

2024-05-21 Sen Plett speaks on PM Trudeau Legacy of Failure (Episode #2)

Thank you Madam Speaker. Honourable colleagues, I rise today to continue my response to this speech from the throne. As you know, I will use this time to overture those legacy.

Today I will focus on another important component of that legacy, the cultivation of a divided Canada. I know many of you will be tempted to leave the chamber as I speak, but I want you all to know, colleagues, I am not doing this for the benefit of those of you in the chamber. I am doing this for the benefit of the almost 1 million viewers that viewed the last speech I made about Trudeau's legacy.

I am doing it for the 6 million plus Conservatives that voted for the Conservatives and a different Prime Minister in the last federal election. And I am doing it for the 3 million extra voters that want to vote for something other than Justin Trudeau in the next election. Colleagues, in 2015, Justin Trudeau and the Liberal Party formed government with the promise of national unity and sunny ways.

And as you will see, their record is one of dismal failure. It would be unfair to not acknowledge that the world is very divided. In the past decade, the political climate, certainly in Western democracies, has seen the embrace of radical ideologies, the doctrines of which have been adopted into policy.

The rise of identity politics is dividing citizens by gender, by race, religion and perceived level of oppression. The narrowing of acceptable thought punishes those who fall outside the lines. This has spurred populist revolts by those who feel abandoned and disregarded by the established elite groups.

More and more people define themselves in opposition to the system which further fuels division. Canada has not been immune to those forces. However, a leader with any integrity or sense would acknowledge the political climate, remind citizens of who we are as a country, our common goals and principles, and focus on moving forward with policies that could bring us together.

Justin Trudeau, colleagues, has done precisely the opposite. He plays the game of division by taking a very predictable ideological stance in every quarrel and then literally insulting and dismissing those who disagree with him, all the while preaching a vacant message of unity. In 2024, it should be clear to every Canadian that our sunny ways Prime Minister has left the country far more divided than he found it.

Is there a person in Canada who can honestly say we are more united and unified than we were prior to Justin Trudeau taking office? Colleagues, our country is a mess, and I fear that this is not by accident. It would appear that Trudeau's divide-and-conquer politics are intentionally stoking flames of division. It is a calculated attempt to distract Canadians from the failures of his government.

If they hate their neighbour, if they are divided into distinct group identities, they can blame the other for Canada's problems. If we are afraid, maybe we will forget about the myriad of crises happening simultaneously throughout our country, which has leaked into their own homes, including their inability to pay the bills and put food on the table. When recently trying to defend the indefensible in this particular case, the ill-timed carbon tax increase, Trudeau stated, and I quote, my job is not to be popular.

No, Prime Minister, it is not. It is also not your job, Prime Minister, to cultivate polarization and ostracize swaths of Canadian population who disagree with you. John Ebbetson wrote in the Globe and Mail in October, every Prime Minister's highest priority should be to leave the Federation stronger, or at least not weaker than they found it.

By that measure, he notes, Mr. Trudeau's tenure has been a failure. Honourable Senators, allow me to walk you through some of the many ways our national unity has unravelled during and under Trudeau's watch. The COVID-19 pandemic was indeed a challenging time for leaders around the world.

Their citizens were dealing with the loss or fear of loss of loved ones, the economic uncertainty as a result of lockdowns, the mental health impact of isolation, the inability to mourn the loss of family members together, and the list goes on. When the vaccines eventually came, so did the onslaught of fear. Many were left wondering how effective are these vaccines in preventing transmission? What are the risks? Is it safe and advisable for children to be vaccinated? There was a wide range of medical opinions on this.

The CDC and the WHO and public health officers were making recommendations on what they perceived to be the most complete and relevant data available. Yet other scientists and health professionals were making different recommendations. Many Canadians found the research and data presented by alternative sources compelling and were not willing to blindly trust their respective public health authorities.

This was confounded when previous recommendations and assertions by public health officials were later deemed to be incorrect or no longer advisable. Many health experts warned of a shadow pandemic with respect to mental illness as well as the detrimental impacts on children and their learning given the school closures. The growing division was palatable.

Some saw those who did not want to get the vaccine as nothing but a group of uneducated anti-vaxxer, religious radicals, and conspiracy theorists. Some on the other end of the spectrum would post pictures on social media, mocking individuals wearing masks outside or would refer to anyone following the CDC guidelines as sheep. By the end of 2021, the Public Health Agency of Canada announced the requirement for essential service providers, including truck drivers, to be fully vaccinated by January 15 of 2022.

