobs in the energy sector. Well over 110,000 workers are unemployed in Saskatchewan and Alberta.

A moratorium on pipelines in northern B.C. is just another example of the government's blatant hostility toward our energy sector and the jobs and economic opportunities it would supply to communities across this country. The government has used the justification of environmental protection as a smokescreen for its anti-Canadian energy policies. When this argument is held up against the facts, we see it for what it is: a desperate attempt to mask the Liberals' ideological agenda. There are no real winners as a result of the northern B.C. pipeline moratorium, except American consumers, who receive discounted prices on our Canadian oil.

Government Orders

•(1025)

Mr. Adam Vaughan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development (Housing and Urban Affairs), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, listening to some of the members, particularly from the Prairies, talk about our great coastlines and waterways and then ask what the difference is between the St. Lawrence Seaway and the coast of northern B.C. is a little like saying I have a backyard garden and I know about agriculture. There is a very big difference between the St. Lawrence Seaway and the northern coast of B.C. For example, the St. Lawrence Seaway is man-made. That is one of the critical differences.

Does the member and the party opposite really think that the St. Lawrence Seaway should be governed with exactly the same rules as the most sensitive marine environments in our country, regardless of where they are, regardless of whether there is access, regardless of whether there is even a city or a real port on the site? Is that really what the Conservatives say, that all coastlines are equal and should be treated as such?

Mr. Kevin Waugh: Mr. Speaker, it is a direct attack on the northern coastline of British Columbia. We have talked about it in our speech here. There are no regulations to bring in Venezuelan oil or Saudi Arabian oil. The Liberals seem to think that it is very good to bring it into New Brunswick. We do not even talk about southern B.C. The bill talks about northern B.C.

I just talked about the opportunities of first nations that want to join the economy in this country, and they want to shut it down. We have heard from many groups in northern B.C. that want an opportunity of employment, an opportunity of prosperity, only to be shut down by this bill and the Liberals.

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the revisionist history here is breathtaking. The northern gateway pipeline was defeated by first nations on the basis that the Harper Conservative government failed to consult them. Therefore, this is challenging language.

Given what we are now hearing from that quarter of the House about the Conservative Party's commitment to science and evidence, how does the member view the previous Conservative government's sabotage of the Environmental Assessment Act and the removal of protections under the Navigable Waters Protection Act? Where was the science that told that government it was a good idea to remove habitat protection from the Fisheries Act?

•(1030)

Mr. Kevin Waugh: Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives did a lot in nine and a half years in government, and the Liberals have been undoing it in the last two and a half years.

I can stand here and talk about Eagle Spirit. All it wants is the opportunities in northern B.C., and they are being shut down here today. If and when the bill passes, this will be disastrous for northern communities. It is the same with Kinder Morgan. We have more first nations in B.C. that approve the pipeline than those that do not, and yet we cannot get it done.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, it is hard to know where to start.

I would point out to the member that, in 1972, there were extensive consultations when the government of the day, under former prime minister Pierre Trudeau, enacted a moratorium against oil tanker traffic in the passage that includes Hecate Strait and Dixon Entrance. That area has the fourth most hazardous body of water on the planet, and the transit is in interior waters with an immediate threat to Haida Gwaii and the B.C. coast. It is incomparable to any other body of water on any Canadian coastline. The moratorium was respected by Progressive Conservative federal governments and Social Credit provincial governments. It did not matter what government was in power, provincially or federally, until Stephen Harper, with zero consultations, ignored the moratorium and took it away.

I challenge the member to say why a government should not be allowed to fulfill an election promise and legislate a moratorium that we had for four decades.

Mr. Kevin Waugh: Mr. Speaker, we are losing \$50 million a day, and 110,000 jobs have been eliminated in my province and in Alberta because of the oil sands. It is because of the Liberals' attack on oil in Saskatchewan and Alberta. This is just another example. The Liberals are not listening to Canadians, and they will dearly pay for it next year.

The Speaker: Resuming debate, the hon. member for Nanaimo—Ladysmith.

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson: Mr. Speaker, I thought the member for Cloverdale—Langley City was next.

The Speaker: As I understand it, there was a change earlier to accommodate one of the earlier speakers. I have the member for Nanaimo—Ladysmith next. She has the floor.

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am thankful for the opportunity to speak to Bill C-48, the north coast partial oil tanker ban. That we have this in place is a credit to decades of work by north coast people. I also want to acknowledge the work of my colleague, the member of Parliament for Skeena—Bulkley Valley. His version of this bill in the previous Parliament toured the entire country, and thousands of people came out under the “Defend Our Coast” banner. It was very powerful. It gave the Liberal government the mandate to implement this, so we are glad to see the legislation.

We will be voting in favour of the bill. Our New Democratic colleague from Port Moody—Coquitlam tried quite hard to strengthen it. There is more ministerial discretion than we would like to see. Some of our colleagues have been quoted saying that one could drive an oil tanker through this moratorium. Nevertheless, we are going to vote in favour and we are glad to see some version of it moving forward.

Government Orders

As a member representing the south coast of British Columbia, the Salish Sea and Nanaimo—Ladysmith, I can say that we have very complicated shorelines, very fast-moving currents, very sensitive ecology, and 450 islands between the area I represent on Vancouver Island and the mainland of British Columbia and the U.S. border, with extremely complicated shipping traffic. We have very sensitive ecology and shorelines where we know that if there was an oil spill of any size, it would be extremely difficult to clean up.

Given that the industry standard for oil spill response is a 10% cleanup of oil, let me say again that members representing the southern part of British Columbia are committed to protecting their coastline, the economy, and the jobs that depend on it. They are just as concerned about the impacts of oil tanker traffic, especially when it is an unrefined, raw product that has no value-added jobs in Canada and no energy security benefit for Canada. Certainly, for British Columbians, the shipment of what we view as an increased level of danger by more oil tanker traffic and a thicker, unrefined product is all downside for our coast. There is no upside.

If the government is willing to put in strong measures for the north coast, why not for the south coast? There is still no peer-reviewed science that tells us how bitumen would react in the marine environment, in rough water with sediment in it. Who is going to have an oil spill with no waves? It just boggles the mind that the Liberal government could have approved the Kinder Morgan pipeline in the absence of evidence that bitumen can be recovered from the marine environment and that our response times are adequate to clean it.

What we have is some suspicion or concern based on what has been observed from other times when bitumen has been spilled in the marine environment. The diluent, which allows the raw, unrefined bitumen to flow, may evaporate very quickly. The evaporation itself may pose dangers to first responders, so it might be that first responders have to keep away. Certainly, if there was a bitumen spill in a heavily populated area, such as downtown Vancouver, a million people would be affected by a spill with much more toxic fumes than a refined product would have. We saw that in the Kalamazoo spill, which was in fresh water, but that was a huge occupational exposure.

When first responders have to stay away and cannot get to the spill quickly, this means that the diluent has more time to evaporate and there is an increased risk that the bitumen would sink. I have folders full of science reports from the Polaris Institute, the Royal Society of Canada, and others that talk about the stickiness and impact on marine wildlife such as sea otters and sea birds, let alone what would happen if we end up with bitumen coating the seabed. The damage that would be done trying to clean that up is alarming to contemplate.

•(1035)

We ask again, how is it that although the north coast partial oil tanker ban is being lauded by many of us on the coast and in the environmental movement, we do not have a concomitant level of protection in the south? We do not have confidence that our oil spill response is in a respectable and responsible place.

It turns out I am splitting my time with the member for Courtenay—Alberni. I look forward to his speech. We are full of surprises today.

My understanding is that the response regulations have not been updated or tightened since 1995. The Liberal government has had two and a half years to make that change. It has not. It is my understanding that if there is an oil spill in my region, the corporate entity responsible for the oil spill has 72 hours to get there. It is not in violation of the regulations unless it does not have booms and an oil spill response plan enacted within three days. How could that ever give any of us any confidence?

If the current government, or the previous government, really wanted to have pipelines approved and give coastal people any measure of confidence, then surely it would have upgraded and tightened those response times, as Washington State has done, repeatedly, as has Alaska.

When I was chair of the Islands Trust Council, we heard from our fellow governments at the local, regional, and state level that they were extremely concerned about Canada's, or British Columbia's, poor level of preparedness for an oil spill. Oil does not recognize the international boundary. They are very concerned, given the fast-moving currents. First of all, we are shipping a dangerous product for which there is no adequate response technology, and if we do not have the response times in place, the oil will move quickly to their side of the border. Certainly, their aquaculture industry is extremely concerned about our poor level of preparedness.

I am very glad to continue to see the Washington State governor salute the British Columbia NDP premier, John Horgan, for the very strong stand that he is taking to say, "I believe that the oil spill response plans for B.C.'s south coast are inadequate."

We are seeing now, in court, the provincial government saying that as soon as the oil hits the shoreline, it is its responsibility and jurisdiction. If the federal government is not going to adequately regulate to protect this resource, then the provincial government will consider implementing regulations itself that would protect coastal ecology and coastal jobs.

To my regret, yesterday the federal Liberal government decided to intervene in that case to oppose my premier's efforts to better protect the coast where the Liberal government has failed to. Our New Democrat leader, Jagmeet Singh, urged the Prime Minister to join the British Columbia premier so they would co-operatively go to the courts together and ask for clarification.

That would have been leadership, and it would have been a real sign of co-operation and trying to get the right answer. Instead, to see the federal government intervening against the British Columbia government, which is simply trying to strengthen and increase the safety net, is extremely discouraging. What a strange way of spending both the government's legal resources and taxpayers' dollars. How on Earth could that be a good expenditure? What we need to be doing is strengthening the ecological safety net, and not fighting against stronger measures in court.

Government Orders

When I was chair of the Islands Trust Council, we heard from our Washington State colleagues about how important it was to have geographic response plans in place for oil spill prevention and preparedness. These are micro-studies of a particular region that would be enacted in the event of an oil spill. The responsible spiller, whoever that was, would know to boom this. The spiller is likely to be a corporate entity, and they do a pretty good job of looking after their own business.

We would love to see geographic response plans in place. I am pleased that the B.C. government is pushing for that.

• (1040)

The Speaker: Before I go to questions and comments, I simply want to advise the hon. member for Nanaimo—Ladysmith that she was in fact correct that there was a mix-up here, for which I take responsibility. We probably should have gone to the hon. member for Cloverdale—Langley City. We will get to him in due course. That was a bit of a mix-up, and I appreciate her readiness to carry on as she did.

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

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that the NDP will support the legislation, which is a positive. This issue has been important to the government. It was raised during the last federal election, and the government is fulfilling that commitment.

I am a bit disappointed in the NDP's approach on the national interest and how it is prepared to forgo that based on the position that the environment has to be taken into consideration and there is absolutely no consideration given to the national interest. The member mentioned, for example, that she was disappointed by the federal government's actions with respect to the courts and not being onside with British Columbia.

Would the member at least acknowledge that the national interest does take into consideration our environment and the economy? The Trans Mountain pipeline is an excellent example of that. There even is controversy within the NDP. We have an NDP premier in Alberta saying that Albertans want the transcontinental. Does the member believe that the NDP premier has any merit whatsoever to her argument?

• (1045)

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson: Mr. Speaker, I salute the Alberta New Democrat premier, Rachel Notley. She campaigned on a strong platform of standing up for the existing jobs and industry in her province, and she is continuing to do that. I also salute New Democrat premier, John Horgan, who campaigned against the Kinder Morgan pipeline and said loudly that he would use every measure he could within his limited provincial jurisdiction to protect the coast, and he is doing that.

From my perspective, when we hear in Kinder Morgan's filings to the National Energy Board that the permanent jobs in British Columbia are 50, and we recognize the tens of thousands of jobs that are dependent on a clean environment, on sport fishing, on tourism, and everything in the coast, for us it does not compute. I would argue that the true national interest would have been for the Liberal

government to have kept its election promises to redo the Kinder Morgan review, but, most important, to truly reconcile with indigenous people. If the Liberals are to sign off on UNDRIP, then they certainly cannot ram a pipeline through and fight first nations in court. It is in the national interest to protect the environment. That is what we are doing.

Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the member's contribution to the debate. Politicians will often pick a position and then try to find facts that support their position, and I completely understand that. However, the member raised concerns about the science regarding diluted bitumen.

In the recent response to B.C.'s policy intentions paper for engagement activities related to spill management by the government, it says:

Federal scientists have published or presented over sixty papers on diluted bitumen science in peer-reviewed fora since 2012...to determine the fate, behaviour, potential impacts, and effectiveness of response techniques on a variety of heavy oil products....This research has ranged from lab-scale and pilot-scale tests of oil spill behaviour to field trials and evaluations of response technology. Findings have shown that diluted bitumen behaviour falls within the range of conventional oil products and so conventional mechanical recovery methods have been found effective...

The science on this is very clear. Could the member point to actual evidence showing the contrary? Will she then go to other arguments that may back her position? Science should not be one of them.

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson: Mr. Speaker, in my capacity as Islands Trust council chair, I started writing to the Conservative ministers of transport and environment starting in 2011, asking them to show me the science they had. Apparently that caused a bit of a ripple in the departments because it had not been studied. The marine environment studies are extremely limited.

Just a year ago, the Liberal transport minister was quoted on the radio saying that the government did not know how it reacted and through the oceans protection plan, it would study its behaviour in the marine environment. I have a file full of peer-reviewed papers that say this needs more study in the marine environment and in estuaries and places where there would be sediment and waves.

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is a huge honour to rise today to speak to this bill. Before I get started, I want to acknowledge all my colleagues in the House, especially in the Conservative Party.

Government Orders

We have had an incredible loss this week of our good friend from Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes. It is important that I acknowledge not just the loss of our friend, but the strength and courage of everyone in the House, especially our colleagues from the Conservative Party, for coming back here in honour of their colleague and constituents and for showing up for work yesterday. I was at committee and I was really touched by how everyone was dealing with this, but at the same time showing up for work. I want to commend them. My heart goes out to them, to the family, and to all the constituents of our good friend.

We are speaking to a bill to ban tankers on the north coast. I appreciate the efforts that are being made on the bill. Of course, there are some gaps that we have concerns about, certainly around ministerial jurisdiction and the ability for a minister to override some of this legislation. These are serious concerns. I could push the bill aside and open the door for something that we would not want to see happen, which is tanker traffic in a pristine area.

We have heard Liberal colleagues talk about the importance of this ecosystem. We have heard the Conservatives talk about jobs, and I will get to that in a minute. Most important, we are making a decision on legislation that protects our ecosystems for generations to come. We know how valuable those ecosystems are. I live on the coast, so I really understand how important our coastal waters are. We rely on clean oceans for our food, our economy, and our culture. It is precious and we must do everything we can to mitigate any chance that we could destroy these ecosystems forever, or even for decades, and upset our whole way of life.

