



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

House of Commons Debates

Official Report
(Hansard)

Volume 152 No. 033
Friday, October 3, 2025

Speaker: The Honourable Francis Scarpaleggia



CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, October 3, 2025

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayer

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1000)

[*Translation*]

AN ACT RESPECTING CYBER SECURITY

The House resumed from September 26 consideration of the motion that Bill C-8, An Act respecting cyber security, amending the Telecommunications Act and making consequential amendments to other Acts, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Jacques Ramsay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first, I will be sharing my time with the member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot—Acton.

I am honoured today to have an opportunity to speak in support of the bill on cybersecurity. Now more than ever, it is crucial that we take action to protect our most important pieces of infrastructure against ever-changing security threats and cyber-threats. This is without a doubt a key piece of legislation, perhaps even a life-saving one for Canada.

As we all know, this bill is the result of extensive consultations carried out by the government with numerous stakeholders. We consulted with the provinces, territories, municipalities, critical infrastructure owners and operators, cybersecurity experts, civil liberties groups and the academic community. We listened closely to the concerns they raised about the bill, as well as those raised by stakeholders in committee. One of the stakeholders' key concerns is the need to increase oversight and transparency while strengthening privacy protections.

I want to assure all parliamentarians that the government has taken these concerns into account and has made significant changes to the bill to address them. Although a number of legislative and constitutional instruments already protect Canadians' privacy, Bill C-8 provides greater certainty when it comes to protecting their privacy and personal information.

In addition, “for greater certainty” clauses have been added to reassure Canadians that orders and directions cannot and will not be used to conduct surveillance activities or intercept private communications. Rather, these powers are intended to be used in rare and

serious circumstances where there is an urgent need to respond to a known threat or vulnerability. These amendments are a direct response to concerns expressed by civil liberties organizations.

Bill C-8 also clarifies that confidential information must continue to be treated as such by anyone who receives it and must only be shared if it is absolutely necessary to do so.

Other amendments also seek to improve government transparency and accountability. When the previous bill was examined in committee, stakeholders expressed concerns about the lack of public reporting requirements for the orders set out in part 1 of the bill. As a result, an amendment was passed to balance respect for confidentiality with the public's need for transparency.

Another amendment now sets out the information that must be included in annual reports to Parliament, such as the number of orders and directions issued and the number of service providers affected. What is more, in response to stakeholders' concerns regarding accountability, the bill was amended to require the government to notify the National Security and Intelligence Review Agency and the National Security and Intelligence Committee of Parliamentarians within 90 days after an order or confidential direction is issued.

During review in committee, civil liberty groups and industry experts expressed concerns regarding the scope of the new powers granted to the government under this legislation. Some stakeholders pointed out that there was a risk that the government could issue orders or directions without consulting or considering relevant factors, such as the existence of reasonable alternatives.

Although the Governor in Council already has a mechanism in place to control its powers, Bill C-8 addresses these concerns by introducing a reasonableness standard and a non-exhaustive list of factors that the Governor in Council must first consider before issuing an order or direction. When issuing, amending or revoking an order or direction, the Governor in Council may consult with governments and industry, recognizing the need to do so in an expedient manner given the urgency of the situation.

Government Orders

These amendments will ensure that any new powers granted to the government are accompanied by appropriate controls to prevent abuse and strengthen accountability.

• (1005)

They will provide the Governor in Council with greater clarity and fairness in the exercise of these new powers. In particular, the Governor in Council will have to take into account factors such as the operational and financial impacts on public safety before issuing any given order or direction.

Thanks to all these changes, Bill C-8 has been strengthened and will provide greater transparency and accountability to Canadians. It also provides additional safeguards for Canadians with respect to the protection of their privacy and personal information.

Security threats and cyber-threats are becoming more frequent, complex, sophisticated, and politically motivated. The government is committed to defending Canada and its critical infrastructure. Cyber-threat programs sponsored or supported by states such as China, Russia, Iran, and North Korea represent the greatest strategic threats to Canada today. They are part of global campaigns of espionage, sabotage, and subversion carried out by these states. These malicious cyber-threat activities can seriously compromise Canada's national security, public safety, and economy.