These mandates would prevent an estimated 26,000 unvaccinated truck drivers who are required to regularly cross the border from doing their jobs. As we all know, the response from truck drivers across the country is what came to be known as the freedom convoy. Protesters occupied the downtown core of Ottawa, requesting to speak to and to hear from the Prime Minister, and they announced they would not leave until the mandates were repealed.

While thousands of protesters certainly supported the concerns of the truckers, the overall protest quickly became a broader call to action on COVID-19 restrictions, generally and their impact on Canadians' autonomy, mental health, and the freedom to earn a living. The truckers who ironically were praised by Justin Trudeau in the early days of the pandemic, along with an empty thank-a-trucker hashtag, ultimately became Trudeau's political target and enemy. Truck drivers who spend their days alone in the cabs of their vehicles suddenly became a threat to public health if they were unvaccinated.

Of course, when asked in the House of Commons to produce data linking truck drivers to COVID-19 infections in Canada, neither the Health Minister nor the Chief Public Health Officer were able to do so. These men and women were literally fighting for their right to work. They were exercising their right to protest in the nation's capital, and they had come together with other concerned Canadians to stand in opposition to government overreach that was becoming pervasive.

A leader with any capability or integrity may look at the stark divide plaguing the nation and respond by acknowledging the struggle among Canadians and the difficulty of navigating, changing, and conflicting information, and may remind Canadians that we have a common goal, and that is to minimize the risk of death and illness among Canadians and to resume life as usual, including the ability to earn a living as quickly as possible. So what did Trudeau do? Did he acknowledge the fears of many Canadians who were concerned about their mental health, their ability to pursue a livelihood, or their autonomy with respect to health care choices? Did he give the protesters who had traveled all this way, who had felt left out of the conversation, the opportunity to be heard? No, he ran from the problem, quite literally hiding from Canadians and waiting for the right opportunity to attack. As is the case with nearly every large-scale protest, there were a few bad actors who showed up to promote a message of hate that had nothing to do with the protest itself.

As soon as the media gave those hateful individuals the time of day, the Prime Minister pounced. The media reports were all Trudeau needed to dismiss a name called Truckers and the millions of Canadians supporting them. It is still hard to believe, two years after the fact, even for the Prime Minister, who has a terrible track record of division, that he called millions of Canadians racist, misogynist, insurrectionist, and a fringe minority.

His words. He even called their views intolerable, and in a televised speech asked Canadians, how can we tolerate these people? Let me repeat, the Prime Minister asks about those who oppose him, how can we tolerate them? Of course, the Prime Minister knew that the few racist idiots did not speak for or represent the ballot concerns of Truckers, but rather than using his position of power to unite at the height of COVID-19 tensions, he dismissed and disregarded the concerns of Canadians who felt left out of the conversation, who felt powerless and desperate, and he insulted them. He intentionally painted them all with the same brush in an attempt to justify his failure to engage with them.

As Jennifer Lewis said in a special to the National Post, it was like watching a leader pour gasoline on already burning fire. Here we had a leader who had no issue creating an environment of intolerance for anyone who did not fall into line, and to make it worse, his MPs and supporters started doing the same thing. She quoted, quotes, a government that

had pledged to crack down on online bullying was making it acceptable for Canadians to harass their neighbours for making a different medical choice.

Even Liberal Member of Parliament, Joel Lightwood, took note of his discomfort with the situation when he stated, and I quote, I can't help but notice with regret that both the tone and the policies of my government changed drastically on the eve and during the last election campaign. From a positive and unifying approach, a decision was made to wedge, to divide and to stigmatize. Now that we have one of the most vaccinated populations in the world, we've never been so divided.

This is a powerful statement from a member of the Prime Minister's own caucus. The week after Mr. Lightwood's comments in response to a question from a Jewish Member of Parliament, Melissa Lantzman, the Prime Minister doubled down on his characterization of the protesters saying, Conservatives members can stand with people who wave swastikas. They can stand with people who wave the confederate flag.

This is our Prime Minister colleagues. Imagine Justin Trudeau just associated a Jewish Member of Parliament to a swastika. He was so intent to divide the world between good and evil and of course putting his political adversaries in the evil camp that he forgot who he was speaking to.

This is Justin Trudeau. He will never hesitate to insult his adversary. He will never hesitate to go over the top and paint anyone who disagrees with him as evil.