When I talk about our way of life, we do not just use the ocean for transportation and the things I outlined. The ocean is our home. When I think about the north coast, I think about the south coast. There is no dividing line or border between the north and the south coasts. There is no wall between them. Currents, winds, and tides move the water from the north coast to the south coast. The fish migrate from the north coast to the south coast. Salmon move up and down. As coastal people, we move up and down. When I hear the Prime Minister say that tankers do not belong on the north coast, I have a hard understanding why he thinks they belong on the south coast and wants to increase tanker traffic sevenfold.

Yesterday, a great speech was given by my friend from Vancouver Quadra. She talked about witnessing “the environmental, economic and social devastation caused by the *Exxon Valdez* and BP catastrophes” in the Gulf of Mexico. “One major spill along B. C.’s shorelines would threaten fragile ecosystems, endanger wildlife, harm lives and communities, and jeopardize many of our” tens of thousands of “coastal jobs”. It is simply not worth the risk.”

It is clear that the spill, which happened over 25 years, is still impacting the community and causing devastation. She expressed that, and I appreciate her efforts. She is genuine about her support of a ban on the north coast. However, she could not square it when I asked her how she could support the Kinder Morgan pipeline. I have a lot of concerns with the Liberals talking from both sides of the coasts, or from both sides of their mouth. I am confused and I have questions.

● (1050)

I will pivot over to Kinder Morgan. It is important to talk about the Trans Mountain pipeline expansion. It is integrated. When we talk about a ban on the north coast, again, it is connected to the south coast. We cannot lose sight of the fact that the government is looking to approve a pipeline that is going to increase tanker traffic sevenfold.

The Prime Minister said in his 2015 campaign that if he was the prime minister, Kinder Morgan would have to go back to the drawing board, and that the process would need to be redone. Redone was a three-member panel that travelled around, listening to selected people and groups. It heard loud and clear from southern British Columbians that we did not want a pipeline. Therefore, I am confused. If that is the renewed process and the government is still moving forward, then there is not a lot of trust in the new three-member process that was delivered to the coastal people.

I have another quote from my friend from Vancouver Quadra with respect to the tanker ban. She said, “promise made, a promise kept.” Let us talk about a promise made, a promise broken, because that is Kinder Morgan, that is electoral reform, and a number of things. The list goes on and on. What we heard was a promise to protect coastal British Columbians. However, we know we do not have the science and the evidence-based decision-making, which the government said it would abide by, on how it will clean up raw bitumen.

As a coastal person, in the last couple of years we had a diesel spill in the Heiltsuk territory that we could not clean up. It affected the shellfish. It affected the Heiltsuk people's way of life, their economy, and their ability to sustain themselves. After the Conservatives closed the Kitsilano Coast Guard station, there was a 14-hour delay in dealing with the bunker fuel spill. How will the government deal with a spill from a supertanker full of crude oil? It cannot.

When the *Simushir* was off the coast of Haida Gwaii, we worried that it would land on the beaches of Haida Gwaii, on the traditional territory of the Haida people. Luckily, the Coast Guard got up there in time. The government is saying that we are going to get two tugboats and that is going to save us. I am sorry. British Columbians do not feel safe about two tugboats saving us and protecting us from an oil spill. We will appreciate them and we will take them. However, we are not feeling that confident based on scenarios like the *Queen of the North*. These are all examples that we can cite.

We had a spill in 1988 off the coast of Washington, and it landed on our beaches as far north as where I live in Tofino. It is not that it might happen; it is that it will happen at some point. Therefore, I have huge concerns with respect to the pipeline.

The other part of the conversation I do not feel is happening is this, and there is misleading information with respect to it. We hear that jobs will be lost and that it will allow more foreign oil to come to Canada. This is misleading. These pipelines are not designed to replace foreign oil. They will not replace oil from Nigeria or Saudi Arabia. This is made for export. No conversations are happening about a transition, about energy security, about refining more oil, and how we do that while we are in the midst of a transition.

We have seen what Norway has done. It put a trillion dollars in the bank, while Canada put \$11 billion in the bank. Where is the trust from the Canadian people that we are investing in assets for future generations? Norway is earning \$50 billion in interest alone off of its wealth fund.

We know we can do better and be more responsible with the management of our resources. We can find a better way for our future and that of our children by creating jobs, not exporting jobs, but also with respect to the transition that is needed, and needed now. The world cannot wait. We have to protect our pristine coastlines and ecosystems. They are sensitive. They cannot afford an oil spill of raw bitumen.

• (1055)

The Speaker: After question period, the hon. member for Courtenay—Alberni will have roughly five minutes of questions and comments in relation to his speech.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*Translation*]

DENISE BEAUCHAMP

Mr. Greg Fergus (Hull—Aylmer, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last Friday, one of Hull—Aylmer's best left us far too soon. Denise Beauchamp, "Mom" to her regulars, was co-owner of Bistro L'Autre Oeil in Old Aylmer.

Daughter, sister, mother, and wife, Denise was from a close-knit family. She warmly welcomed so many of us into her extended family, celebrating our joys and standing by us in our sorrows. Her reassuring presence was the heart and soul of L'Autre Oeil, a place that breathed new life into Old Aylmer. On good days and bad, the dynamic atmosphere she created made us all feel at home.

Denise was the driving force behind the revitalization of Aylmer's main street, and she was actively involved in the community, getting people on board with all kinds of good causes. On behalf of the entire community of Hull—Aylmer, I extend my most sincere condolences to her family and the many friends who were privileged to be part of her life.

Rest in peace, Denise.

* * *

• (1100)

[*English*]

SASKATCHEWAN LEASEHOLDERS

Mr. Robert Kitchen (Souris—Moose Mountain, CPC): Mr. Speaker, recently the member for Yorkton—Melville and I met with

Statements by Members

160 members of the Shesheep Cottage Owners Association and the Grenfell Beach Association. We were there to listen to their concerns about a nine-year process affecting their leases with Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada.

Many of these 324 leaseholders and their families invested their life savings into the development of their future. Their leases have been increased 600 to 700%. They are consistently told that the issue is before the courts and there is nothing the government can or will do for them.

Decisions made by the court are appealed. Remedial resolution meetings are not kept or not made. They are frustrated at every step. In fact, some leases will expire this year. With no written leases presented, how can they determine their future? As with the pipeline, the government continues to kick this process down the road. The government is taking no action to help resolve this issue. The cottagers have not missed payments and they are reasonable people asking to be treated fairly. It is time for the government to step up and do the right thing.

* * *

GENDER EQUALITY

Mr. Terry Duguid (Winnipeg South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last week I had the pleasure to travel to Washington, D.C., to celebrate 20 years of leadership by Promundo, a global leader in promoting gender justice and preventing violence by engaging men and boys in partnership with women and girls. I was particularly honoured to accept the Future of Manhood Award on behalf of our Prime Minister.

[*Translation*]

Our government puts gender equality at the heart of decision-making. That is why we have made new investments to prevent and address gender-based violence and develop an engagement strategy for men and boys that promotes equality.

[*English*]

We simply cannot move forward when half of us are held back. I am proud that our Prime Minister is being recognized for his strong global leadership on gender equality.

* * *

[*Translation*]

HUMAN TRAFFICKING

Ms. Christine Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to tell you that senators and MPs from all parties got together to form a parliamentary group to combat modern-day slavery and human trafficking.

I will have the privilege of serving as co-chair alongside the member for Winnipeg Centre, the member for Peace River—Westlock, and Senator Christmas.

Statements by Members

Our goal is to take a non-partisan approach, because we believe this issue is just too important for us to get caught up in partisan squabbles. Our group will be supported by Nicole Barrett, the director of the International Justice and Human Rights Clinic at the University of British Columbia. Ms. Barrett was also a member of the national Task Force on Trafficking of Women and Girls in Canada. Even in our own country, over 90% of victims are women who are being exploited mainly for sexual purposes. These women are our mothers, our sisters, our daughters, and our neighbours. By working together, we can give them the help they deserve.

I invite all members of this House to join our group and help find solutions to put an end once and for all to these human rights atrocities that are being perpetrated right here in Canada.

* * *

[English]

FLOODING IN NEW BRUNSWICK

Mr. Wayne Long (Saint John—Rothesay, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart, but also one full of pride for the amazing outpouring of community support in response to the historic flooding afflicting the residents of my riding Saint John—Rothesay and all of New Brunswick.

There are so many unsung heroes: our first responders; Saint John Energy; our mayors, Don Darling and Nancy Grant; Premier Brian Gallant; and so many others.

This is already a record-breaking flood, and thousands of Saint John—Rothesay residents whose homes have never been at serious risk of flooding in the past are now bearing the brunt of catastrophic flood damage. For me this flood is personal. One of my best friends, Terry Ferguson, lives at ground zero. The effort to save his home is inspiring. People like Kevin Ferguson, Larry Dunlop, Gerry Foley, Shawn Ferguson, Mike Gray, Shawn Crawford, Chris Ferguson, and so many others have answered the call for help. I urge everyone in my riding to listen closely for and heed advisories issued by EMO officials in the region.

Let us stand together, be resilient, and show compassion. I will be home to help tonight.

* * *

DOWN'S SYNDROME

Mr. Brad Trost (Saskatoon—University, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few moments and speak about an energetic woman named Christina Lee Fast.

Christina has a good sense of humour. She likes to seek out the sense of humour in others. Being a sociable person, she started a young adults group in her church, and that group has grown in time. Christina likes to work out at her local gym. Naturally, her love of fitness led her to become an Olympic athlete in the Special Olympics.

Christina loves her life, and the people in her life love her, but not all people in Canada love or even value women like Christina. Why is that? It is because Christina has Down's syndrome. Once diagnosed with Down's syndrome in the womb, 90% of Down's

syndrome children in Canada are aborted. Instead of being valued and accepted, sadly, they are viewed as a burden to be avoided.

Canadians with Down's syndrome, Canadians like Christina, make Canada a wonderful place. We should all be proud of their contributions.

* * *

•(1105)

[Translation]

LES CÈDRES RIVERBOAT RIDE

Mr. Peter Schiefke (Vaudreuil—Soulanges, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, many activities for families, young people, and seniors are held throughout Vaudreuil-Soulanges year-round.

One of the most exciting of these wonderful activities is the Les Cèdres riverboat ride. With the help of a guide, participants are able to learn more about our history, raftsmen, and the *Rapids Prince* steamship, while exploring the Soulanges Canal and the natural beauty of our region.

The riverboat ride gives people a rare opportunity to see, feel, and experience Vaudreuil-Soulanges like never before. I encourage everyone from Vaudreuil-Soulanges to join me, Les Cèdres mayor Raymond Larouche, and the city council on the Les Cèdres riverboat ride.

* * *

[English]

SOVEREIGN'S MEDAL FOR VOLUNTEERS RECIPIENT

Ms. Kate Young (London West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I rise to acknowledge Beverley Thomson, a London West resident and recipient of the Governor General's Sovereign's Medal for Volunteers. As an official Canadian honour, the medal for volunteers recognizes the exceptional volunteer achievements of Canadians from across the country.

Beverley Thomson has spent many years helping those suffering from alcohol and drug addiction. She was a founding member of Westover Treatment Centre in Thamesville and executive director of St. Stephen's House, a recovery home for men in London. After decades of devotion to get local and affordable treatment programs in place for people battling alcohol and drug dependency, Bev Thomson is still championing addiction awareness today.

I thank Beverley for the lives she has touched and for all that she has done for southwestern Ontario. Her selflessness and dedication to service are truly an inspiration.

Statements by Members

[Translation]

ROSALIE GAGNON

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, April 18, 2018 will forever remain etched in the memories of all Canadians, particularly those from Charlesbourg, as the day the unthinkable happened. That is the day that the murdered body of two-year-old Rosalie Gagnon was found in a garbage bin. That little girl endured great suffering.

It is our duty, as a society, to do whatever it takes to protect our most vulnerable members, our seniors and our children. Rosalie's tragic death brought together her community, Quebec, and all of Canada. Everyone joined together in bidding her a final farewell. Over the past few weeks, a walk and a balloon release were organized in Charlesbourg in little Rosalie's memory.

Her funeral will be held tomorrow at Saint-Rodrigue church, and I will be there to honour the memory of this little angel. I am a father. Our children are vulnerable. We need to take care of them. They are our future.

Goodbye, Rosalie.

* * *

[English]

DENNIS FRANKLIN CROMARTY HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. Don Rusnak (Thunder Bay—Rainy River, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today a group of students from Dennis Franklin Cromarty High School in Thunder Bay are visiting Parliament Hill. DFC is a unique school that was established by the parents and elders in the Nishnawbe Aski Nation territory of northwestern Ontario and serves youth from many different first nations throughout northwestern Ontario.

At Dennis Franklin Cromarty, students have the unique opportunity of attending a first nation high school within the city of Thunder Bay. The mission of DFC is to ensure students develop a strong sense of identity in the distinct language, culture, and traditions of their communities, while also achieving academic excellence.

I want to welcome the students here today, and say to them *meegwetch* for the work they do.

* * *

EVENTS IN CLOVERDALE—LANGLEY CITY

Mr. John Aldag (Cloverdale—Langley City, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, people who have ever dreamed of starting their own businesses will want to hear this.

The Downtown Langley Business Association is inviting aspiring entrepreneurs across B.C. to enter a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to win a prize valued at over \$100,000 to help launch the retail business of their dreams in beautiful downtown Langley. The grand prize winner will receive an incredible prize package that includes six months' free rent in a new retail space, full branding and marketing support, legal and accounting support, and much, much more. Applications are open for one more week and close on May 11.

Interested applicants can visit downtownlangley.com for more information.

Also, the Cloverdale Rodeo is coming up, from May 18 to 21. We will have cowboys and cowgirls competing in a variety of events, the area's largest midway, axe-throwing competitions, a ribfest, freestyle skateboarding, and so much more. You will not want to miss it.

* * *

● (1110)

UNITED CONSERVATIVE PARTY

Hon. Michelle Rempel (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Albertans are humble, hard-working people. They carry pride that comes from self-reliance, of caring for their community, and for standing for what they believe in. The Liberal government has not been kind to my province. Frankly, neither has their current provincial government, but here is the thing: Albertans do not take a punch and stay on the ground. They get up and they punch back. This is why over 2,600 Albertans, an unprecedented number, are gathering this weekend in Red Deer to plan to take their future back.

Canadians from around the country congratulate members of the United Conservative Party on the eve of its founding annual general meeting. Their grassroots movement has caught fire across the province and mobilized tens of thousands of people to fight for their right to a prosperous future. I thank my former colleague, Jason Kenney, for what he has done to unite the people of Alberta in this movement.

The people of Alberta are strong and they are free. What is happening in Red Deer this weekend will ensure they stay that way.

Get 'er done, Alberta.

* * *

INDIAN RESIDENTIAL SCHOOL HISTORY AND DIALOGUE CENTRE

Ms. Joyce Murray (Vancouver Quadra, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on April 9, UBC and its partners celebrated the opening of the new Indian Residential School History and Dialogue Centre in my riding of Vancouver Quadra. UBC president Santa Ono took this opportunity to apologize for the university's part in that harmful system. Musqueam first nation assisted this project of truth sharing, and local elders were present to talk about the long-term impacts of residential schools.