This bill is therefore essential to protect Canadians. It will enable the government to act quickly to promote the security of Canada's telecommunications system by minimizing risks to users.

When we hear stakeholders express their concerns, we take them seriously. We work diligently in committee, guided by a spirit of collaboration and our commitment to the national interest. As several other hon. members have already pointed out, this bill is long overdue. Passing Bill C-8 will mark an important stage in the government's ongoing efforts to counter security threats and cyber-threats. It will protect the safety of Canadians and Canadian businesses. I urge my hon. colleagues to support it without delay.

[English]

Michael Guglielmin (Vaughan—Woodbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Privacy Commissioner highlighted several amendments that did not make it into the bill. We all know that cybersecurity threats are a very serious issue that we need to work diligently on, but privacy is paramount. Would the member agree that improvements should be made to the bill in the committee process?

[Translation]

Jacques Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, let me remind members that this bill was brought before the House in the last Parliament. Obviously, we would be more than willing to consider amendments on anything that has changed since that time. I think it would be rather tedious to have the parliamentary committee repeat the same work done during the previous Parliament.

In my view, the amendments we proposed are significant. They guarantee privacy. We are convinced that Canadians will view that as entirely reasonable.

• (1010)

Alexis Deschênes (Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Lestigouj, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for his

speech. I have a question for him. Although we agree on the general objective of securing our infrastructure, we have concerns related to individual freedoms and the right to privacy.

What guarantees can my colleague give us that information collected by the federal government will not be used for purposes other than the purpose it was collected for?

Jacques Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, we had the same concerns as my colleague. We made sure to strengthen those safeguards in the bill. There is now a reasonableness standard that the Governor in Council will be required to consider before issuing a direction or order. I think those safeguards are entirely satisfactory at this stage.

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, for his excellent speech.

I am proud of our government, which has proven that it takes public safety seriously with Bill C-2, the strong borders act, Bill C-9, the combatting hate act, and our upcoming bail reform.

I would like to hear my colleague's thoughts on why it is so important, in the current context, to have a strong legislative framework for cybersecurity.

Jacques Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, the consequences of any breach in our telecommunications and cybersecurity would be catastrophic. It could paralyze the country. That is why we are taking action. We have a legislative model that will be the envy of all G7 and G20 countries. We are confident that we are fulfilling our obligations while respecting the privacy of all Canadians.

[English]

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, in the NDP, we have highlighted that there would be risks to privacy and civil liberties, and the bill would allow for mandatory information sharing between telecom regulators and federal agencies, as well as possibly onward to foreign governments.

One of our questions is this: What is the standard for this disclosure? Simply having the minister's judgment on what is necessary as a standard is vague, subjective and wide open to abuse, so maybe my colleague can answer this: Why are there no requirements for privacy impact assessments in the bill?

Government Orders

[Translation]

Jacques Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, we already have a number of constitutional and legislative instruments guaranteeing privacy. Bill C-8 is very clear on this. It simply allows information collection when faced with a risk that is serious and known. There will be no fishing expeditions. We have established the parameters that will guarantee Canadians' civil rights and liberties.

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot—Acton, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in the House today to speak to this issue. In fact, I spoke to the previous version of the bill, Bill C-26, in the last Parliament. It is easy to get lost in all these “C” bills.

Since the elements of Bill C-8 are absolutely identical to those in the previous version, our hopes and fears are exactly the same as well. I could copy and paste what I said last time. Having said that, I am still going to make an attempt at originality today.

I think there is consensus in the House that the goal is so fundamental and that this issue of cybersecurity is so important that it goes without saying we need to give Bill C-8 a chance at second reading.

The bill will then be studied in committee, where we will have the opportunity to examine it in greater depth. We all agree that this bill is filled with good intentions. However, the road to hell is paved with good intentions, so who knows what else we might find in there. That is often the case with this type of bill. There are issues, and the Privacy Commissioner of Canada has raised some concerns, as have we, while still agreeing with the bill's objective.