In his mind, he does not have political adversaries. He has enemies. And since he is Canada, his enemies are Canada's enemies.

With this attitude, it has proven impossible for him to simply debate and come to a compromise or an agreement. It is always good, him, versus evil, the other side. When asked to apologize for his remarks to Ms. Lantzman, he refused and left the chamber.

He was not willing to back down from his in-group, out-group, us-versus-them view of Canadians. Instead of trying to understand the concerns and the impact of his government's measures on the citizens he is mandated to represent, he used his power to shut them down. As I said when we were debating the Emergencies Act motion in February of 2022, this is a Prime Minister who does not like opposition.

He admires the basic dictation of China. He does not listen. He preaches.

He does not debate. He insults. He does not convince.

He imposes. When the Prime Minister unleashed his most appalling divisive tool, invoking the Emergencies Act and freezing the bank accounts of protesters and those who supported him, he stoked the flames of division in a way that we are still recovering from today. It was an international embarrassment and will be a stain on our country's history.

While the use of the Emergencies Act has now been deemed unreasonable and a violation of the Charter by a federal court, the effects are still being felt. A survey done by the Canadian Hub for Applied Social Research at the University of Saskatchewan, 40% of those

surveyed said they have reduced contact with friends or family over an argument about the pandemic. I spoke to one of those just last week.

This is a nearly half of the country, colleagues. Not only has the Prime Minister divided Canadians by region, by partisanship and by vaccination status, but his divisive rhetoric and actions are literally ripping families and friendships apart. A year after the coming into force of the vaccine mandates and a year after the government's use of the Emergencies Act, after what could have been a year of reflection, Trudeau, in a public appearance, stated that he did not force anyone to get vaccinated but rather, I quote, encouraged.

The internet was quick to provide clips of the Prime Minister saying things like, and I quote, the bottom line is proof of vaccination will be required by no later than the end of this month for all federal employees and by mid-November. Enforcement measures will be in place to make sure that everyone is vaccinated. Enforcement measures will be in place to make sure that everyone is vaccinated.

That doesn't sound like encouragement to me. This, however, did not faze the Prime Minister. He carried on dividing and conquering, stoking fear and division, and operating as if he and his government were untouchable.

And to top it all off, he cynically called an election in the middle of the pandemic. He tried to get the majority that he could not get two years earlier, so he used the COVID-19 as his platform. Colleagues, many Canadians entered the pandemic with different health and social circumstances and a range of views on how they thought it should be handled and how they expected their fellow Canadians to act.

That is normal. That's the beauty of a pluralistic society. Where things went awry is when the Prime Minister, who preaches diversity is our strength, suddenly expected the country to think exactly the same way on every critical issue.

And then he mocked, insulted and punished those who deviated from the acceptable line of thinking. Faced with the pandemic, he did not act as a leader, as a unifier. Justin Trudeau decided to divide Canadians during the pandemic for his own political benefit.

This, colleagues, will be his legacy. Let me turn now to immigration. Of all the files the Trudeau government has botched, one would argue this one takes the cake, although a RiveCam app is certainly up there competing.

Canadians are fundamentally pro-immigration. Our culture and our economy have been enriched and strengthened by immigration, and our diversity has always been a source of pride for Canada. It is quite profound, then, and in tragic truth, that a government could mismanage this critical file so badly in eight years that it's actually starting to turn Canadians from a favourable view on immigration.

A recent study by Focus Canada surveyed Canadians on their attitudes about immigration and refugees. 2,002 Canadians were surveyed, a sample size that researchers note that produces accurate results within 2.2 percentage points. According to this data, Canadians now are significantly more likely than a year ago to say there is too much immigration to our country, dramatically reversing a trend dating back decades.

For the first time, a growing number of Canadians are questioning how many immigrants are arriving. According to the research, this expanding view that Canada is taking in too many immigrants is driven in large part by rising concerns about how newcomers may be contributing to the housing crisis. Among the most concerned citizens, according to this study, are first generation Canadians.

The state of our immigration in our country, colleagues, is truly a mess. Even Trudeau himself said at a press conference in early April, over the past few years we have seen a massive spike in temporary immigration that has grown at a rate far beyond what Canada has been able to absorb. He provided an example in 2017, 2% of Canada's population was made up of temporary immigrants.

Today it's 7.5%. That's something we need to get back under control. He said, adding that temporary immigration has caused so much pressure in our communities. It's ironic, as Robin Erbac notes in the Globe and Mail, that it was these types of remarks about immigration that caused Trudeau to accuse the Conservatives of fear mongering.