The centre provides a place for public education and dialogue on this dark chapter of our history to ensure that the experiences, policies, and abuse will never be forgotten. Our government's comprehensive approach to indigenous reconciliation is only a small part of our national journey. I commend President Ono and I thank director Linc Kesler for his years of championing this project and making it a reality.

Finally, I thank the Musqueam first nation for inspiring us with its experience and wise counsel.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

JONQUIÈRE MÉDIC

Ms. Karine Trudel (Jonquière, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today I want to tell the House about a unique service offered to the people of Jonquière, Quebec. Jonquière Médic is an inspiring success story.

Since 1982, Jonquière Médic has been making free house calls to provide medical care. They currently have six dedicated doctors who arrange their schedules to make these calls. Jonquière Médic has proven successful by making it possible for patients to get the medical care they need without having to travel unnecessarily.

Where does the funding come from for this organization whose services benefit thousands of people who do not have a doctor? It comes from the community. Annual fundraising campaigns collect donations from businesses and individuals who are more and more generous every year.

I rise in the House to commend the extraordinary work of the entire team at Jonquière Médic.

* * *

[English]

WORKERS WITH DISABILITIES

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, for the last 20 years, the Canadian Association for Supported Employment has been helping people with disabilities get and keep great jobs, but Annette Borrows, the president of the association, is warning of an obstacle. She said that the association strives for employment equality and when people are faced with any disincentive to be able to contribute to society in a meaningful way through employment, those disincentives need to be addressed and eliminated. She is referring to the clawbacks and taxes that often mean people with disabilities are worse off when they work, add hours, or get a raise.

My bill, the opportunity for workers with disabilities act, would require governments to ensure that people can always get ahead through their own hard work. I am happy to announce that Ms. Borrows and her association have endorsed that bill. She said that the opportunity act would eliminate the disincentive to work due to excess clawbacks on disabled workers and that she supports its principles.

I encourage all members of the House to do the same. Let us pass the bill and bring justice for hard-working Canadians.

* * *

●(1115)

SPRING EVENTS IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

Mr. Robert Morrissey (Egmont, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this past week, the spring lobster fishery in Prince Edward Island opened. This also marks the time of year when farmers begin cultivating their land.

I would like to take this opportunity to wish all farmers and fishers a safe and productive season and remind Canadians that the hard work of these people is why Canada has a strong reputation for the safest, most abundant food in the world.

I would also like to take a moment to recognize one farmer from my riding, Leo Handrahan, who harvested his first blueberries on the family farm near Tignish in 1966. Despite acknowledging that his first crop was not much, he persevered, helping to re-establish the crop in West Prince.

He was recently given the Pioneer Award by the P.E.I. Wild Blueberry Growers Association, which recognizes individuals who have helped build and grow their industry. It is a well-deserved honour.

I congratulate Leo Handrahan.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[English]

CARBON PRICING

Hon. Candice Bergen (Portage—Lisgar, CPC): Mr. Speaker, for over a year, we have been asking the Liberals about how much their carbon tax will cost Canadians, and for over a year, they have been covering up the cost and refusing to answer. However, yesterday, the Minister of Finance said that he is going to tell us in the fall, and he blames the provinces for this cover-up.

The fact is the finance minister knows exactly what the carbon tax will cost. He has given us the report, but he has blacked out the numbers. The Liberals need to tell Canadians how much their carbon tax will cost everyday Canadian families.

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased this week that we released a report. What did it show? It showed that carbon pricing works. Why? It reduces emissions at the lowest cost while also growing the economy.

Eighty per cent of Canadians live in a province where there is a price on pollution. There is no federal price on pollution. Members can look at British Columbia, which has been able to reduce its emissions while growing its economy.

What Canadians really want to know is what the Conservatives would do to tackle climate change.

Hon. Candice Bergen (Portage—Lisgar, CPC): Mr. Speaker, high gas prices are not only a burden for Canadian families, but they are a job-killing expense for farmers, fishermen, and business owners.

My colleague, Rob Moore, from New Brunswick, has been hearing from fishermen right across Atlantic Canada. They are really angry about what the government has already done to the lobster and snow crab industries, and now they are very worried about the federal carbon tax and that they will not be able to afford fuel for their fishing vessels.

Just how much is the Liberal carbon tax going to cost the good people of New Brunswick?

Oral Questions

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to talk with the Premier of New Brunswick.

Provinces across the country understand that we need to put a price on pollution and that we need to have a serious plan to tackle climate change. Provinces are well within their rights to establish their own plan. Eighty per cent of Canadians already live where there is one, in Ontario, Quebec, Alberta, and B.C. The provinces can determine what to do with the revenue. They can return the revenue to individuals, to businesses, or they can decide that they are going to invest in energy efficiency.

We think that is the best way, because that is the way we can actually tackle climate change, work together, and grow our economy.

Hon. Candice Bergen (Portage—Lisgar, CPC): Mr. Speaker, these elitist Liberals are completely out of touch with everyday Canadians. In rural areas and in provinces like New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, driving a vehicle is a necessity. Not to use fuel is not an option. In some cases, the closest grocery store, hospital, or bank could be 50 kilometres or more away. Jet-setting millionaires like the Prime Minister can afford \$1.81 a litre for gas, but most Canadians cannot afford that.

Again, when will the Liberals tell us how much their carbon tax is going to cost everyday Canadians?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would note that in the past election, every single riding in Atlantic Canada was won by the Liberals. I guess that was the message that was missed by the Conservatives. They did nothing.

The other thing the Conservatives do not realize is that climate change is real. It is not an elitist view. It is having an impact on farmers. It is having an impact on fishers. It is having an impact on everyone.

We need to take smart, practical measures to tackle climate change, and that is exactly what we are doing.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jacques Gourde (Lévis—Lotbinière, CPC): Mr. Speaker, according to the Parliamentary Budget Officer's report, the carbon tax will hurt the Canadian economy to the tune of \$10 billion by 2022. That is a lot of money for Canadian families.

How much money does that represent for the families that will be affected by the sexist carbon tax over a one-year period?

● (1120)

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am quite surprised to hear them say they are concerned about sexism. That is the party that closed 12 out of 16 Status of Women Canada offices.

We know that we must take action on climate change. Canadians know that we have a plan, but they are not so sure if the Conservatives do.

Mr. Jacques Gourde (Lévis—Lotbinière, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the sole purpose of the sexist carbon tax is to pay for the deficits accumulated by the Liberals because of their poor management. The

most disadvantaged in our society will be the most affected. On this side of the House, we respect Canadians' money.

Why does the Liberal government believe that it is entitled to Canadians' money by imposing new taxes in order to pay for their excessive expenditures?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, talking louder or shouting is not going to change things. Climate change is real. I will now explain how it works: 80% of Canadians pay a carbon tax and their province decides what to do with the revenue. Quebec's economy is growing. The four provinces with carbon pricing are the four provinces with the highest growth in the country.

We must tackle climate change. I will ask my question again. What is the Conservatives' plan for climate change?

[*English*]

The Speaker: As much as I almost always enjoy hearing the voice of the hon. member for Souris—Moose Mountain, I would ask him not to yell out when someone else has the floor and to wait until he has the floor.

The hon. member for Victoria.

* * *

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Murray Rankin (Victoria, NDP): Mr. Speaker, three weeks ago, just outside these doors, NDP leader Jagmeet Singh suggested that the federal government, B.C., Alberta, and indigenous leaders refer jurisdictional issues concerning Kinder Morgan to the Supreme Court of Canada. The Liberal government scoffed. It said it was a ridiculous proposal, that their jurisdiction was clear and beyond dispute.

Now the government has decided to join in the reference case to the B.C. Court of Appeal. Oops. If it was such a ridiculous idea then, why is it such a good idea now?

Ms. Kim Rudd (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are intervening in the reference question filed by B.C. We are confident in our jurisdiction and will intervene to defend the national interest.

The TMX project is of vital strategic interest to Canada, and it will be built. Our government has initiated formal financial discussions with Kinder Morgan, the result of which will be to remove uncertainty overhanging the project.

We are also actively pursuing legislative options that will assert and reinforce the federal jurisdiction in this matter, which we know we clearly have. Hundreds of thousands of hard-working Canadians depend on this project being built.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

Ms. Karine Trudel (Jonquière, NDP): Mr. Speaker, almost one month ago, the NDP proposed working with British Columbia, Alberta, and indigenous communities on a reference question on Kinder Morgan to be submitted to the Supreme Court. The Liberals thought that was ridiculous.

However, we learned yesterday that the Liberals are planning to intervene in the legal proceedings initiated by the Government of British Columbia. Not only are they slowing down the process, but they also continue to ignore the fact that there is faster recourse.

When will the government refer this matter to the Supreme Court?

[English]

Ms. Kim Rudd (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I said a moment ago, we are intervening in the reference question filed by B.C. We are doing so because we are confident in our jurisdiction, and we will intervene to defend what is in the national interest. The TMX project is of vital strategic interest to Canada, and it will be built.

We are also actively pursuing legislative options that will assert and reinforce the federal jurisdiction in this matter, which we know we clearly have. Our government has also initiated formal financial discussions with Kinder Morgan, the result of which will be to remove uncertainty overhanging this project.

* * *

[Translation]

MARIJUANA

Ms. Karine Trudel (Jonquière, NDP): Mr. Speaker, another file, another disagreement with the provinces. We have the health transfers, Kinder Morgan, the price on carbon, the tax on cannabis, the tax on online products, and the reopening of the Constitution, just to name a few.

This time, the government could end up in court over the authorization of home growing. This is a far cry from the leadership and co-operative federalism that we were promised.

Will the government stop ignoring the provinces' concerns and finally work with them?

Hon. Ginette Petitpas Taylor (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the current approach to cannabis does not work. It allows criminals to profit and has not managed to keep cannabis out of the hands of our children.

We have a lot of respect for the work done by the Senate, and we look forward to carefully studying the report that the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology is working on.

Our government is confident that Bill C-45 can be passed in June. Our government has taken significant measures to address the specific interests of indigenous communities and organizations.

• (1125)

[English]

Mr. Murray Rankin (Victoria, NDP): Mr. Speaker, so much for co-operative federalism and sunny ways. Co-operative federalism

means actually working with the provinces, not simply telling them that this is the way things are.

Now provinces are raising concerns about the home cultivation of marijuana, but the Prime Minister simply says, "No way, we are going ahead, regardless of your concerns."

When did the Liberals decide to abandon co-operative federalism?

Hon. Ginette Petitpas Taylor (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the approach to cannabis does not work. It has allowed criminals and organized crime to profit while failing to keep cannabis out of the hands of youth.

We respect the work that the Senate has been doing, and we look forward to reviewing the recommendations brought forward by the social affairs committee.

Our government is confident that Bill C-45 can be adopted later this June. Our government has taken important steps to address specific interests expressed by indigenous committees and other groups.

We will continue to collaborate with the provinces and territories to ensure that a reasonable transition to a legal market is brought forward.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is ignoring the basic economic reality that his carbon tax unfairly punishes farmers and rural communities. He refuses to accept Saskatchewan's own climate change strategy, and continues to threaten my province. At the same time, he refuses to come clean about the actual cost of his carbon tax on Canadians.

If the Prime Minister cannot answer this basic question about his carbon tax, will the public safety minister, who is from Saskatchewan, answer this question?

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in the last election, we campaigned on improving the economy and protecting the environment. We are protecting the environment, and we have the best growth in the G7. We have also not taken science money out of agriculture, like the previous Harper government did. We have added \$100 million to the science budget in agriculture. We have and will continue to support the agricultural sector in this country.

Mr. Kevin Waugh (Saskatoon—Grasswood, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal carbon tax will have a negative impact on Saskatchewan's exports, along with its energy industry's competitiveness. This will be one of the largest national tax increases in Canadian history, and that is why my province is taking it to the Supreme Court. This tax affects everyone, every man, woman, and child in my province.

Analysis has been done. The Liberals know the answer, yet they continue to cover it up. Why will the public safety minister, who is from my province of Saskatchewan, not come clean and give us the numbers?

Oral Questions

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. gentleman missed my speech last year, where I described some of these issues in considerable detail before the Canadian Club in a meeting in Regina. The fact of the matter is that the Province of Saskatchewan has the full option to design a carbon pricing system of its own, including the exemption of farm fuel, including the exemption of small oil and gas companies, if it would choose to do so. If it does not choose to do so, the fallback position will come into effect, but the first right—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Souris—Moose Mountain.

Mr. Robert Kitchen (Souris—Moose Mountain, CPC): Mr. Speaker, during a debate on the carbon tax, the Minister of Environment stated that carbon capture and storage is a solution that will benefit everyone. This technology has existed for years at the Boundary Dam power station, where carbon capture technology has removed over two million tonnes of CO₂ from the atmosphere. The minister sings the virtues of this innovative, green, emissions-cutting technology yet is forcing a job-killing carbon tax on the people of Saskatchewan.

Why is the only minister from Saskatchewan, the public safety minister, not championing Saskatchewan's clean energy initiatives?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, jeepers, he missed the speech too. It specifically dealt with carbon capture and sequestration. I am pleased to tell him that I was the minister in the Government of Canada, 20 years ago, who put the initial funding into carbon capture and sequestration in Saskatchewan.

• (1130)

Mrs. Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, he should let his environment minister know that.

The carbon tax is already killing jobs and hurting families in Alberta and British Columbia. Saskatchewan is taking this Liberal Prime Minister and his greedy government to court to stop this punitive tax. In court, the Liberal carbon tax cover-up will be exposed. Why wait until Saskatchewan wins?

Will the Minister of Environment come clean today and reveal the cost of the federal carbon tax on Saskatchewan families? No, she will not. How about the public safety minister, who was elected to represent the beautiful, cutting-edge, environmentally efficient province of Saskatchewan?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me be clear. I was actually with Saskatchewan technology, with carbon capture and storage, in China so I could help promote this technology. Let me tell members another thing, but it will be hard, because they are going to have to stop shouting and listen. Carbon capture and storage is only economic if one puts a price on pollution, because people will choose that technology.

It is about choice. There are Conservatives who are very happy to explain why the price on pollution works. There are many of them, including the former adviser to Stephen Harper. Maybe you should listen to people who understand economics.

The Speaker: Order. On the one hand, I would ask members to listen and not be interrupting when someone else has the floor. On the other, I would ask the hon. minister to remember to address her comments to the Chair.

The hon. member for North Okanagan—Shuswap.

Mr. Mel Arnold (North Okanagan—Shuswap, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister lectured Canadians the other day that they need to make better choices and change their behaviour. Well, that behaviour change should not mean missing a health appointment because they cannot afford the gas to get there, but that is the choice some British Columbians are being forced to make with the Prime Minister's punitive carbon taxes.