I want to start by talking about the objective of the bill. Everyone agrees that cybersecurity is a major issue, including for everyone here in Parliament. In a few days, on October 21, it will be six years since I became a member of Parliament here in the House. I have lost count of the number of emails I have received warning of cyber-attacks. We already know that cyberspace is at the heart of economic and geopolitical warfare in this increasingly dangerous world. Some would say that cyber-attacks are better than military attacks, but unfortunately, they are not mutually exclusive.

Let us look at several examples to show that this issue is not just theoretical. Let us remember that, in 2020, Parliament adopted a motion to force the government to make a decision regarding Huawei and Chinese interference in general. The federal government recently banned Huawei from the 5G network after years of dithering and warnings from intelligence services.

Let us briefly review what the 5G network is to help us understand why there is a clear need for legislation in this area. The 5G network is a new telecommunications technology with bandwidth that is 10 to 100 times greater than that of the current LTE networks. The technology stands out for more than just its speed. It stands out for its extremely low latency, which is the time it takes for one computer to communicate with another and receive a response. This opens the door to many possibilities in different areas, but to achieve such performance, 5G uses a multitude of pathways. To simplify, let us say that something that is sent from Montreal to a computer in Paris could have a portion pass through New York, another through London, another through Barcelona, and so forth.

That is the interconnected world we live in today. This makes the technology particularly vulnerable because it becomes difficult to track the path that the data takes.

Huawei has already been implicated in a scandal involving China spying on the African Union headquarters. I do not know if anyone remembers that, but it is extremely worrying. In 2012, China gave the African Union a fully equipped ultramodern building. China told the African Union that it could get set up, that the networks, computers and telecommunications systems would be provided by Beijing. In 2017, after a few years of operation, African computer scientists realized that the servers were sending out huge amounts of data at night, when nobody was working in the building. It was odd. They wondered why that was happening.

They discovered that the data was going to servers in China that were being used to spy on political leaders and staff. As it turned out, Huawei was the main supplier of the network infrastructure. Microphones were discovered in the walls and tables.

In 2017, China adopted a new national intelligence law where all Chinese companies are obligated to contribute to Chinese intelligence work, be it military or civilian intelligence. A company could be told to spy on behalf of another Chinese company to give China an advantage on the world stage.

● (1015)

China has always denied that its companies had to engage in espionage in foreign countries. Western intelligence agencies, however, say otherwise, and also agree that Chinese laws apply abroad. In any case, we know that China's large companies have close ties to the Chinese Communist Party, the Chinese military and the Chinese government, and that all four have an extremely incestuous relationship with Beijing.

In any case, any company that shows the slightest defiance toward the Chinese Communist Party has no chance of prospering. China, of course, is not a market economy. It is a highly controlled and centralized economy even though, on paper, private companies have officially existed in areas known as special economic zones since the death of Mao Zedong, undergoing constant expansion ever since. For a while, it was thought that China would evolve into a market economy, but that has obviously not turned out to be the case.

For all of these reasons, experts are leery of using Chinese equipment in critical infrastructure such as telecommunications infrastructure. Digital technology played a key role in the so-called new silk roads strategy, launched by the Chinese regime in Beijing.

Government Orders

Once again, the British felt that the risk could be mitigated by not using Chinese equipment in certain specific areas, such as the military and embassies. These are such strategic areas that the British excluded them. However, they have since reconsidered their position and banned the company altogether in 2023.

The U.S. intelligence agency, the CIA, and the Canadian criminal intelligence agency, CSIS, believe that the threat is too great and that the company should be banned, just as the Canadian government recently banned Huawei's 5G technology. The United States has banned Huawei from developing 5G technology in the United States and is pushing for its NATO allies to follow suit, which Australia, New Zealand and now Britain have done.

It is important to note that Huawei was way ahead of the game in terms of developing 5G technology, which prompted many companies, including Canadian companies, to consider using Huawei equipment. Since then, many other companies, such as Nokia, Ericsson and Samsung, have caught up. This means there are more options on the market today, and the Canadian telecommunications industry has shifted away from Huawei services to develop 5G technology. Therefore, it is entirely possible. We are not that dependent on what China has to offer.