For example, when Conservative MP Stephen Blaney asked about the massive backlog in immigration applications in 2018, Trudeau responded by saying, it is completely irresponsible of the Conservatives to arouse fears and concerns about our immigration system and refugees. Trudeau then went on to blame the Harper Conservatives for the irresponsible management of the immigration system. As Erbac states, since then we are to infer the immigration system has been managed responsibly and the proof is in the Liberal government now frantically trying to reverse course from even a few months ago.

Colleagues, in November of 2022, the government released its plan to bring in nearly 1.5 million new permanent residents by 2025. Despite, as we now know, an internal report on immigration, refugees and Citizenship Canada that warned the Deputy Minister, among others, that population growth was outpacing housing supply and would continue to put pressure on Canada's health care services. This came after Trudeau's ill-conceived tweet responding to Donald Trump essentially opening the door for migrants to flood to Canada.

After his tweet in 2017, over 18,000 migrants illegally crossed the border. After entering illegally, they claimed asylum as refugees and were permitted to stay and get access to a myriad of social programs Canada has to offer, including education, social assistance, housing and health care. That number continued to skyrocket the following year.

This will be part of Justin Trudeau's legacy. He adhered to the century initiative, the irresponsible plan to increase Canada's population to 100 million before 2100. All this without any planning or investment in the infrastructure and social systems to integrate the newcomers.

When it became clear that Canada could receive such a massive influx, as he had been warned by his own officials, Justin Trudeau started blaming those same immigrants for the problems. He is now on a crusade to reduce the same numbers of asylum seekers, temporary workers and foreign students. His own government increased.

He is not only trying to run away from his failed immigration policies, he is trying to run against them. Justin Trudeau has managed to shatter the more than 125-year-old Canadian consensus on the benefits of immigration. When Justin Trudeau ran out of excuses for the difficulties Canadians are facing, especially on housing, he started blaming immigrants.

He targeted international students and temporary foreign workers, like he was not the guy who let all those people into Canada in the first place. Because of his incompetence, Justin Trudeau has managed to change the Canadians' positive vision on immigration, and then he decided to pit Canadians against immigrants for his own political benefits. This will be his legacy.

As I said, Trudeau's divisive policies have spanned nearly every portfolio. I will turn my focus now to his energy policy and his repeated antagonizing of Western Canada. Many of us in this chamber remember the hostile approach of Pierre Elliott Trudeau to the booming oil industry in the West in the 1970s and early 1980s, from freezing oil prices to imposing taxes on oil exports in order to subsidize imports for eastern refiners to the disastrous National Energy Program, or NEP.

Tensions were so high between the federal government and the West that then Premier of Alberta, Peter Lougheed, called the export tax the most discriminatory action taken by a federal government against a particular province in the entire history of Confederation. The notorious NEP that followed was sold by the government as a way to redistribute some of the oil wealth from Alberta while keeping prices low for Canadians. In reality, it was a way for the government to curb some of its \$14.2 billion deficit and high inflation rates.

It set the stage for a battle between the provinces and for Western alienation. It led to the first upswing of Western separatism and contributed to the tanking of a previously thriving economy. Many thousands of people lost their jobs and homes and attributed this directly to the program.

When the National Energy Program was first announced, as the CBC reflected in a 2020 article, it was more than just a financial hit or the sense that the federal government was overstepping its constitutional bounds and meddling with Alberta's resources. It was a shot of adrenaline right into the restless heart of Western alienation. Wow, that was our CBC.

Thankfully, accompanying the election of the late, great Right Honourable Brian Mulroney and the announcement that Canada was open for business, the NEP was formally terminated in its entirety. Now, colleagues, it has been over 40 years since the National Energy Program was enacted, but for many reasons it still feels very fresh to Albertans. Its history is a looming reminder of what's possible, especially now with another Trudeau in office who has demonstrated that the proverbial apple has not fallen far from the tree.

In 2019, Trudeau brought forward Bill C-69, the Impact Assessment Act, later dubbed the No Pipelines Bill, which set up a new authority to assess industrial projects such as pipelines, mines and interprovincial highways for their effects on public health, the environment and the economy. In effect, it created more red tape around bringing Canadian oil to market and gave the federal government the power to trump major projects like oil mines and oil sands projects if they deemed them to not be in the public interest. It was a gross infringement of

exclusive provincial jurisdiction and has since been ruled unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of Canada.