Does the Prime Minister believe Canadians should be forced to make the choice between driving to a health appointment or paying for groceries?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, of course we care about the cost of living for Canadians. Of course we care about growing the economy. Of course we care about tackling climate change. That is why we have a serious, credible plan, with low-cost measures, to make sure that we tackle climate change. Once again, all I want to know, and all Canadians want to know, is, what did they ever do to tackle climate change, and do they actually believe it is real?

Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC): The government says it cares, Mr. Speaker, but actions speak louder than words. In British Columbia this week, the Prime Minister lectured Canadians that they need to make better choices. What he considers better choices is devastating to my province. What is worse is that the Liberals will not tell Canadians or their representatives in this place how much it will cost. We are already starting to see the cost, with gas at \$1.60 a litre. Of course, the Prime Minister and his cabinet will not feel the effects that everyday families are feeling, because everything is paid for. When will the Liberals come clean and tell Canadians what their carbon tax will cost them?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have been clear with Canadians. We released a study this week, and what does it show? It shows that putting a price on pollution works. Why does it work? It is because it creates incentives for people to choose low-cost options, it creates incentives to choose innovation, and it creates incentives to reduce emissions and tackle climate change.

Once again, we are going to continue asking: what is the Conservative plan to tackle climate change, and do they believe it is real?

Oral Questions

[Translation]

CANADA REVENUE AGENCY

Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault (Sherbrooke, NDP): Mr. Speaker, two years ago, it was revealed that the Canada Revenue Agency had offered amnesty to the wealthy clients of KPMG. The Minister of National Revenue said that the net was tightening, that justice would be done, and that no one was above the law. Unfortunately, nothing has been done since then. No criminal charges have been laid against KPMG or its clients. However, when it comes to attacking single mothers who depend on the Canada child benefit, the CRA moves like lightning. It wastes no time going after the little guys.

Why, then, is the CRA taking so long to go after the real tax cheats, meaning KPMG and its clients?

[English]

Ms. Kamal Khera (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, cracking down on tax evasion, especially offshore, is a priority for our government. Budget 2018 would invest almost \$100 million in the CRA, in addition to nearly \$1 billion in the last two budgets, to allow it to go even further in this fight. The budget also includes legislative changes that would close tax loopholes used by multinationals. We have fully adopted the international standard for the automatic exchange of information with our OECD partners, and starting this year, we will have access to even more data from other jurisdictions, which will enable us to fight tax evasion even more effectively.

* * *

• (1135)

[Translation]

TAXATION

Mr. Pierre Nantel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Quebec union of municipalities is troubled about the harm caused by the federal government's reluctance to tax web giants. This week, the Minister of Finance got mixed up again. He was asked about GST, and he answered something about corporate taxation. That is troubling. Canadian businesses are struggling while multinational corporations continue to get a free pass from the government. Everyone should pay their fair share. It is just common sense.

Is this going to be like with pot? Do the Liberals have friends they want to protect?

Mr. Joël Lightbound (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, to answer the member's question, no, there are no friends to protect. We are taking a cautious and responsible approach. We want our approach to taxing web giants to be collaborative and not piecemeal. We want an approach that supports and fosters an innovative economy, while ensuring that the system is fair and just. That is why the Minister of Finance is working with his OECD partners to make sure Canada takes an internationally collaborative approach.

[English]

CARBON PRICING

Hon. Michelle Rempel (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): In May 2016, at a G7 ministers meeting, the environment minister, according to an article in *The Globe and Mail*, advocated for greater recognition of the gender dimension to climate. However, a subsequent gender-based analysis of the Prime Minister's carbon tax suggested that it could have a lopsided negative impact for different genders. Why is the Prime Minister not taking his own minister's advice and refusing to recognize the gender dimension of the carbon tax?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the member opposite has raised the importance of doing gender-based analysis. We are committed to doing that. In the second annex to the report we put out this week, it talks about the gender-based analysis. We think provinces that are putting a price on pollution should take into account the impacts of putting a price on pollution on everyone: on women and on marginalized groups. They can do that through rebates and through other means. It is very good that we are having this discussion in the House of Commons and actually talking about and looking at the impact of policies, including on women.

Hon. Michelle Rempel (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, now it is the provinces' responsibility to implement the intersectional gender-based sexist carbon tax?

I support asking questions on whether new policies, like new taxes, create barriers to equal opportunity. In that spirit, why is the Prime Minister set on implementing or forcing the provinces to implement a new tax that his own intersectional gender-based analysis said will make life harder for women?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the focus of doing a gender-based analysis is basically that every policy can have a disproportionate impact on different groups. We actually did this. I would encourage the member opposite to review appendix 2 of the report.

Yes, provinces are the ones that are putting a price on pollution. In fact, 80% of Canadians live in a province where they put a price on pollution. Provinces have the opportunity to take the revenues and give them back to people. They can give money back to women. They can give money back to disadvantaged groups. They can give money back to farmers. It is up to the provinces. We are giving them the tools and the information they need.

*Oral Questions***CBC/RADIO-CANADA***[Translation]***IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP**

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I asked the minister a question, but I do not think he understood it. I will ask it again. In 2010, the Harper government appointed a special advisor to the Privy Council Office to address human smuggling and illegal migration issues, but that advisor retired in 2016. The position has remained vacant ever since.

My question is not about the G7 summit or the issues that will be discussed there. I am asking the Prime Minister when we can expect that position to be filled.

[English]

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have taken a broader approach. We have embedded these issues with respect to human trafficking in a broad range of federal government policies at the G7, but beyond the G7. Indeed, in the last budget is one very useful initiative that has been asked for, for a very long time, by a variety of women's organizations. It is the establishment of a national hotline for dealing with human trafficking. We are proceeding step by step on an effective plan to deal with human trafficking, and it is proving to be effective.

• (1140)

[Translation]

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we will come back to this next week because the question is about whether someone will be tapped to fill that position.

We have learned that Canadian government officials are in Nigeria to talk to the Americans about the visa process. It is also clear that Nigerians are continuing to receive visas and continuing to enter Canada illegally.

Now that the Prime Minister knows that these people are obtaining visas for the sole purpose of coming to Canada illegally, he is finally realizing that there is a problem at the border.

Is the Prime Minister prepared to implement a mechanism to immediately deport these individuals?

Mr. Serge Cormier (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again, our government is committed to protecting the safety of Canadians and securing our borders. As members know, in the last budget we invested \$175 million, including \$74 million for processing refugee claims. That is in stark contrast to the former government, which made over \$400 million in cuts to border services.

I can say that, yes, we are in discussions with our American counterparts with regard to members of the Nigerian community who are crossing the border. We will continue to deal with this situation with the help of our American counterparts, who have recently taken some very practical steps to address this problem.

Ms. Christine Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the disappearance of over-the-air broadcasting is having an impact in my region. Not only is there no longer any regional news programming on Radio-Canada, but people who tuned in to Radio-Canada over the air no longer have access, unless they are prepared to pay for cable or satellite. Similar situations are increasingly common in rural regions across Canada.

Will the Minister of Canadian Heritage share her position on the gradual disappearance of over-the-air Radio-Canada broadcasting in rural areas?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we certainly believe in the importance of our national broadcaster. That is why we invested \$675 million in CBC/Radio-Canada to get more local journalists and to gradually enhance Radio-Canada's online programming.

I understand the over-the-air issue, but I would like to remind my colleague that this matter is under the jurisdiction of the CRTC, which functions at arm's length from the government.

On the telecommunications infrastructure file, we have invested \$500 million to improve Internet services in the regions throughout Quebec and across Canada.

* * *

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. François Choquette (Drummond, NDP): Mr. Speaker, egregious language errors continue to appear on the French versions of the government's websites, a problem that appears to be getting worse. This time it is the Parks Canada and Revenue Canada websites that are riddled with poor translations. Here is an example. Imagine wanting to go to a park this summer where the hours of operation are from “1^{er} juillet au 4 septième”, or “July 1 to Seven 4”.

It is unbelievable. The French language is not a language for Google Translate; it is an official language in its own right and must be respected. The Minister of Public Services and Procurement promised to fix this problem.

When will she take action?

Mr. Steven MacKinnon (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Services and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are committed to restoring the Translation Bureau's good name. We have made significant investments in the Translation Bureau. We just appointed a chief quality officer and we are creating important partnerships with universities, students, and others, in order to meet future HR needs. Obviously, language errors in the French or the English versions of government websites are unacceptable. We are committed to correcting them and that is what we will do.

Oral Questions

[English]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. James Maloney (Etobicoke—Lakeshore, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Portugal was one of the very first countries to ratify CETA last November. CETA was an important step in our bilateral relations, providing great opportunities for businesses and workers in both countries.

This morning, as part of the state visit, our Prime Minister and the Portuguese prime minister are attending the Economic Club of Canada summit, entitled “Canada-Portugal Economic Relations: Maximizing the Benefits of CETA”.

Could the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade tell us a bit more about the benefits of CETA for our two great countries?

Ms. Pam Goldsmith-Jones (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada and Portugal are long-standing friends and allies, and important commercial partners. CETA marks an important new chapter in our relationship.

With the increased market access from CETA, our exports to Portugal have already increased by over 40%. We are very grateful for the support and leadership Portugal has shown.

With CETA, Canadian companies, especially in sectors like oilseeds, aircraft, and cereals, are benefiting. This historic progressive trade agreement is creating opportunities for the middle class today.

* * *

DEMOCRATIC REFORM

Mr. John Brassard (Barrie—Innisfil, CPC): Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the issue of electoral reform, Canadians should not have an ounce of trust in the Liberals doing the right thing. Does anyone remember that 2015 was going to be the last election under first past the post? That lasted about a year or so until Canadians realized the Liberals were trying to rig the election system in their favour.

Why is it that every time the Liberal Party wants to change things for the better, it ends up being better for the Liberals?

● (1145)

Mr. Andy Fillmore (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Democratic Institutions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are committed to strengthening Canada's democratic institutions and increasing Canadians' trust and participation in our democratic processes.

Bill C-76 is a great example of that. The bill would increase the transparency of our electoral process. It would make elections more accessible to all Canadians. It would make the electoral process more secure and ensure political parties protected Canadians' privacy.

We believe that a whole-of-government approach is required to protect Canada's democratic institutions. We look forward to working with all members in the House to build a more open and transparent system for Canada.

Mr. John Brassard (Barrie—Innisfil, CPC): Mr. Speaker, last election, nearly one million incorrect voter information cards were

mailed out. The Liberals now want those to be used as proof of address.

Outside foreign influencers funnelled millions of dollars into Canada last election as an assault on our democracy. They have left the door open for the same thing to happen in 2019. Liberal operatives can organize to verbally vouch for individuals with no ID and allow their votes to count.

Why is the Prime Minister ripping democracy out of the hands of Canadians and giving it to foreigners and Liberal operatives?

Mr. Andy Fillmore (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Democratic Institutions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the main challenge for our electoral democracy is not voter fraud but voter participation. Eliminating the voter ID card does not improve the integrity of the system. It only takes away the ability of many qualified voters to vote.

In Bill C-76, we are not only restoring the use of voter identification cards and vouching, but we are also giving back the mandate for Elections Canada to promote participation. The Conservative Party's so-called Fair Elections Act was simply cover for a government determined to wring political gain from every measure.

We will take no lessons from the party opposite. We believe Canadians have a right to vote and we will continue to fight for that.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Harold Albrecht (Kitchener—Conestoga, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal carbon tax will raise fuel costs by over 10¢ per litre. For a farmer in Kitchener—Conestoga, that means an additional \$6,000 a year just for this carbon tax. Add to that the cost of getting his feed to his farm and getting his milk to market, these costs will be devastating.

Why is the Liberal government padding its books on the back of farmers in my riding of Kitchener—Conestoga?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to be very clear for Canadians that we have committed that all revenues will be returned to the province. In the province of Ontario there is a price on pollution, as there is in Alberta, B.C. and Quebec. Eighty per cent of Canadians live in a jurisdiction where there is a price on pollution and, guess what, those jurisdictions are the fastest-growing economies in the country, while reducing our emissions.

Is that not what we should all want? Should we not all want that we tackle climate change for our kids and that we should also grow our economy and create jobs? I wish the party opposite would understand we can do both.

*Oral Questions***PUBLIC SAFETY**

Mr. Glen Motz (Medicine Hat—Cardston—Warner, CPC): Mr. Speaker, communities in New Brunswick are currently experiencing record flooding, with water levels expected to continue to rise in southern regions of the province over the coming days. Families along the St. John River have been forced to leave their homes and dozens of roads have been closed, leaving others cut off and in need of assistance.

My question is for the Minister of Public Safety, and I do not want him to blow another gasket with this question. Will you please update the House, sir, on what the government measures will be to assist those affected by the New Brunswick flooding?

The Speaker: While I appreciate that the hon. member for Medicine Hat—Cardston—Warner was polite to say “sir”, he should not be saying “you” of course. Unless he is referring to the Speaker, we address the Chair.

The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries.

Mr. Terry Beech (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our thoughts are with the people affected by the flooding and with the first responders who are working hard to keep them safe.

Initial estimates of damages are in the \$24 million range. However, this could increase should the water hit forecasted levels in the upcoming days. I am happy to report to the House that since being asked, the Canadian Coast Guard has actually worked throughout the night to help people in this horrible situation.

Our government always stands ready to help the province or territory requesting federal assistance in response to natural disasters, including flooding. The Prime Minister has also offered to provide military to the province if it requests it.

* * *

PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

Ms. Sheri Benson (Saskatoon West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it has been one year since STC was shut down, and the people of Saskatchewan are still without access to safe, affordable, public transportation.

After saying it would work with me to address this issue in a meaningful way, the silence from the government is deafening. I hope the minister was sincere when he said he would work with me.

When will the minister break the silence and get to work and find solutions for the public transit crisis in Saskatchewan?

• (1150)

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we understand that having an efficient and functional transportation system is absolutely critical. We need to work together. We have to work together with the provinces and with the municipalities to make that happen. Those kinds of discussions are under way.

Ms. Georgina Jolibois (Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, perhaps the minister does not understand that there is no public transportation in northern Saskatchewan. This

means that many women, seniors, and residents, including first nations and Métis, cannot safely get to medical appointments or other critical services. Some cannot even get to a grocery store. This is unacceptable.

When will the minister start working with first nations, Métis, and rural communities to provide them with safe transit?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows of course that the decision to cancel the Saskatchewan Transportation Company and to eliminate that service across Saskatchewan was a decision taken by the provincial government.

The federal government has infrastructure programming available to support transit services and facilities. The Government of Canada does not actually operate the bus system, but the Government of Canada can invest in the physical assets that are required to support the bus system. There would need to be a proponent in Saskatchewan willing to bring forward that proposition.

* * *

HEALTH

Ms. Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my palliative care bill passed into law last year. As part of that law, the health minister is required to meet with the provinces to determine the services to be covered, appropriate training for the different levels of service provision, and to get input on a plan to get consistent access to palliative care for all Canadians.

Since the law passed, the term “palliative care” was removed from the 2018 budget. Why is the minister dragging her feet on this very important issue?