In addition, countries such as Australia and New Zealand have denied Chinese companies access to 5G technology development, even though these countries are much more dependent on China than Canada is. Justin Trudeau's government could not make up its mind for the longest time, but it finally woke up. Things started to move. The same is true when it comes to concerns about TikTok. The government is concerned that China could be using certain apps to steal information, and rightly so. As we have seen, China is the queen of data collection.

This bill obviously seeks to address a very real problem, to ward off these potential cyber-attacks, but we are concerned about interference from Ottawa. The Privacy Commissioner asked whether there was any evidence that this bill, which does not clearly rule out the possibility of tracking old emails or searches, would not infringe on the most fundamental aspects of people's privacy. The answer is in the question, in that we should likely clarify things and include more specifics to reassure people who may be concerned about their privacy. Right now, there is no evidence to show that the bill will not infringe on privacy, and we certainly do not have any guarantees that it will not.

That is why it is imperative that the committee conduct a thorough study, that we do the study right, that we hear from witnesses and experts. In any case, some of the work was done during the study of the previous version of the bill, Bill C-26. Unfortunately, that study was not very reassuring. We need to amend the current bill to ensure that Ottawa is not able to infringe on people's privacy.

• (1020)

Madeleine Chenette (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages and to the Secretary of State (Sport), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for his presentation, which summed up the geopolitical issues and all the challenges posed by certain governments that are more autocratic than democratic.

This bill contains all the necessary parameters to protect people and data. I would also like my colleague to tell us what he thinks are the strengths of the institutions protecting us in Canada. There is no need for fearmongering. Canada does have robust institutions.

Is my colleague familiar enough with these concepts to explain them to Canadians?

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of positive elements in the bill. One example is that it enacts the new critical cyber systems protection act. Another is the impact that amending the Telecommunications Act to add promotion of security could have.

However, what is being proposed may also have an impact on provincial infrastructure, such as Hydro-Québec, and we are worried about that encroachment.

As I said, I have no problem with the objective of what is being put in place. However, we must keep an eye on areas of overreach, which should be limited and more strictly controlled. I am confident that our colleagues on the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security will be able to do a good job on this.

• (1025)

[*English*]

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, one concern New Democrats have raised is the one-size-fits-all approach. This bill would lump together banks, telecoms, nuclear facilities and energy co-operatives under a single compliance framework. All of them would face the same 90-day timeline to stand up cybersecurity programs, no matter their size or capacity. For large corporations, perhaps this is feasible. For small operators or co-ops, it could be impossible.

Should compliance obligations not be tailored to the realities of different sectors?

[*Translation*]

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: Mr. Speaker, I do not disagree with my colleague on that. I think this will likely come up in committee. As soon as we start hearing from witnesses, some will say that they agree with the idea, but that they need more time and a transition plan.

Needless to say, no one can argue against virtue and common sense. That is why it is hard to disagree with what my colleague said.

Government Orders

[English]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, protecting the critical systems we have in place is ultimately protecting the Canadian economy, among many other things. Yes, we need to be concerned about the whole issue of privacy and so forth, but not moving legislation of this nature forward would have a very negative impact on cybersecurity and our economy.

I wonder if the member could provide his thoughts on how important it is for the Canadian economy as a whole that we have legislation of this nature.

[Translation]

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: Mr. Speaker, it is important for the economy as a whole, especially in today's world. That said, there are some important privacy considerations at stake. That about sums up my remarks. Yes, doing this is essential, but not at any cost. I think that is my speech in a nutshell.

[English]

Dane Lloyd (Parkland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, there has been some concern about some provisions of the bill that talk about when the minister has a reasonable belief that there is a threat to the telecommunications system. One, the word “system” might be an overly broad way of categorizing the telecommunications infrastructure and, two, when dealing with individuals, there could be some room for potential abuses.

I was hoping the member could talk to us about his perspective on ways we could perhaps strengthen this legislation to ensure that individual Canadians with concerns are not being in any way targeted by this legislation.

[Translation]

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: Mr. Speaker, that is why I was saying that it is important for the committee to do a thorough job. It must ensure that the bill's objective, which is commendable, is not pursued without regard for the consequences, which could be devastating.