In 2021, Trudeau first announced the GHG emissions cap. His government would be placing on one industry and one industry alone, the oil and gas sector. There was no simultaneous commitment to reduce emissions from other sectors of the economy, including transportation, which accounts for almost as much emissions as the oil and gas sector.

The proposed regulations were brought forward in December of this year and, as promised, they single out the oil and gas industry and exempt the 73.4 per cent of the remaining GHG emissions from other sectors. At best, it is scientifically unjustified, and at worst, it is an outright attack on the West. As political science professor Lydia Miljan stated in a Globe and Mail article after the announcement, demand for oil and gas will continue.

We live in a large, cold, sparsely populated country that relies on natural gas and heating oil to keep us warm, and gasoline and diesel to keep us moving. Putting caps on domestic emissions will not change our demand for oil and gas. It will simply shift our supply from Canadian sources to countries that are willing to sell it to us.

This is shameful. Likewise, analysts at the Fraser Institute, in a contribution to the Calgary Herald, stated, and I quote, Every credible forecast of world energy consumption indicates that oil and gas will continue to dominate the global energy supply mix for decades. Any constriction of our oil and gas production and experts in Canada could merely shift production to other regions with lower environmental and human rights standards.

The feeling of Western alienation was further exacerbated by the carbon tax, specifically by the carve-out favouring Atlantic provinces. When pleas for relief from Western provinces were ignored, Trudeau's carbon tax exemption ensures that the rural residents of Atlantic Canada who use home heating oil will enjoy a three-year pause in taxation, while requiring households who use other fuels to pay up. For Justin Trudeau, the folks protesting against his carbon tax are conspiracy theorists and extremists.

You can feel his openness to debate his policies. Add to this the requirements for clean electricity that targets Alberta, and the picture is complete. Like his father before him, Justin Trudeau is punishing Western Canada, and in particular, Alberta, hoping the rest of Canada will thank him for that.

The only difference is that what was presented as an energy policy in 1980 is now disguised as an environmental policy. Again, like his father, Justin Trudeau is pitting one region of Canada against another for crass political reasons. Like his father, Justin Trudeau will leave office having alienated Western Canada.

Justin Trudeau decided to pit region against region for his own political benefits. These divisions in Canada will be his legacy. Pierre Elliott's tenure in office fueled the creation and rise of separatist movements, first in Quebec, then in Western Canada.

History is now repeating itself. Another Trudeau, same result. In the Globe and Mail article entitled, National Unity is Fraying Under Trudeau's Watch, John Ibbotson eloquently paints a

picture of a unified Canada before Trudeau took office, and aptly captures the provincial divides and the rebirth of separatist movements in Canada.

Allow me to read directly from this article, as I think the point he illustrates is a crucial one. When the Liberals won their majority government in October of 2015, they had a golden opportunity to reverse decades of liberal unpopularity in the West. The Grits had taken 17 seats in British Columbia, seven in Manitoba, four in Alberta, and one in Saskatchewan.

They were well placed to grow that vote with policies that consulted rather than dictated, that recognized the importance of the resource-based Western economy, and that respected the distinct societies of the prairies and BC. He continued, Mr. Trudeau inherited a federation at peace. In Quebec, the Parti Quebecois was out of government and in decline, and the federal bloc Quebecois was decimated, having taken only 10 seats in the 2015 election.

Things were quieter on the federal provincial front than at any time since the 1950s. Surely, this was a time to strengthen national bonds between English and French, between the heartland and the West. Ibbotson then goes on to note the recent resurgence of the Bloc Quebecois, the rising of the French-English tensions, and the even more profound estrangement of Alberta.

He notes the increasing divides that, according to the polls, the Conservatives would trounce the Liberals if an election were held today. What went wrong, he asks. In a word, bossiness.

The Liberals imposed conditions on the provinces before granting health funding. They imposed a carbon tax on provinces that didn't meet federal carbon reduction targets. Bill C-69 imposed such intrusive conditions on resource development that the Supreme Court ruled it unconstitutional.

The Liberals decided that national priorities justified using the federal spending power to dictate terms to the provinces. They were willing to let the prairie oil and gas sector suffer in order to meet carbon reduction targets. The result? Increasing resentment towards Ottawa across the country.

He concludes, this is Canada today on Justin Trudeau's watch. When Stephen Harper called the 2015 election, the Bloc Quebecois was down to two seats and now has 32. And because of Justin Trudeau's attack on provincial rights, the separatist Parti Quebecois is now leading the polls in Quebec and is pushing for another referendum on independence before the end of the decade.