Hon. Ginette Petitpas Taylor (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we recognize that Canadians want to stay independent as long as possible and if they need services, they want to receive them within their home. In addition to the Canada health transfer payments, we have invested more than \$6 billion to provinces and territories to ensure that better home care and palliative care services are in place. We recently announced \$6 million to Pallium Canada to increase capacity to deliver palliative care to communities.

I look forward to working with provinces and territories as we move forward in the implementation of Bill C-277. We certainly want to make sure that the provisions of the bill are put in place.

* * *

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Mrs. Cathy McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after lengthy court battles, Charmaine Stick finally won the right to see the financial information for her band, Onion Lake Cree. The vast majority of bands publish this information freely. However, the government has enabled the rest to hide their books.

Oral Questions

As Charmaine said, “Now that we have the numbers, our leaders are going to have to start answering tough questions.” That is the way it should be, communities that are empowered. Why is the government continuing to be complicit in this cover-up?

Mr. Don Rusnak (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indigenous Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, everyone, including first nation governments, support transparency and accountability. We held 27 engagement sessions from coast to coast to coast, and heard clearly from first nations that top-down solutions do not work.

We are moving forward with the co-development of the mutual accountability framework, which was a recommendation for the new fiscal relationship report that was developed with the AFN. Mutual transparency and accountability will only be approved by working in true partnership with first nations.

* * *

[Translation]

REGIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Alupa Clarke (Beauport—Limoilou, CPC): Mr. Speaker, on April 6, the Ministers of Finance, International Trade, and Families, Children and Social Development enjoyed a tour of the Port of Québec. I am very pleased about that because since 2015, the Port of Québec has been working on Beauport 2020, a promising project for the economy of the Quebec City and Beauport—Limoilou region. However, the port authority has been waiting for three years for government support for this project and for the \$60 million allocated by the previous Conservative government.

I am therefore asking the ministers to simply tell me if you discussed the Beauport 2020 project with the Port of Québec and what those discussions entailed.

The Speaker: Order. I would remind the hon. member to address his comments to the Chair.

The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport.

[English]

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with respect to the hon. member's question, I do not have the specific answer on that particular project, but I know that the minister—

An hon. member: He's right there.

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon: If you would give me a minute, the minister has been in contact. There is a port authority review that is ongoing at the present time. I know that the minister is very involved in this discussion as we move forward.

● (1155)

The Speaker: The hon. member knows that I will give members 35 seconds and not give them a minute, but I do not think she was actually meaning to talk to me when she said “you”. I would ask her to direct her comments to the Chair.

The hon. member for New Brunswick Southwest.

PUBLIC SAFETY

Ms. Karen Ludwig (New Brunswick Southwest, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the flooding in New Brunswick is unprecedented. This week I have been very involved, as always, talking with my constituents, and with the Minister of Fisheries, EMO officials, mayors, and volunteers about this flooding.

Would the minister please inform the House how our government will help New Brunswickers and my riding of New Brunswick Southwest impacted by this unprecedented flooding?

Mr. Terry Beech (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our thoughts are with the people of New Brunswick. We offer all the support that we can during this challenging time. That is why yesterday, at the request of the Government of New Brunswick, the Canadian Coast Guard committed to assisting the flood relief effort across the province. In addition to boats and personnel, the Coast Guard will help residents safeguard their homes against potential damage.

The safety and security of New Brunswickers is a priority for our government, in fact, for all members of this House. We are committed to doing everything we can to support New Brunswickers during this difficult time.

* * *

[Translation]

CANADA REVENUE AGENCY

Mr. Bernard Généreux (Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, CPC): Mr. Speaker, during the election campaign, the Prime Minister stated that the budget would balance itself. Once elected into office, the Minister of National Revenue thought that by giving \$1 billion to her officials she would find \$25 billion. That has not happened. However, Nova Scotia sculptor Steve Higgins just received a \$14,000 tax bill because the CRA considers his work to be a hobby. Having gone after single mothers and people with disabilities, the Liberals are now trying to balance the books on the backs of honest workers, like Mr. Higgins.

Why?

[English]

Ms. Kamal Khera (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadian artists are among the most talented in the world, and we will work with our partners in the arts to support them in their work. As my colleague opposite knows very well, I cannot comment on specific cases.

The rules surrounding what is considered a hobby or a business are defined in the Income Tax Act, the test for which was defined by the Supreme Court in 2002. We are committed to working with artists and stakeholders from the arts community to ensure that they have the tools and information needed to understand their tax obligations.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mrs. Brenda Shanahan (Châteauguay—Lacolle, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we live in a world where women living in poverty face outrageous inequalities from their birth to their death. Women do not have anywhere near the same advantages as men when it comes to access to education, employment, property, and responsibilities.

Can the Minister of International Development and La Francophonie tell the House how a feminist international assistance policy makes a difference to women in developing countries?

Hon. Marie-Claude Bibeau (Minister of International Development and La Francophonie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Châteauguay—Lacolle for her support for women.

With our feminist international assistance policy, we focus on empowering women and girls to end poverty by supporting local women's organizations, funding education, in particular by reducing the barriers that prevent teen girls from going to school, giving them full access to sexual and reproductive health services, and supporting women entrepreneurs.

By involving women and girls, we can create a fairer, more inclusive, and more prosperous world.

* * *

[English]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. Dean Allison (Niagara West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadian companies are waiting on the Liberal government to do something on the TPP. They know that being one of the first in the agreement will give them a head start on selling their high-quality products to a market of 500 million consumers. The Prime Minister has given no timeline on the ratification.

Can the Liberals tell us when we will see legislation so that Canadian companies can start taking advantage of this great Conservative-negotiated agreement?

[Translation]

Ms. Pam Goldsmith-Jones (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the ratification of the CPTPP is a priority for our government. The minister was pleased to sign the agreement on March 8. Now that the agreement is signed, each member nation of the CPTPP will start its own ratification and implementation procedure. Agreements must go through the normal legislative process before being ratified. I look forward to working with my esteemed colleague on this legislation.

* * *

YOUTH

Mr. Sean Fraser (Central Nova, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, the Prime Minister, in his role as Minister of Youth, launched a national dialogue on developing Canada's very first youth policy.

● (1200)

[English]

Can the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister for Youth update the House on the progress of the youth policy and how other young people can get involved?

Mr. Peter Schiefke (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister (Youth), Lib.): As you know, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister firmly believes that youth are not just leaders of tomorrow but leaders of today, and that is why the “for youth, by youth” approach that we have taken to the creation of the first-ever youth policy for Canada is proof of just that. We have had an opportunity to speak with thousands of youth from all across the country about the issues that matter most to them, but we always want to reach out to more.

[Translation]

That is why I encourage all members of the House to invite and encourage the young people in their riding to visit the website youthaction.ca to share their comments and provide feedback.

* * *

CONSUMER PROTECTION

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette, GPQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the media, the Competition Bureau responded to our request to investigate gas prices. The Bureau talked about a conspiracy and asked the public to submit evidence. When officials ask the public for help then it is clear that a real investigation is needed.

Yesterday, the parliamentary secretary told us that he would monitor the situation, but we are asking the minister to do his job and call for an inquiry.

Mr. David Lametti (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for the question.

High gas prices are cause for concern for me and all Canadians. We are determined to ensure that the prices that consumers pay are set by a fair and competitive market.

When the Competition Bureau identifies behaviour that is inconsistent with the Competition Act, it does not hesitate to take the necessary measures to protect competition and consumers. The Competition Bureau, as an independent law enforcement agency, ensures that Canadian businesses and consumers prosper in a competitive market and—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Joliette.

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette, GPQ): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development is the only person who has the power to order the Competition Bureau to investigate, and that is what we are asking him to do.

Oil companies are certainly not the ones wondering if the price of gas will ruin their vacation plans. Compared to last year's numbers, Esso's profits jumped by 55%, Valero Energy's by 27%, and Suncor's by 22%. Meanwhile, Quebecers will once again get a nasty surprise at the pump just in time for Saint-Jean and the construction holidays.

Routine Proceedings

I am asking the government to stand up for people instead of oil companies for once. Is that too much to ask?

Mr. David Lametti (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government has no jurisdiction when it comes to regulating the retail price of gas. Only the provinces and territories have that authority.

The Competition Bureau takes action if there is evidence of anti-competitive behaviour. In a recent case, Bureau investigations led to 39 individuals and 15 companies being charged with participating in a gas price-fixing scheme in four local Quebec markets. To date, 33 individuals and 7 companies have pleaded guilty, been found guilty, and been fined.

* * *

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Ms. Monique Pauzé (Repentigny, GPQ): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister did not care one iota about Quebec's opinion on the legalization of cannabis. He did not care one iota when he imposed the implementation date and the rules for growing cannabis at home.

The same goes for health transfers, the Netflix deal, tax havens, and so forth. Open federalism merely means that Quebec must be open to the will of the Prime Minister.

Will the Prime Minister's response to Quebec's demands always be fuddle duddle?

Hon. Ginette Petitpas Taylor (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the health and safety of Canadians is a priority for our government. The cannabis being sold today is neither regulated nor tested, and is very dangerous. Bill C-45 creates a responsible, well-regulated, legal market.

We are taking the time to do things right, but delaying the bill would only benefit organized crime and our youth would still be at risk.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8) I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 19 petitions.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Ms. Filomena Tassi (Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Orders 104 and 114 I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 61st report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, regarding the membership of committees of the House. If the House

gives its consent, I intend to move concurrence in the 61st report later today.

• (1205)

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. James Maloney (Etobicoke—Lakeshore, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the ninth report of the Standing Committee on Natural Resources, entitled “Value-added products in Canada’s Forest Sector: Cultivating Innovation for a Competitive bioeconomy”.

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

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Ms. Filomena Tassi (Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the House gives its consent, I move that the 61st report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, presented to the House earlier today, be concurred in.

The Speaker: Does the hon. member have the unanimous consent of the House to propose the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

PETITIONS

CANADA SUMMER JOBS PROGRAM

Ms. Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from my riding with respect to the Canada summer jobs program.

The petitioners call on the Prime Minister to defend the freedoms of conscience, thought, and belief by withdrawing the attestation requirement for applicants to the Canada summer jobs program. They say that it is the duty of the Government of Canada to defend the rights of all Canadians, regardless of whether the current Liberal government agrees with their specific views.

[Translation]

GUARANTEED INCOME SUPPLEMENT

Ms. Karine Trudel (Jonquière, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to table a petition signed by the people of Jonquière regarding automatic registration for the guaranteed income supplement.

The federal government recently announced a new process to automatically enrol seniors for the guaranteed income supplement, but automatic enrolment will not apply to all eligible individuals when they turn 64. The guaranteed income supplement program is important because it provides low-income seniors who collect old age security with extra income, which enables them to remain in their homes, receive additional care, and access more of the services they need. That is why this petition regarding registration for the guaranteed income supplement is so important.

Routine Proceedings

THE ENVIRONMENT

The Speaker: I would remind hon. members not to comment on the importance of their petition or whether they support it. They may simply present their petitions.

[*English*]

PUBLIC SAFETY

Hon. David McGuinty (Ottawa South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 I rise today to table a petition regarding the former Bill C-51. Although the petitioners are from southern Ontario and not from my immediate riding of Ottawa South, I am tabling this petition on their behalf.

CANADA SUMMER JOBS PROGRAM

Mr. Mel Arnold (North Okanagan—Shuswap, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition today that I received from people in North Okanagan—Shuswap and across B.C.

The petitioners call on Parliament to remove the condition of employers to attest to respecting the reproductive rights of abortion within the Canada summer jobs program.

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am rising to table a petition on behalf of constituents from coastal British Columbia, calling on the government to develop a national strategy to combat plastics entering our waterways.

The petitioners call on the government to put forward a strategy to regulate single-use plastics, stormwater outfalls, and microplastic pollution; to clean up derelict and ghost fishing gear; to extend producer responsibility; to fund education, outreach and beach cleanups; and to address the root problem by redesigning the plastic economy.

[*Translation*]

GATINEAU PARK

Mr. William Amos (Pontiac, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to present a petition to the House of Commons on behalf of some of my constituents who care about protecting Gatineau Park. It is one of the most visited parks in Canada, and is home to about 90 endangered plant and 50 endangered animal species. The boundaries of Gatineau Park are not set out in any federal legislation, so the petitioners are calling on the House of Commons to pass legislation to provide Gatineau Park with the necessary legal protection to ensure its preservation for future generations.

[*English*]

It is an honour to submit this petition on their behalf.

● (1210)

CANADA SUMMER JOBS PROGRAM

Mr. Dean Allison (Niagara West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have two different sets of petitions here, all from my riding. They say that the undersigned citizens and residents of Canada draw the attention of the right hon. Prime Minister to the following: section 2 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms identifies, among other things, freedom of conscience, freedom of thought, and freedom of belief as fundamental freedoms. The petition goes on to ask the government to look at the Canada summer jobs program as it relates to freedoms of conscience, thought, and belief.

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Mr. Speaker, because of the risk to sport fishing and to tourism and the risk of an oil spill on sensitive shoreline, particularly on Sandwell Provincial Park and Whalebone Beach, which is in Snuneymuxw, I commend to this House yet more petitions opposed to the establishment of five new bulk anchorages off Gabriola Island, which is also my home.

Petitioners from Calgary, Surrey, Red Deer, Gabriola Island, the province of Quebec, and across the country are urging the transport minister to cancel the bulk anchorages establishment at a time of unprecedented new anchorage traffic from these huge ships in the Salish Sea. We do not want to add to more of the risk and more of the load.

CANADA SUMMER JOBS PROGRAM

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to table a petition signed by constituents in Battlefords—Lloydminster who feel that their Canadian charter rights have been breached. The petitioners are calling upon the Prime Minister to withdraw the discriminatory attestation requirement from the Canada summer jobs program. They want the Prime Minister to defend and respect their fundamental freedoms of conscience, thought, and belief.

[*Translation*]

BOOKS

Mr. François Choquette (Drummond, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today I have the honour to table an electronic petition signed by a total of 1,447 people. The petitioners state that books are essential to the vitality of a free and democratic society. As a result, these citizens and residents of Canada are calling upon the Government of Canada to exempt books from the goods and services tax; to reestablish the postal preferential rate applicable to books; and to establish a personal tax credit applicable to books bought from accredited booksellers.

[*English*]

CANADA SUMMER JOBS PROGRAM

Mr. Harold Albrecht (Kitchener—Conestoga, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition signed by many residents of Kitchener—Conestoga and the surrounding regions in the Waterloo region. They point out that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms identifies freedom of conscience, freedom of thought, and freedom of belief as fundamental freedoms. They are calling on the House of Commons to defend the freedoms of conscience, thought, and belief and withdraw the attestation requirement for applicants to the Canada summer jobs program.