Our remarks are summed up nicely in the testimony of the Privacy Commissioner of Canada. He said that he supported the idea but urged caution. Are there safeguards in place, given that it would be possible to use the data, to discover people's personal online search history and to look at their old emails? Does the bill not go a bit too far? Should we not make it clear that these things should not be done at all costs? They are already happening in the context of criminal investigations, but that is not the case here.

[English]

Leslyn Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today with heavy concerns about Bill C-8, a proposed law presented as a measure to secure Canada's telecommunications and critical infrastructure.

I think we can all agree that cybersecurity is very important. Our information networks are the lifeblood of our economy, education, health systems and daily lives. Protecting this critical infrastructure is essential, but without liberty, there can be no security. As such,

my speech today will focus on how Bill C-8 would impact the individual liberties of average Canadians.

Bill C-8 would grant the federal government sweeping powers. It would allow the Minister of Industry, with direction from cabinet, to order telecommunications service providers like Rogers, Telus and Bell to act, refrain from action, remove equipment, prohibit certain services and, in extreme cases, suspend or terminate services to individual users. While Bill C-8's intention is to focus on service providers, it indirectly encroaches on the fundamental freedoms of Canadians by failing to carve out an exemption for individual Canadians who rely on the Internet and telecommunications to work, travel, communicate, engage in commerce and banking and connect in their virtual communities.

Consider what that means in practical terms. In today's world, losing access to telecommunications or the Internet is not just a minor inconvenience; it is a form of isolation. It can prevent someone from working, learning, paying bills, accessing health care and participating in civic life. It is, in essence, a digital prison.

The gravest concern about Bill C-8 is that it contains provisions of secrecy and non-disclosure. A person whose Internet is cut off may not know why their service was terminated. They may not know the evidence against them. They may not have a meaningful opportunity to defend themselves. A Canadian could be trapped in a digital prison with no way to challenge it. Bill C-8 therefore breaches fundamental guarantees under the Charter of Rights. This strikes at the heart of our Constitution.

Section 7 of the charter guarantees the following:

Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of the person and the right not to be deprived thereof except in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice.

Fundamental justice includes someone knowing the case against them and having a fair opportunity to defend themselves. Bill C-8, as it stands, would allow the government to deprive individuals of essential services without ever seeing the evidence, which is a profound breach of these principles.

Section 8 of the charter, which protects against unreasonable search and seizure, would also be engaged. The bill would allow the government to collect private information without consent and with minimal safeguards. This combination of secret orders and the lack of disclosure creates a scenario where Canadians' privacy and liberty are deeply at risk. Even if national security is invoked, section 1 of the charter requires that limitations on rights be proportionate, necessary and minimally impairing.

Secret orders, broad powers and no avenues for defence fail this test. Canadians should not have to surrender their rights to remain secure. Security and freedom can coexist. The government can both defend our telecommunications networks and protect the rights and freedoms of all Canadians.

Government Orders

Bill C-8 might secure networks, but as it stands, it risks imprisoning citizens digitally and denying them fundamental justice. In so doing, it would undermine the very freedoms we seek to protect. Let us not mistake security for liberty. Let us not trade the rights of Canadians for a false sense of protection.

• (1030)

Let me give a concrete example of how Bill C-8 could affect an ordinary Canadian. Imagine Sarah, a citizen frustrated with a government program she believes was mismanaged and corrupt. In her frustration, she posts online, threatening to expose government corruption. She threatens to reveal secret information she has collected about the program. The government views her post as a threat to the telecommunications system, so it quietly issues an order under Bill C-8. Her Internet provider receives direction to shut down her Internet and phone services, all without a court warrant or court order. The same provider is legally forbidden from disclosing the reason why Sarah's Internet was suspended. If the provider were to explain, it could face penalties and even jail. The next morning, Sarah is shocked to find that she cannot access her email, bank account or work portal. Her social media accounts are frozen. She cannot contact her friends, family or colleagues. She has been cut off entirely from the digital world and she has no idea why.