Instead of focusing on what a Prime Minister should focus on, the files that fall under federal jurisdictions such as criminal justice, national defence, foreign affairs, national monetary and economic policy, Justin Trudeau continuously meddles in provincial jurisdictions. Almost all the budget announcements made by the Liberals in recent weeks were about a new program in a provincial jurisdiction. Isn't that ironic? Justin Trudeau wants to manage kindergartens, take over school food programs, arbiter-tenant-landlord relations, manage the province's health care systems.

After all, he and his fellow Liberals know better than all the premiers of all political stripes. Forget regional wisdom and experience. For him, provinces are a mere regional managers of his policies.

What is ironic about his need to manage any and all the programs in the country is that he is unable to manage what is actually under his own jurisdiction. When you see what is going on in the passport office, when you see how our immigration policy is managed, when you see how our armed forces are under-equipped, you cannot help but hold your breath in fear as you wait to see what will happen with all the new programs that Team Trudeau is putting together. Trudeau's attacks on provincial jurisdictions have one objective, change the channel on his failures in the files under federal jurisdiction.

Of course, in the process, he has created fights with premiers across the country. Even leaders of provincial NDP and Liberal opposition parties are distancing themselves from the federal levels. The B.C. Liberals had to change their name to make sure no one would think they support Justin Trudeau's policies.

Fighting with the provinces was one of Pierre Elliott Trudeau's pastimes. It may have been profitable in the short term for the Liberal Party in the 1970s, but it almost destroyed our country. Justin Trudeau is using the same recipe that his father used back then.

Pick fights with the provinces. Even the lonely Liberal premier left, Andrew Furey from Newfoundland and Labrador, is attacked by Trudeau. Hopefully, Canadian voters will soon put an end to the Liberal regime so that Pierre Paglia can go back to working in collaboration with the provinces, not against them.

We will soon go back to a period of mutual respect, dialogue and collaboration between provinces and federal government, like we always have when the Liberals are not in power. In the meantime, we know that these divisions between levels of government in Canada and the resurgence of the separatist movement in Quebec will be part of Justin Trudeau's legacy. Tackling controversial issues is an unavoidable aspect of leadership.

Achieving unanimous support for proposed policies among citizens is next to impossible. Yet in Canada, there once existed a common belief in ultimate objectives and fundamental values. This is no longer the case.

Under Justin Trudeau's leadership, Canadians are less likely to engage in thoughtful discourse and are more likely to distance themselves from someone they disagree with. After all, their own Prime Minister is constantly choosing winners and losers, identifying the morally righteous and the morally unacceptable, and making disparaging comments about the half he does not agree with. He has not only fueled discords on the pressing issues of the day, but he has reignited division on issues many of us thought he had long transcended—for example, divisions on the basis of religion.

Many of us considered Canada a place where citizens were free and empowered to practice the religion of their choice, both in the context of a chartered right and also as a culturally valued principle. While this right still exists, Trudeau's unwavering adherence to his ideology has dictated that certain faiths are to be valued more than others. Since the spring of 2021,

Two North has counted 47 churches or church buildings that have been burned or destroyed by arson, and another 53 have been the target of acts of vandalism.

Not a word from our Prime Minister. An attack on a place of worship is repugnant. On any place of worship, our government cannot vocally denounce attacks on some religions and remain silent when others are targeted.

But this is what we have in Canada under Justin Trudeau. For example, he has pledged to remove the charity status of pregnancy crisis centres, who are often affiliated with the Christian faith because they have a different opinion than he does on the topic of abortion—more intolerable views. He has yet to act on the promise, but the threat still looms for these charities, as some of the advocates for the pregnancy centres have stated.

If their charitable status is stripped, it would set a dangerous precedent and would affect far more than just crisis centres. For example, it would impact churches, camps, and ministries. The Liberal talking points have specifically singled out crisis pregnancy centres as the type of organisation that would be targeted.

Yet some have wondered about the language and what would be classified as an anti-abortion organisation. For example, would a place of worship that opposes abortion qualify? As David Cook from Campaign Life Coalition stated, whenever a charitable status is revoked, donations go down. If they don't have tax-exempt status, they're going to have to start paying property tax, and that property tax will just kill them.