Routine Proceedings

THE ENVIRONMENT

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise this afternoon to present a petition from residents throughout Saanich—Gulf Islands calling on the government to protect the coast of British Columbia, and not just the north coast. The petitioners call on the House of Commons to establish a permanent ban on crude oil tankers on the west coast of Canada to protect British Columbia's fisheries, tourism, coastal communities, and natural ecosystems along the entire coast.

CANADA SUMMER JOBS PROGRAM

Mrs. Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have three separate petitions to present today on behalf of the wonderful constituents of Yorkton—Melville.

In the first petition, the petitioners want to draw to the House's attention that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms identifies, among other things, freedom of conscience, freedom of thought, and freedom of belief as fundamental freedoms. Therefore, they are calling upon this Prime Minister to defend the freedoms of conscience, thought, and belief and withdraw the attestation requirement for applications to the Canada summer jobs program.

●(1215)

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mrs. Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Second, Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from members of my riding as well as across Saskatchewan and Manitoba in regard to Bill C-71. The petitioners feel that the bill would do nothing to tackle firearms violence, but rather would add further red tape to law-abiding gun owners and bring back the useless and ineffective long-gun registry. It would not provide the resources to front-line police forces to tackle the true source of firearms violence: gangs and organized criminals. The undersigned residents of Canada call upon the House of Commons to scrap Bill C-71, An Act to amend certain Acts and Regulations in relation to firearms, and to instead devote greater resources to policing in Canada.

SEX SELECTION

Mrs. Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Finally, Mr. Speaker, these petitioners indicate that a CBC documentary revealed that ultrasounds are being used in Canada to tell the sex of an unborn child so that expectant parents can choose to terminate the pregnancy if the unborn child is a girl. An Environics poll found that 92% of Canadians believe sex-selected pregnancy termination should be illegal, and the Society of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists of Canada and the Canadian Association of Radiologists strongly oppose the non-medical use of fetal ultrasounds. Over 200 million girls are missing worldwide because of this practice, and the three deadliest words in the world are "it's a girl".

Therefore, the undersigned call upon the Canadian Parliament to condemn the discrimination against girls occurring through sex-selected pregnancy termination.

* * *

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):

Mr. Speaker, if a supplementary response to Question No. 1564, originally tabled on May 3, 2018, and the government's responses to Questions Nos. 1568 to 1583 could be made orders for return, these returns would be tabled immediately.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Text]

Question No. 1564—**Mr. Daniel Blaikie:**

With regard to federal expenditures over the last two years: (a) what is the total disbursement of net expenditures, broken down by (i) provinces and territories, (ii) provinces and territories, per capita, (iii) provinces and territories, by organization and program; (b) what is the total disbursement of transfers to persons, broken down by (i) provinces and territories, (ii) provinces and territories, per capita; (c) what is the total disbursement of transfers to provincial governments, broken down by (i) provinces and territories, (ii) provinces and territories, per capita; (d) what is the total disbursement of business subsidies, broken down by (i) provinces and territories, (ii) provinces and territories, per capita; and (e) what is the total disbursement of infrastructure spending, broken down by (i) provinces and territories, (ii) provinces and territories, per capita?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1568—**Mr. Martin Shields (Bow River):**

With regard to any contracts over \$10,000 entered into by the government since January 1, 2016, but which were not disclosed on proactive disclosure: what are the details of all such contracts including (i) date, (ii) vendor, (iii) amount, (iv) description of goods or services provided, (v) file number, (vi) reason why contract was not listed on the relevant proactive disclosure website?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1569—**Mr. Martin Shields:**

With regard to gifts with a fair market value over \$500 accepted by the Prime Minister or his wife since January 1, 2016, including, but not limited to any gifts of clothing or accommodations: (a) what are the details of each such gift including (i) recipient, (ii) provider of gift, (iii) estimated value, (iv) description of gift, (v) date, and duration, if applicable, of gift; (b) was the gift handed over to the Crown, (c) was any action taken to either return the gift or reimburse the fair market value; and (d) if the answer to (c) is affirmative, what specific action was taken and when was it taken?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1570—**Mr. Colin Carrie:**

With regard to the national vehicle registration system being set up by Natural Resources Canada: (a) what is the total projected cost to set up the system; (b) what is the breakdown of all projected costs by type; and (c) what is the projected carbon footprint resulting from setting up the system?

(Return tabled)

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 1571— Mr. Larry Miller:**

With regard to the media briefing provided by the Prime Minister's National Security Advisor in February 2018, where the theory that elements within the Indian government had conspired to embarrass the Prime Minister was advanced: (a) was any classified or national security information revealed at the briefing; (b) if the answer to (a) is negative, what are the details of the information revealed at the briefing; (c) if the answer to (a) is affirmative, has the matter of a potential breach of the Security of Information Act been referred to the RCMP; (d) did the Prime Minister or anyone in the Prime Minister's Office advise or instruct the National Security Advisor to reveal classified or national security information at the briefing, and if so, who; (e) has any member of the Prime Minister's Office been reprimanded for facilitating the release of confidential or national security information; (f) is it the policy of the government that civil servants are permitted to release classified or national security information if they are advised to do so by the Prime Minister or his office; (g) did the Prime Minister authorize a civil servant to release classified or national security information in order to protect his own image; and (h) is the rationale for not referring the matter to the RCMP is that the information revealed in the briefing was fictitious?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1572— Mr. Phil McColeman:

With regard to projected expenditures related to the Canada Child Benefit: for each of the next five years, what is the total projected amount which will be distributed to families under the Canada Child Benefit program?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1573— Mr. Dave MacKenzie:

With regard to the March 6, 2018, event with the Prime Minister and Bill Nye at the University of Ottawa: (a) what is the total amount of all expenditures related to the event including (i) venue rental, (ii) staging, (iii) promotion, (iv) and other costs; (b) what are the details of all such costs referred to in (a) including (i) vendor, (ii) amount, (iii) description of goods or services provided; and (c) what are the details of all costs incurred by the government related to Mr. Nye's appearance at the event including (i) airfare or other travel to the event, (ii) accommodation, (iii) speaking fees, either paid directly to Mr. Nye or through a third party, (iv) other expenses including a description and breakdown of each?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1574— Mr. Dave MacKenzie:

With regard to the names provided by Members of Parliament to be included on the guest list for various receptions during the Prime Minister's trip to India in February 2018: (a) which Members of Parliament submitted names; (b) what names were submitted, broken down by Member who submitted them; and (c) for each name submitted, was it submitted to the (i) Prime Minister's Office; (ii) Global Affairs Canada, including the High Commission in India, (iii) another government department, agency or entity, specifying which one?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1575— Mr. Tom Kmiec:

With regard to any savings found as part of the expenditure review laid out in the 2017 Budget: (a) what is the total amount of savings found, broken down by department or agency; and (b) what are the details of savings found including (i) program from which savings was found, (ii) manner in which savings were achieved (e.g. selling of inventory, service contract renegotiation, etc), (iii) amount of savings derived from (ii)?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1576— Mr. David Yurdiga:

With regard to application processing and wait times at the Department of Citizenship and Immigration, from the date an application is received by the Department to the date it is processed, as of the most recently available statistics: (a) what is the average wait time for an individual who applies for a work permit in Canada; (b) what is the average wait time for an individual who applies for a visitor visa in Canada; (c) what is the average wait time for an individual who applies for a

student visa in Canada; and (d) what is the average processing time for an application made under the spousal sponsorship program?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1577— Mr. David Yurdiga:

With regard to the revocation of citizenship by the government, since December, 2016, and broken down by month: (a) how many individuals have had their citizenship revoked and in each instance what was the (i) origin of citizenship of the individual, (ii) age of the individual, (iii) sex of the individual, (iv) specific reason for their citizenship revocation; and (b) for each of the reasons listed in (a)(iii), was is the total number given, broken down by reason?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1578— Mr. Matthew Dubé:

With regard to addressing irregular border crossings by asylum seekers: (a) what is the protocol that RCMP officers are to follow when individuals irregularly cross the border; (b) how are RCMP officers prepared to be qualified to work at the border, particularly at Roxham Road, broken down by (i) type of training, (ii) training provider, (iii) training content, (iv) date of last training given, (v) cost; (c) since 2016, how many individuals have been sent to the entry points of the border between Quebec and the United States, broken down by (i) agency and department, (ii) quarter, (iii) administrative region; and (d) for 2018, how many individuals are being sent or will be sent to the entry points of the border between Quebec and the United States, broken down by (i) agency and department, (ii) quarter, (iii) administrative region?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1579— Mr. Ziad Aboultaif:

With regard to state and official visits to Canada by heads of state and heads of government, since November 4, 2015: (a) who has made a state or official visit to Canada; (b) for each visit, what are the dates, locations and nature (i.e., state or official) of the visit; (c) for each visit, did the Prime Minister meet with the visitor(s); (d) if the answer to (c) is negative, for a particular visit, what was the Prime Minister's itinerary for the dates of the visit; and (e) for each visit, what other ministers met with the visitor(s)?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1580— Mr. Ziad Aboultaif:

With regard to at-risk and bonus payments to employees of the federal public service, broken down by year for fiscal years 2015-16 and 2016-17 and by department or agency: (a) how many federal public servants received at-risk payments; (b) how many federal public servants received bonus payments; (c) what amount was allocated in each department's budget for at-risk payments; (d) what amount was allocated in each department's budget for bonus payments; (e) what was the cumulative amount of at-risk payments paid out in each department; (f) what was the cumulative amount of bonus payments paid out in each department; (g) how many public servants were eligible for at-risk pay but did not receive it; (h) what were the reasons given for each public servant who received an at-risk payment; (i) what were the reasons given for each public servant who received a bonus payment; and (j) what were the reasons given for each public servant who was eligible for an at-risk payment but did not receive it?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1581— Mr. Ted Falk:

With regard to expense claims for the Minister of Natural Resources, since November 4, 2015: (a) what are the details of expenditure, including (i) total office expenditure, (ii) total travel expenditure, (iii) total staff expenditure, broken down by individual staff members, (iv) total other expenditure; and (b) what is the itemized breakdown of each expense referenced in (a), including (i) airfare, (ii) other transportation, (iii) accommodation, (iv) per diems, (v) other; and (c) what is the total monthly breakdown of expenditure for the Minister of Natural Resources?

(Return tabled)

Government Orders

Question No. 1582— **Mr. Ted Falk:**

With regard to all infrastructure funding from the government to projects in the province of Manitoba since November 4, 2015: (a) how much money has the federal government committed; (b) of the figure identified in (a), how much has been delivered; (c) what is the list of projects for which money has been committed, detailed by (i) name, (ii) riding in which the project is located, (iii) amount committed, (iv) amount disbursed to date, (v) project description; (d) for each of the projects identified in (c) where funding has been committed but not delivered, why has the funding not been delivered; (e) for each of the projects identified in (d), when is funding expected to be disbursed; (f) what infrastructure funding has been cancelled, broken down by riding; (g) what was the rationale provided for the cancellation of each item identified in (f)?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1583— **Mr. Rhéal Éloi Fortin:**

With regard to management positions within the government: (a) what is the representation of francophones in senior positions (EX 01, EX 02, EX 03, EX 04 and EX 05), broken down by job classification in departments, government and special operating agencies and Crown corporations; and (b) what is the representation of bilingual individuals in senior positions, broken down by mother tongue and province of work?

(Return tabled)

[English]

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

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

OIL TANKER MORATORIUM ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-48, An Act respecting the regulation of vessels that transport crude oil or persistent oil to or from ports or marine installations located along British Columbia's north coast, be read the third time and passed.

The Speaker: We will now go on to five minutes of questions and comments following the speech by the member for Courtenay—Alberni.

Questions and comments, the hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, to reinforce the importance of the commitment made by the Prime Minister in the lead-up to the election in terms of having a moratorium put in place, this proposed legislation would fulfill that particular commitment. However, the government as a whole, in dealing with our natural resources and working with the many different stakeholders, from indigenous peoples to provincial entities, has recognized how important it is that we move forward in terms of both economic development and ensuring the interests of our environment.

Would the member not acknowledge that we can, in fact, do both at the same time and that it is indeed in the national interest?

Mr. Gord Johns: Madam Speaker, yes, we absolutely can. In fact, we are doing that right now where I live in coastal British Columbia. We have 100,000 jobs in tourism that rely on clean oceans and a healthy environment.

As New Democrats, we would like to see a transition from fossil fuels to renewable energy. We wish that the government would have pursued those same ambitious goals the Liberals talked about in 2015 in their campaign. However, when we look at the bill before us, the Prime Minister made a commitment: crude oil supertankers just have no place on B.C.'s north coast. I could not agree more, but the Prime Minister seems to believe that they belong on B.C.'s south coast.

There is no wall between the north coast and the south coast. The water does not go through a filter or anything like that. Our tides move. Our currents move. The wind moves water. Water moves. Our fish move. They migrate from the north to the south. Our whales migrate from the north to the south. There is no wall between the north and south coasts.

We need to protect our coasts. Therefore, I wish that this proposed legislation expanded beyond the north coast and included the south coast and was bold in protecting coastal waters.

There was an oil spill off the coast of Washington State, and that oil spill ended up on the west coast of Vancouver Island. That is how far it travelled, and this was a small oil spill. When we talk about the environment and the economy, yes, we can do both, but we do not need supertankers moving crude oil to protect the environment and grow the economy.

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Madam Speaker, my colleague really is a strong defender, not only of his riding but of what we on the coast of British Columbia feel.

It is odd being in the House, because we have the Conservatives and the Liberals both trying to out-pipeline each other, and here we are standing in the face of stark evidence of what climate change is currently doing to our planet and what it is about to do.

We acknowledge that there are economic opportunities in moving toward a just transition. My colleague talked about that. I would like him to highlight, when we are talking about the national interest, what our coastal economy is really based on and what the potential is for the future when we take that forward-looking view, bringing in first nations, bringing in economic tourism and sportfishing, and wrapping that up all together for a clear vision of what we want to see on the coast going on through this century?

● (1220)

Mr. Gord Johns: Madam Speaker, I belonged to a chamber of commerce that went from 160 members to 330 members. In fact, I was the executive director of that chamber of commerce for five years. I watched the economy grow, and the economy grew with really great foundational principles of a community that had core values based on the protection of the environment while growing the economy and working for reconciliation.

Government Orders

These jobs rely on a clean environment. When we think about our oceans and the national interest, it is in the national interest that we have a clean, healthy ocean, whether we live in Regina or Newfoundland.

We have had people move to our community from every province in this country, work in our community, and enjoy the beautiful environment we have. Almost all of those people would say, after leaving a place like Tofino, that we should not be increasing tanker traffic on the coast of British Columbia.

That is in our national interest: protecting our economy and growing a sustainable, healthy economy, a marine-based economy that relies on clean sensitive ecosystems.

Mr. John Aldag (Cloverdale—Langley City, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity today to join in the discussion about Bill C-48 and the important role it would play in the protection of the province I represent, British Columbia.