This is a system of double secrecy. The government order is hidden and the provider is prohibited from telling her anything. Sarah cannot see the evidence against her or ask questions, and she has no way of defending herself. She is effectively trapped in a digital prison. She is isolated, powerless and silenced.

Over the following days, the impact deepens. Sarah cannot pay her bills, participate in remote work, access health care portals or communicate with anyone. Eventually, she finds out the government is behind this, so she attempts to challenge the order, only to hear that any judicial review may involve secret evidence that she cannot see. The provider has the information but, under Bill C-8, is not allowed to share it. Every attempt to assert her rights is blocked. She is not merely inconvenienced; she is entirely cut off with no meaningful recourse.

This scenario is conceivable and would be legal under Bill C-8 as it stands. It illustrates why Bill C-8's secrecy and non-disclosure provisions are so dangerous to individuals. People may say this would never happen. The government will, no doubt, insist that the intent of the bill is clear, but why should Canadians trust it?

We must take the bill at face value. We must rely on what the text explicitly sets out in the law; otherwise, the law intended to protect telecommunications infrastructure could easily be weaponized by any government against ordinary citizens. Citizens most at risk are people like me. They are those who publicly and loudly express dissent, challenge orthodoxy or raise uncomfortable truths. These citizens most active in civil society are most at risk of being cut off, penalized and isolated without ever knowing why.

For these reasons, Bill C-8 undermines the principles of fundamental justice in the charter as it stands. Security in this context can be a pretext for control while transparency and liberty are sacrificed.

Sarah's story is not just a hypothetical; it is a warning. Bill C-8 risks turning ordinary Canadians into prisoners of secrecy, silenced without cause and stripped of their most basic rights. We can secure a network without the risk of trapping innocent citizens in a digital prison and without stripping them of the ability to defend themselves. This can be done. We can provide clear exemptions in the legislation for individual users, which should be part of what we discuss in committee. These are practical, reasonable measures that governments could adopt.

We owe it to all Canadians to do everything in our power to elect leaders who will not be silenced, who will protect their security and who will guard their freedoms, because freedom without security is a cage.

I am splitting my time with the hon. member for Kitchener South—Hespeler.

• (1035)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am not too sure if the member supports the legislation. It comes across that she has some concerns for individuals like Sarah.

I think the minister has been fairly clear as we have gone through this legislation that Bill C-8 is important for many different reasons. I recently highlighted that we need to protect the consumers of our economy through cybersecurity. It is not optional for the government to do it; it has to be done.

Would the member not, at the very least, agree that having cybersecurity to protect the Canadian economy is absolutely critical and that we need to have legislation? Maybe it is just a question of having some amendments to address some of the concerns the member has put forward.

Leslyn Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I want all Canadians to know that cybersecurity is an extremely important thing in this digital era. It is very important for the government to take this seriously.

This bill is a very important bill, but that does not mean there are not elements it that, as a legislator and a trained lawyer, I must bring to the public's attention. There are some concerns about how individual users are not properly treated in this bill, and they need to be corrected.

• (1040)

Ziad Aboultaif (Edmonton Manning, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my colleague is highlighting an important issue. We hear a lot of concerns from Canadians about Bill C-8. She included some of them in her speech. If she could shed light again on those concerns, it would be great.

Leslyn Lewis: Mr. Speaker, we recognize that there are times when our telecommunication infrastructure is threatened. In those instances, the government must act expeditiously to minimize and curtail that threat. However, these provisions can seep over into the realm of ordinary citizens. In the example I gave of Sarah, her entire life was unravelled because of this legislation.

I do not believe this should be the intent of this legislation. We really need to look at the impact of this legislation on ordinary individuals, because the average Canadian needs their telecommunications to facilitate every aspect of their life.

[*Translation*]

Madeleine Chenette (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages and to the Secretary of State (Sport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my hon. colleague for her speech.

I would like some reassurance. You said that this cybersecurity bill is important. You focused a lot on Sarah's story, and we certainly agree that it is important to protect people's privacy.

To reassure the public, could you tell us what benefits you see in passing this bill? Will you work with us at committee to get it passed?

The Deputy Speaker: I noticed the member used the word “you”. I would remind members that they must not address other members directly. They must address the Chair.