It's going to shut them down. Pregnancy Care Canada has helped hundreds of thousands of women by providing material supplies such as diapers, formula, clothing, prenatal education, parenting programs, and even post-abortion support and care. By any measure, this is a charity.

When Minister Freeland's office was asked by the National Post whether or not churches could lose their tax-exempt status and by what metric, the CRA would determine an organisation was providing dishonest counselling. They did not provide answers, just reiterated the Liberal platform promise. You'll remember this isn't the first time the Liberals have targeted pro-life groups.

In 2017, the government required groups participating in the summer student jobs program to declare that they were not pro-life, which disqualified a number of religious organisations across Canada from receiving Canada's summer job subsidy. Prior to that, in 2014, he stated that all of the Liberal candidates had to share his view on abortion to run for the party. How progressive.

On an issue on which Canadians are divided, rather than taking the position of previous Prime Ministers who stated repeatedly they would not reopen the debate on abortion, Justin Trudeau has inserted himself squarely in the middle of the debate, once again choosing winners and losers, a right side and a wrong side, tolerable Canadians and intolerable Canadians. On an already impassioned and emotional debate, Trudeau has done nothing to ease tensions and instead has driven a wedge even further. Let me quote a May 17th article from the Toronto Sun under the headline, Trudeau is stoking the fires of division.

Another day, another attack by Prime Minister Justin Trudeau on a Conservative Premier. He's attacked Saskatchewan's Scott Moe over the carbon tax. He's assailed Alberta's Danielle Smith over almost everything.

This week, Trudeau targeted New Brunswick Premier Blayne Higgs, calling him a disgrace on women's rights and criticising him for his policies on gender identity. By importing American politics, Trudeau is stoking the fires of division. With respect to the Israel-Hamas war, Trudeau has made numerous jumbled, incomprehensible statements and has tried to take a public position of neutrality while sending some MPs to mosques to deliver one message and others to a synagogue to deliver another message.

The Liberals have now supported a motion that makes a false equivalency between the state of Israel and the terrorist organisation Hamas, and in doing so have alienated members of his own caucus, like Jewish Member of Parliament Anthony Hausfather, who stated that the motion crossed the line. His embarrassing and incoherent foreign policy positions and the division among his own caucus has even caught the attention of international media. The Economist published an article in April entitled, Justin Trudeau is beset by a divided party and an angry electorate, noting that Trudeau has had to quell several angry exchanges among his Liberal MPs over Canada's role in the war in Gaza.

They referenced the original NDP motion calling for a ceasefire and the recognition of Palestinian state and noted that more than half of Trudeau's caucus supported the motion before it was watered down. The article notes, had it gone ahead, it would have laid bare a split among Liberal MPs. It goes on to say that the amended version, quote, avoided an embarrassing display on foreign policy and coherence, but noted that three Liberal MPs broke rank and voted against the motion, while many did not show up for the vote at all.

On this issue, Trudeau delivers his typical platitudes calling on Canadians to stop entrenching division and to remember who we are. But his position on neutrality and moral relativism has contributed to a fractured Canada. The absence of leadership from the Prime Minister and his government has consequences.

Only a few days ago, right here on Wellington Street, a mob was cheering for Hamas and celebrating the October 7th massacre. Trudeau's lack of moral clarity is simply staggering and has emboldened the wave of anti-Semitism and Jew hatred that we are witnessing right across Canada. It is clear that these anti-Israel movements are coordinated and financed from overseas.

Instead of protecting Canada from yet another foreign interference in our public debate, the Trudeau government is completely missing in action. This lack of leadership and moral clarity from Justin Trudeau, combined with the pandering by the Liberals for votes from certain communities, is causing more and more divisions in Canada. We now have tensions between the Muslim and Jewish communities like we have never seen before in Canada.

And it is also the case for tensions between the Chinese community or between Sikhs and Hindus. Canada is built on respect between all communities. A true leader would make it clear all Canadians will be treated equally and Canadians must respect each other.

But Justin Trudeau has fuelled the divisions for electoral purposes and he will leave behind a more divided Canada. This will be his legacy. Finally, the housing crisis, particularly the affordability component, has the potential to divide us even further to the extent of a revolt, according to a recent RCMP report.

A heavily redacted RCMP report was made public in March as the result of an access to information request filed by Matt Malone, an assistant professor of law at the British Columbia's Thompson Rivers University. The report warns of a plausible descent into civil unrest in the near future once Canadians recognize the hopelessness of their economic situation. The report reads, the coming period of recession will accelerate the decline in living standards that the younger generations have already witnessed compared to earlier generations.