Bill C-48, an act that would establish an oil tanker moratorium on British Columbia's north coast, is a significant step we are taking to enhance environmental protections for our coastlines. Preventing accidents from occurring in the first place is our primary goal. This measure, which complements the \$1.5-billion oceans protection plan, takes a precautionary approach to help safeguard the extremely ecologically sensitive marine environment in this region.

The B.C. oil tanker moratorium would build on the existing voluntary tanker exclusion zone, which has been in effect since 1985. To protect our shoreline, the voluntary tanker exclusion zone ensures that loaded tankers carrying oil from Valdez, Alaska to U.S. west coast ports transit west of the tanker exclusion zone boundary.

By formalizing an oil tanker moratorium, this legislation would prohibit tankers carrying large shipments of crude or persistent oils from stopping, loading, and unloading at ports and marine installations in northern British Columbia. The moratorium area would extend from the Canada-U.S. border in the north down to the point on British Columbia's mainland adjacent to the northern tip of Vancouver Island, and it would also include the beautiful islands of Haida Gwaii.

The legislation would also include strong penalty provisions for contravention that could reach up to \$5 million. This would help keep our waters and coasts safe and clean for use today, while protecting them for future generations. Through this legislation, we would put in place unprecedented levels of environmental protections for the marine environment in northern British Columbia. The precautionary approach taken in Bill C-48 would target both crude oil and persistent oil products that are likely to remain in the environment the longest if spilled.

Under the act, the Governor in Council would have authority to amend the schedule of prohibited persistent oil products. Amendments to the schedule would be done via regulation and could be considered following a review that would assess new science and evidence around the fate and behaviour of the petroleum product when spilled, advances in cleanup technology, and institutional arrangements for responding to vessel-source oil spills. Indeed, environmental safety and science would be the main considerations for adding products to the schedule or removing products from it.

During consultations and witness statements, we heard about the importance of environmental protections in this region. Coastal communities and industries rely on healthy ecosystems to protect their way of life and livelihoods, for example through fish populations that could become threatened should a serious spill occur in this region.

The moratorium would protect the livelihoods of communities on British Columbia's north coast by providing a heightened level of environmental protection while continuing to allow for community and industry resupply by small tanker.

Bill C-48 demonstrates that we do not support large shipments of crude oil or persistent oil products in this region. The British Columbia oil tanker moratorium would take a preventative approach to oil spills in the region so that Canada's coastal habitats, ecosystems, and marine species, including marine mammals, are able to thrive.

In addition to establishing the moratorium, we are also taking steps through the oceans protection plan to improve our incident prevention and response regime, and address environmental concerns in the event of a marine incident.

The role and authority of the Canadian Coast Guard are being strengthened to ensure rapid and efficient responses in case of a marine incident. The Canadian Coast Guard will offer training to indigenous communities for search and rescue, environmental response, and incident command to allow for a greater role in marine safety for these communities.

We are implementing the incident command system and enhancing emergency coordination centres across the government in order to bolster our response capabilities. These measures would improve the coordination of response actions of departments and agencies when dealing with an incident by using a common response system.

During the response to larger pollution incidents, our government quickly brings together relevant subject matter experts in the field of environmental protection who supply consolidated scientific and technical advice on environmental concerns, priorities, and spill countermeasure strategies. This ultimately enables an effective and timely response to pollution incidents.

Government Orders

● (1225)

Clearly, the oil tanker moratorium is just one of many initiatives in our comprehensive plan to protect the marine environment. The oceans protection plan, which is the largest investment ever made in our oceans and waterways, and the oil tanker moratorium act are two concrete actions we are taking to ensure a clean and vibrant marine environment. These measures reinforce our determination to advance science and utilize valuable traditional knowledge to keep our waters and wildlife clean, safe, and healthy for generations to come. This is why we hope we can expect the support of the members present for the passage of this bill, which moves this critical agenda an important step forward in protecting our pristine environment.

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Beauport—Limoilou.

I stand in the House today to speak to Bill C-48, the oil tanker moratorium act, a bill that is yet another disappointment for all Canadians who want to see our country prosper.

The Liberals may want Canadians to believe that this moratorium is in their interest, but that is just not the case. This legislation is not justified by an environmental or economic study, nor is it supported by proper consultation with the impacted communities, industries, and experts. Rather, the legislation before us today is the fulfillment of political will, and its economic impact goes far beyond the prescribed geographic area in the legislation.

In considering Bill C-48, we must look at the full picture. The proposed moratorium is yet another hit to Canada's oil and gas sector, a sector that has already lost \$80 billion in investment under the Prime Minister's watch. That is the biggest decline in Canadian energy investment in 70 years. Just last week, Canadians found out that the Prime Minister's government gave taxpayer money to an environmental lobby group to hire an activist to protest against the Trans Mountain pipeline project, a pipeline project that is supported by its environmental assessment and that the government told Canadians it supports. Canadians deserve a government that is up front with them, a government that does not undermine their prosperity.

Championing Canada's energy sector should be common sense. The responsible development of our natural resources is essential to our country's prosperity. It is our second-biggest export and provides tremendous economic opportunity. In fact, it employs hundreds of thousands of Canadians. It creates billions of dollars of tax revenue, tax revenue that benefits Canadians and communities across this country from coast to coast to coast, and we cannot dismiss the fact that oil produced and transported in Canada operates within strict environmental standards while also upholding human rights and workplace standards.

The message that the government's action is sending is that it would rather import oil from countries like Saudi Arabia than create infrastructure to move Canadian oil across this country, and by obstructing Canada's access to the global market, it is opening the door for countries like Saudi Arabia, Russia, and Venezuela, countries that do not have the same environmental standards and human rights that Canada does.

The demand for oil is not ceasing but growing, and I believe the world needs more Canadian oil. The fact is that Canada is capable of providing more energy and greater energy security to Canada and the world, but to harness that opportunity, we need new infrastructure. We need pipelines and access to reach new markets, and to get that done, we need federal leadership, not tomorrow but today.

Unfortunately, that is not what we have before us. What we have is another step forward in the Prime Minister's plan to phase out the oil sands. The United States is Canada's largest energy trading partner, which is an important relationship, but landlocking Canadian oil does not put our country on a path for long-term energy success. That is why the diversification of Canada's energy partners is also important. By not relying on a single market, we will reduce our economic risk and better protect the long-term health of our country's economy.

The Asia-Pacific region is a large and valuable market opportunity. It is a market that can only be accessed through marine transport. The tanker moratorium proposed on the north coast of British Columbia hinders that access. The Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers has said, "The moratorium would cut off the most economic path to Asia and sends yet another signal to the investment community that Canada is not open for business."

The Liberals are turning away business, and for what benefit? The moratorium bans oil tankers carrying more than 12,500 metric tons of oil from loading, unloading, or anchoring in the north coast of British Columbia. It does not ban tanker traffic. It does not take any substantial action to protect the environment. It penalizes an industry and prohibits communities in northern British Columbia from accessing economic opportunity.

● (1230)

Let us contrast that with real action to protect our coastlines. Our former Conservative government took strong action to ensure that Canada's tanker safety system is robust and modern. It introduced changes that included modernizing Canada's navigation system, improving inspections for all tankers, enhancing area response planning, increasing penalties for polluters, and building marine safety capacity in indigenous communities. That is tangible action to protect our environment, action that improves environmental protection in our waters and our coastlines, all while keeping Canada on the right path to harness our economic opportunities.

The legislation in front of us does not build on that meaningful action. As I have said, it builds on the Prime Minister's record of building roadblocks to stop the success of our energy sector. It is not in the interests of Canadians.

The Prime Minister already vetoed the northern gateway pipeline that would have brought economic opportunity to the impacted region. Now, if this ban is enforced, the north coast of British Columbia will be closed for energy business. Again, let us remember that is closed for business without any meaningful consultation, a concern that is rightfully echoed by industry leaders and impacted communities.

In fact, this tanker moratorium is even being pushed through without properly consulting coastal first nations. There is considerable support among British Columbia's coastal first nations who want to pursue energy development opportunities that are environmentally sound. I find it quite hypocritical of the Liberal government to move ahead without that meaningful consultation, particularly given that it has committed to implementing the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, including free, prior, and informed consent.

It is no surprise that the Liberals' actions are already being challenged. The Lax Kw'alaams are among 30 first nations that are challenging the tanker ban in court. This ban prevents them from opportunities for future energy development on their land. It hinders their people from the economic benefits that it could yield.

The Lax Kw'alaams band has said that they were disheartened that this bill that is directed at their territories was introduced "without prior informed consent or even adequate consultation and input" from their people.

Eagle Spirit Energy Holding Ltd. was working toward a pipeline project that would have yielded tremendous economic opportunity and helped Canadian oil reach the Asia-Pacific market. However, with this ban, its project is essentially rendered useless. In response to the government's legislation it has said:

[T]here has been no consultation with those communities harmfully impacted in the interior of British Columbia or those in Alberta—a situation which certainly falls short of the deep consultation the Crown requires of corporations proposing major resource development projects on the traditional lands of Indigenous Peoples.

I cannot support this legislation. It cannot be overstated that this legislation takes no meaningful action to improve environmental protection in the north coast of British Columbia. It is not justified by science or safety. I cannot support the Liberal government's continued mismanagement of the energy sector. Many of my constituents work in the energy sector and their livelihoods depend on it. Canada needs to diversify its energy-trading partners, not introduce regulations and measures that will landlock it.

The Prime Minister needs to show leadership. The Liberals need to start supporting energy projects that are determined to be safe for the environment and in the interests of Canadians. They need to stand up for our energy sector and they need to stand up for Canadians.

● (1235)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Nantel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for her speech. It is tremendously useful to debate these issues and get away from the overly dogmatic idea of being totally for or totally against oil. It is important to consider the realities of each side.

Government Orders

In my colleague's opinion, what kind of debate could we have in order to obtain information on oil production from the oil sands side?

[*English*]

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk: Mr. Speaker, it is very important that we look at the bigger picture. Canada's economy relies heavily on the oil industry as a whole.

Coming from an area in Canada that has many different types of development of oil and gas, it is important to have those proper consultations with everybody, landowners, industries, first nations, to see how we can all benefit economically from these projects.

Canada has one of the highest, if not the highest, environmental standards for extracting oil, transporting oil, and also workplace standards for Canadians residents who work in oil and gas.

Mr. Ziad Aboultaif (Edmonton Manning, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member and I both come from prairie provinces, Alberta and Saskatchewan, where the oil sector provides the main income and revenue, as well as provides for the rest of the country.

The word on the street is that the bill will really work against the oil and gas industry and will be step toward stopping and/or fighting the development of this sector.

Would the member share that same vision I have heard from people on the street?

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk: Mr. Speaker, I live right in Lloydminster, Saskatchewan and Alberta. We are a very interesting city, because we are the only bi-provincial city in all of Canada. We rely on both provinces quite a lot.

During the past couple of years, my city has lost 8,000 to 10,000 residents because they have gone back home, typically to the east coast. They had come out to Lloydminster to work.

I completely agree with my colleague that this is nothing more than to keep our natural resources in the ground, which is shameful, especially when our country has some of the highest environmental standards and regulations to begin with, as well as with the transportation of our natural resources.

● (1240)

Mr. Alupa Clarke (Beauport—Limoilou, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my colleague on her maiden speech after her recent election in her beautiful riding. I know my colleague and all Conservative colleagues here, and probably all party MPs, go to their ridings each weekend. We work hard. We have activities in the communities, such as spaghetti dinners, etc.

The member will be able to share with us everything she hears from her constituents about the need to ensure Canadian oil can be exported outside the country. It is a major issue.

How can we still, today in 2018, be importing petroleum from dictatorship countries when we have all these resources here? Could my colleague share with us some of the comments she has heard from her constituents?

Government Orders

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk: Mr. Speaker, the constituents of Battlefords—Lloydminster are very disappointed that the public safety minister, who is from Saskatchewan, is not standing up for them and for the people of Saskatchewan. They do not believe the government when it says that it is for the extraction of our natural resources and our oil. I know many people will ensure they get out and vote in the next election. They will do everything in their power to ensure they do not have another Liberal government.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alupa Clarke (Beauport—Limoilou, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is always an honour to speak in the House of Commons.

On a more serious note, I would like to take a moment to talk about my colleague from Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes, who passed away very suddenly this week. I never imagined this could happen. I share his family's sorrow, though of course mine could never equal theirs. His young children will not get to share amazing moments in their lives with their father, and that is staggeringly sad. I would therefore like to publicly state that I encourage them to hang in there. One day, they will surely find joy in living again, and we are here for them.

As usual, I want to say acknowledge all of the residents of Beauport—Limoilou who are tuning in. I would like to let them know that there will be a press conference Monday morning at my office. I will be announcing a very important initiative for our riding. I urge them to watch the news or read the paper when the time comes.

Bill C-48 would essentially enact a moratorium on the entire Pacific coast. It would apply from Prince Rupert, a fascinating city that I visited in 2004 at the age of 18, to Port Hardy, at the northern tip of Vancouver Island. This moratorium is designed to prevent oil tankers, including Canadian ones, that transport more than 12,500 tons of oil from accessing Canada's inland waters, and therefore our ports.

This moratorium will prohibit the construction of any pipeline project or maritime port beyond Port Hardy, on the northern tip of Vancouver Island, to export our products to the west. In the past three weeks, the Liberal government has slowly but surely been trying to put an end to Canada's natural resources, and oil in particular. Northern Gateway is just one example.

The first thing the Liberals did when they came to power was to amend the environmental assessment process managed by the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency; they even brag about it. Northern Gateway was in the process of being accepted, but as a result of these amendments, the project was cancelled, even though the amendments were based on the cabinet's political agenda and not on scientific facts, as the Liberal government claims.

When I look at Bill C-48, which would enact a moratorium on oil tankers in western Canada, it seems clear to me that the Liberals had surely been planning to block the Northern Gateway project for a while. Their argument that the project did not clear the environmental assessment is invalid, since they are now imposing a moratorium that would have prevented this project from moving forward regardless.

The Prime Minister and member for Papineau has said Canada needs to phase out the oil sands. Not only did he say that during the campaign, but he said it again in Paris, before the French National Assembly, in front of about 300 members of the Macron government, who were all happy to hear it. I can guarantee my colleagues that Canadians were not happy to hear that, especially people living in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta who benefit economically from this natural resource. Through their hard work, all Canadians benefit from the incredible revenues and spinoffs generated by that industry.

My colleague from Prince Albert gave an exceptional speech this morning. He compassionately explained how hard it has been for families in Saskatchewan to accept and understand the decisions being made one after the other by this Liberal government. The government seems to be sending a message that is crystal clear: it does not support western Canada's natural resources, namely oil and natural gas. What is important to understand, however, is that this sector represents roughly 60% the economy of the western provinces and 40% of Canada's entire economy.

● (1245)

I can see why the Minister of Environment and Climate Change says we need to tackle climate change first. The way she talks to us every day is so arrogant. We believe in climate change. That is not the issue. Climate change and natural resources are complex issues, and we must not forget the backdrop to this whole debate. People are suffering because they need to put food on the table. Nothing has changed since the days of Cro-Magnon man. People have to eat every day. People have to find ways to survive.