For example, it adds many Canadians under 35 are unlikely ever to be able to buy a place to live. This is truly, truly sad. There is now a divide between those who own a home and those who can only dream of doing so.

Young Canadians, and in particular young families, are plagued by the issue of affordable housing. According to The Economist, young Canadians are the world's 58th happiest. The 58th happiest, just ahead of youth in Ecuador, a country racked by gang violence.

The data from the RCMP report is accurate according to available statistics. The recent analysis by the Royal Bank of Canada demonstrates that housing affordability has reached worst-ever levels in Canada. For example, currently only the wealthiest 26 percent of Canadian families will ever be able to afford a single-family home.

When Trudeau took office, a household earning a median income could cover the cost of owning an average home by spending 39 percent of their pay. Now that figure is 64 percent, 39 percent to 64 percent from 2015 to today. Sky-high interest rates and housing crisis, both of Trudeau's doing are preventing Canadian families from owning a home.

As the RCMP report reads, economic forecasts for the next five years and beyond are bleak. We have seen badly managed economies in the past, but I never thought I would see a Canadian government destroy the financial security of its citizens so profoundly that the RCMP would have to start planning for civil unrest. That, colleagues, is Justin Trudeau and the Liberal Party of today.

Faced by this growing discontent, the Liberals decided to open two other fronts, attack the so-called wealthy and try to pit young Canadians against their parents. It is always the same story with the Trudeau Liberals. Instead of working to correct the problems, they find ways to blame someone else.

The Trudeau champagne socialists have decided to wage a class warfare. They are attacking not only big U.S. companies, they are also attacking Bell and Rogers. Running away from their record, the Liberals are telling us that grocery chains are to blame for inflation.

When did we start with grocery chains? They've been around for a while. Now they are blamed for inflation. Now they have decreed that what they call the ultra-rich should pay for the Trudeau deficits.

The same guys who are giving billions upon billions to car manufacturers are complaining that capitalism is bad. The same guys who are complaining that Loblaws is making too much money gave them millions of dollars to change their fridges. The same guys who are complaining that there aren't enough rentals on the market have decided to increase the taxes of the people who buy, renovate and manage small apartment buildings.

And the same guys who say they do all of this for future generations are saddling them with hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars worth of debt. And the message from the Trudeau government in its last budget could not be clearer. If young Canadians cannot find a home, feel they are underemployed or have lost hope for their future, it is not because of the Liberals who have been in power for the last years.

It is the boomers' fault. Justin Trudeau has decided to pit Canadians against Canadians according to their age or to their revenue for his own political benefit. This will be Justin Trudeau's legacy.

Colleagues, defining Canadian identity has always been a challenging endeavor, yet we know that it includes the ideals of optimism, tolerance and unity. Trudeau's leadership has undeniably fostered division within Canada, leaving us in a state of weakened unity, heightened anger and for many, a sense of hopelessness, a state antithetical to a cohesive Canadian spirit. While navigating controversial issues is an inherent aspect of governance, it is unacceptable for a leader to actively cultivate discord, sow division among citizens or disparage dissenting voices.

He has created several classes of Canadians, dividing us by race, sexuality, vaccine status, region and age. He has declared some segments of our population intolerable. It is a prime example of a divide and conquer strategy intended to distract from his very own failings as the Prime Minister of our country.

A more divided Canada is the legacy of Justin Trudeau. A change of government, colleagues, has never been more critical. The essence of Canadian spirit endures, albeit fragile.

Memories linger for a time of solidarity and prosperity. There remains hope for a future where unity is restored, where the federal and provincial governments collaborate, where separatist sentiments dissolve, where racial tensions fade into history, where immigration is viewed as an enrichment of our society, where international conflicts do not spill into our streets and where politicians do not use cheap populist rhetoric to divide and conquer. What is clear, colleagues, is that Canada needs a common-sense Conservative government led by Pierre Poggia, who will restore our unity.

The challenges that we will face in order to repair our broken country are immense. But, colleagues, it is together that we will achieve this task of rebuilding Canada after these nine long years of darkness. Colleagues, I started this as a Netflix series.

That is episode two of season one. I still have a fair bit more to say on this topic because there really is no end to the amount of fuel that I get from this Prime Minister. I will speak to episode three in the very near distant future.

On that note, colleagues, I would like to adjourn the debate for the balance of my time.
Thank you, colleagues.