When the Liberals go on about how to save the planet and the polar bears, that is their post-modern, post-materialist ideology talking. Conservatives, in contrast, talk about how to help families get through the day. That is what the Canadian government's true priority should be.

Is it not completely absurd that even now, in 2018, most of the gas people buy in the Atlantic provinces, Quebec, and Ontario comes from Venezuela and Saudi Arabia even though we have one of the largest oil reserves in the world? Canada has the third-largest oil reserve in the world, in fact. That is not even counting the Arctic Ocean, of which we own a sizeable chunk and which has not yet been explored. Canada has tremendous potential in this sector.

As I have often told many of my Marxist-Leninist, leftist, and other colleagues, the price of oil is going to continue to rise dramatically until 2065 because of China's and India's fuel consumption. Should Canada say no to \$1 trillion in economic spinoffs until then? Absolutely not.

How will we afford to pay for our hospitals, our schools, and our social services that are so dear to the left-wing advocates of the welfare state in Canada? As I said, the priority is to meet the needs of Canadians and Canada, a middle power that I adore.

Government Orders

To get back to the point I was making, as my colleague from Prince Albert said, the decision regarding Bill C-48 and the moratorium was made by cabinet, without any consultation or any study by a parliamentary committee. Day after day, the Liberals brag about being the government that has consulted more with Canadians over the past three years than any government in history. It is always about history with them.

The moratorium will have serious consequences for Canada's prosperity and the economic development of the western provinces, which represent a growing segment of the population. How can the Liberals justify the fact that they failed to conduct any environmental or scientific impact assessments, hold any Canada-wide consultations, or have a committee examine this issue? They did not even consult with the nine indigenous nations that live on the land covered by the moratorium. The NDP ought to be alarmed about that. That is the point I really want to talk about.

I have here a legal complaint filed with the B.C. Supreme Court by the Lax Kw'alaams first nation—I am sorry if I pronounced that wrong—represented by John Helin. The plaintiffs are the indigenous peoples living in the region covered by the moratorium. Only nine indigenous nations from that region are among the plaintiffs. The defendant is the Government of British Columbia.

The lawyer's argument is very interesting from a historical perspective.

• (1250)

[English]

The claim area includes and is adjacent to an open and safe deepwater shipping corridor and contains lands suitable for development as an energy corridor and protected deepwater ports for the development and operation of a maritime installation, as defined in Bill C-48, the oil tanker moratorium act.

“The plaintiffs' aboriginal title encompasses the right to choose to what uses the land can be put, including use as a marine installation subject only to justifiable environmental assessment and approval legislation.”

[Translation]

He continues:

[English]

The said action by Canada “discriminates against the plaintiffs by prohibiting the development of land...in an area that has one of the best deepwater ports and safest waterways in Canada, while permitting such development elsewhere”, such as in the St. Lawrence Gulf, the St. Lawrence River, and the Atlantic Ocean.

[Translation]

My point is quite simple. We have a legal argument here that shows that not only does the territory belong to the indigenous people and the indigenous people were not consulted, but that the indigenous people, whom the Liberals are said to love, are suing the Government of British Columbia. This will likely go all the way to the Supreme Court because this moratorium goes against their ancestral rights on their territory, which they want to develop for future oil exports. This government is doing a very poor job of this.

Mr. Pierre Nantel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, NDP): Mr. Speaker, first, I must say that I enjoy listening to the hon. member for Beauport—Limoilou speak because he is a good orator who articulates his thoughts very well. It is nice to hear well-thought-out arguments, even though I do not entirely agree with him.

That being said, you raised a number of very important arguments. However, I want to correct you right away when you describe the Liberals as idealists. Clearly, they are nothing more than opportunists. That is all there is to it.

However, I would like your opinion on the fact that Canadian oil has at times been described here as the cleanest in the world. Honestly, can we talk about the serious problem with developing the oil sands or the tar sands? Let us call them oil sands for some positivity.

What do you think of the new technologies that could make this operation acceptable? Transporting oil is on the same level as using it, but oil extraction is unequivocally damaging to the environment.

The Speaker: I would remind the hon. member for Longueuil—Saint-Hubert that he is to address the Chair and not the other members.

The hon. member for Beauport—Limoilou.

Mr. Alupa Clarke: Mr. Speaker, Canadian oil is the most highly regulated oil in the world. Our oil is subject to the largest number of regulations regarding the environment, transportation safety, taxation, consumption, royalties, and so forth.

Would the founding nations consider it normal today for hundreds of huge oil tankers to cross the Atlantic ocean and come to this country when scientists are telling us that we have the third-largest oil reserve in the world? The carbon capture technology for the oil sands is getting better by the day.

We need to improve our environmental practices, I think that goes without saying. However, once again, how can we justify telling our grandchildren that we do not want to share in the wealth created over the next 40 years by the China's and India's incredible consumption of oil? Those countries are not going to stop purely for environmental reasons. They are going to consume oil. They are in a full-blown industrial revolution and it is their right to do so. We could sell up to \$1 trillion in oil to build hospitals and an education system that are efficient.

• (1255)

Mr. Pierre Nantel: Mr. Speaker, it is rare to be able to take part in a dialogue such as this. I would like to ask my colleague a question.

One trillion dollars is a lot of money. Do Canada's oil executives want to invest in improving the extraction process? This is what I know about the extraction process. Simply put, natural gas is used to heat water to remove the oil from the sand. This creates a lot of carbon dioxide. That is the biggest problem with production, but there is also the issue of the water contaminated by the different chemicals found in the tailings ponds, prominently displayed in *National Geographic*, to our disgrace.

Dare we hope that the industry will invest in making the process cleaner?

Private Members' Business

Mr. Alupa Clarke: Mr. Speaker, environmentalists, just like NDP members, all have the same problem. They suffer from amnesia.

Since the 19th century and over the past 40 years, we have seen great environmental achievements, not only in Canada, but also around the world, with issues such as acid rain or the environment in our cities. The air in London in 1845 was worse than it is today in Beijing. Remarkable progress has been made on the environment. What is disappointing about the NDP, the Liberals, and environmentalists is that they never acknowledge progress and the efforts of Canadians.

We are transitioning towards green energy, but we cannot change Canada's entire supply chain in the space of a few years. This is why we are talking about it, because we need to be able to take advantage of our resources in the meantime.

The Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Hon. members: Question.

The Speaker: The question is on the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion, the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 45, the recorded division stands deferred until Monday, May 7, 2018, at the ordinary hour of daily adjournment.

[*English*]

Ms. Filomena Tassi (Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think that if you seek it, you would find unanimous consent for the following. I move:

That, notwithstanding any standing order or usual practice of the House, the recorded division on third reading of Bill C-48, the oil tanker moratorium act, be further deferred until the expiry of the time provided for oral questions on Tuesday, May 8, 2018.

The Speaker: Does the member have the unanimous consent of the House to propose the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. member: Agreed.

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried. Accordingly, the recorded division stands further deferred until Tuesday, May 8, at the expiry of the time provided for oral questions.

Ms. Filomena Tassi: Mr. Speaker, I think that if you seek it, you would find unanimous consent to see the clock at 1:30.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for this particular kind of magic?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Speaker: The House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

● (1300)

[*Translation*]

AN ACT TO CHANGE THE NAME OF THE ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF CHÂTEAUGUAY—LACOLLE

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-377, An Act to change the name of the electoral district of Châteauguay—Lacolle, as reported (without amendment) from the committee.

The Speaker: There being no motions at report stage, the House will now proceed, without debate, to the putting of the question on the motion to concur in the bill at report stage.

Mrs. Brenda Shanahan (Châteauguay—Lacolle, Lib.) moved that Bill C-377, An Act to change the name of the electoral district of Châteauguay—Lacolle, be concurred in at report stage.

The Speaker: The question is on the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt this motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 98, the recorded division stands deferred until Wednesday, May 9, immediately before the time provided for private members' business.

[*English*]

It being 1:02 p.m., the House stands adjourned until next Monday at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 1:02 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Friday, May 4, 2018

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Oil Tanker Moratorium Act

Bill C-48. Third reading	19131
Mr. Hoback	19131
Mr. Hardie	19132
Mr. Nantel	19133
Mr. Waugh	19133
Mr. Vaughan	19135
Ms. Malcolmson	19135
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	19135
Ms. Malcolmson	19135
Mr. Lamoureux	19137
Mr. Albas	19137
Mr. Johns	19137

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Denise Beauchamp

Mr. Fergus	19139
------------------	-------

Saskatchewan Leaseholders

Mr. Kitchen	19139
-------------------	-------

Gender Equality

Mr. Duguid	19139
------------------	-------

Human Trafficking

Ms. Moore	19139
-----------------	-------

Flooding in New Brunswick

Mr. Long	19140
----------------	-------

Down's Syndrome

Mr. Trost	19140
-----------------	-------

Les Cèdres Riverboat Ride

Mr. Schiefke	19140
--------------------	-------

Sovereign's Medal for Volunteers Recipient

Ms. Young	19140
-----------------	-------

Rosalie Gagnon

Mr. Paul-Hus	19141
--------------------	-------

Dennis Franklin Cromarty High School

Mr. Rusnak	19141
------------------	-------

Events in Cloverdale—Langley City

Mr. Aldag	19141
-----------------	-------

United Conservative Party

Ms. Rempel	19141
------------------	-------

Indian Residential School History and Dialogue Centre

Ms. Murray	19141
------------------	-------

Jonquière Médic

Ms. Trudel	19142
------------------	-------

Workers with Disabilities

Mr. Poilievre	19142
---------------------	-------

Spring events in Prince Edward Island

Mr. Morrissey	19142
---------------------	-------

ORAL QUESTIONS

Carbon Pricing

Ms. Bergen	19142
Ms. McKenna	19142
Ms. Bergen	19142
Ms. McKenna	19143
Ms. Bergen	19143
Ms. McKenna	19143
Mr. Gourde	19143
Ms. McKenna	19143
Mr. Gourde	19143
Ms. McKenna	19143

Natural Resources

Mr. Rankin	19143
Ms. Rudd	19143
Ms. Trudel	19144
Ms. Rudd	19144

Marijuana

Ms. Trudel	19144
Ms. Petitpas Taylor	19144
Mr. Rankin	19144
Ms. Petitpas Taylor	19144

The Environment

Mrs. Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	19144
Mr. MacAulay	19144
Mr. Waugh	19144
Mr. Goodale	19145
Mr. Kitchen	19145
Mr. Goodale	19145
Mrs. Wagantall	19145
Ms. McKenna	19145
Mr. Arnold	19145
Ms. McKenna	19145
Mr. Albas	19145
Ms. McKenna	19145

Canada Revenue Agency

Mr. Dusseault	19146
Ms. Khera	19146

Taxation

Mr. Nantel	19146
Mr. Lightbound	19146

Carbon Pricing

Ms. Rempel	19146
Ms. McKenna	19146
Ms. Rempel	19146
Ms. McKenna	19146

Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship

Mr. Paul-Hus	19147
Mr. Goodale	19147
Mr. Paul-Hus	19147
Mr. Cormier	19147

CBC/Radio-Canada

Ms. Moore	19147
Ms. Joly	19147

Official Languages

Mr. Choquette	19147
Mr. MacKinnon	19147

International Trade

Mr. Maloney	19148
Ms. Goldsmith-Jones	19148

Democratic Reform

Mr. Brassard	19148
Mr. Fillmore	19148
Mr. Brassard	19148
Mr. Fillmore	19148

The Environment

Mr. Albrecht	19148
Ms. McKenna	19148

Public Safety

Mr. Motz	19149
Mr. Beech	19149

Public Transportation

Ms. Benson	19149
Mrs. McCrimmon	19149
Ms. Jolibois	19149
Mr. Goodale	19149

Health

Ms. Gladu	19149
Ms. Petitpas Taylor	19149

Indigenous Affairs

Mrs. McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	19149
Mr. Rusnak	19150

Regional Economic Development

Mr. Clarke	19150
Mrs. McCrimmon	19150

Public Safety

Ms. Ludwig	19150
Mr. Beech	19150

Canada Revenue Agency

Mr. Généreux	19150
Ms. Khera	19150

International Development

Mrs. Shanahan	19151
Ms. Bibeau	19151

International Trade

Mr. Allison	19151
Ms. Goldsmith-Jones	19151

Youth

Mr. Fraser (Central Nova)	19151
Mr. Schiefke	19151

Consumer Protection

Mr. Ste-Marie	19151
Mr. Lametti	19151
Mr. Ste-Marie	19151
Mr. Lametti	19152

Intergovernmental Relations

Ms. Pauzé	19152
Ms. Petitpas Taylor	19152

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**Government Response to Petitions**

Mr. Lamoureux	19152
---------------------	-------

Committees of the House**Procedure and House Affairs**

Ms. Tassi	19152
-----------------	-------

Natural Resources

Mr. Maloney	19152
-------------------	-------

Procedure and House Affairs

Ms. Tassi	19152
Motion for concurrence	19152
(Motion agreed to)	19152

Petitions**Canada Summer Jobs Program**

Ms. Gladu	19152
-----------------	-------

Guaranteed Income Supplement

Ms. Trudel	19152
------------------	-------

Public Safety

Mr. McGuinty	19153
--------------------	-------

Canada Summer Jobs Program

Mr. Arnold	19153
------------------	-------

The Environment

Mr. Johns	19153
-----------------	-------

Gatineau Park

Mr. Amos	19153
----------------	-------

Canada Summer Jobs Program

Mr. Allison	19153
-------------------	-------

The Environment

Ms. Malcolmson	19153
----------------------	-------

Canada Summer Jobs Program

Mrs. Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	19153
--	-------

Books

Mr. Choquette	19153
---------------------	-------

Canada Summer Jobs Program

Mr. Albrecht	19153
--------------------	-------

The Environment

Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	19154
--------------------------------------	-------

Canada Summer Jobs Program

Mrs. Wagantall	19154
----------------------	-------

Public Safety

Mrs. Wagantall	19154
----------------------	-------

Sex Selection

Mrs. Wagantall	19154
----------------------	-------

Questions Passed as Orders for Returns

Mr. Lamoureux..... 19154

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Oil Tanker Moratorium Act

Bill C-48. Third reading 19156
Mr. Lamoureux..... 19156
Mr. MacGregor..... 19156
Mr. Aldag 19157
Mrs. Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster) 19158
Mr. Nantel..... 19159
Mr. Abouttaif..... 19159
Mr. Clarke 19159
Mr. Clarke..... 19160

Mr. Nantel..... 19161
Division on motion deferred 19162
Ms. Tassi 19162
Motion..... 19162
Motion agreed to 19162

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

**An Act to change the name of the electoral district of
Châteauguay—Lacolle**

Bill C-377. Report stage 19162
Mrs. Shanahan 19162
Motion for concurrence 19162
Division on motion deferred 19162

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: <http://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.

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 : <http://www.noscommunes.ca>