The hon. member for Haldimand—Norfolk.

[*English*]

Leslyn Lewis: Mr. Speaker, security is always an advantage to private citizens, but security cannot come at the expense of liberty. We have the Charter of Rights in place and it must be respected.

There are a number of provisions in proposed sections 11 and 12 of Bill C-8 that would infringe upon section 7 of the charter, because there is a deprivation of our essential services without procedural fairness. Proposed sections 10 and 11 of the bill would also infringe upon section 8 of the charter, because there is a deprivation of privacy and being secure against unreasonable search and seizure. Proposed sections 11, 14, 16, 18 and 19 of the bill would also infringe upon Canadians' liberties, because there is a deprivation of section 1, which includes justifiable limits in the proportionality of any legislation upon a person's freedom, even when national security is a justifiable ground under section 1.

There are benefits. Security is a benefit to Canadians, but it cannot come at the expense of liberty.

Matt Strauss (Kitchener South—Hespeler, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my learned friend from Haldimand—Norfolk's speech was terrific. She is a very tough act to follow.

When I read the bill for the first time, my jaw hit the floor. As I have previously discussed in the House, my motivation for signing up to become a politician was the violation of basic charter rights that the Liberals perpetrated in the last Parliament. Even with that background in mind, I had thought and hoped that they had perhaps been chastened and that they would not try so hard to claim unto

Government Orders

themselves, in the current Parliament, powers explicitly forbidden by our Constitution, but I was wrong.

Before I start talking about the bill today, let me just say that it has been shocking to listen to Liberals claim to defend charter rights, when they themselves violated section 2 and section 8 of our charter when they imposed the Emergencies Act. That was determined by Justice Mosley of the federal court. All the Liberal members in the last Parliament voted to do that, and I do not want to hear any more about defending charter rights from any such member who has not apologized for that violation.

As for the present bill, I am concerned by the following clauses. Clause 15.1 and clause 15.2 would give the minister the unprecedented, incredible power to kick any private Canadian citizen off the Internet, to cut off their phone line and to turn off their cell phone. That is the plain-language summary but I will quote now the bill in its legalese:

If there are reasonable grounds to believe that it is necessary to do so to secure the Canadian telecommunications system against any threat...the Minister may...

prohibit a telecommunications service provider from providing any service to [the] specified person.

Perhaps this might make sense to do in an extreme circumstance, if a person is trying to cause our satellites to crash or to jam military radar, but the clause does not use language about extreme threats of physical damage or threats to national security. It says “any threat”.

As far as I can tell, given the Liberals' incautious and bombastic use of terms like “misinformation”, that being any information they do not like, or “existential threat”, for instance when the hon. member for Burlington North—Milton West called the leader of my party an “existential threat to our democracy”, which is, of course, bananas, it seems to me that the industry minister could deem any speech they do not like “any threat”, and then kick that person off the Internet. The clause reaches Chinese Communist Party levels of government overreach, and the Liberals should be ashamed of themselves.

The bill gets worse; it does not get better. Subclause 15.2(5) would give the minister the ability to make secret the decision to kick someone off the Internet. Imagine that: Someone has annoyed the Liberal Party overlords, and the Liberal Party overlords have decided to kick the person off the Internet and cut their phone line. This person cannot tell anyone that they have been cut off. I have no idea how this could even possibly be enforced, but imagine being put, effectively, into a digital gulag, unable to use the phone, the Internet or one's online banking, and if the person tells anyone that this happened, they could go to physical jail.

Government Orders

I do not doubt that the Liberals will stand and say that I am being somehow outlandish in my interpretation of this. I am not; it is there in black and white. Let me quote it for them. It seems as though they have not read it: “An order made under subsection (1) or (2) may also include a provision prohibiting the disclosure of its existence, or some or all of its contents, by any person.” If members are not inclined to believe me, they can Google “Bill C-8” and “Canadian Constitution Foundation”. There they will find its publication from October 1, 2025, where its expert lawyers corroborate my concerns.

I am sorry to say that the bill continues to get worse; it does not get better. Clause 15.4 says, “The Minister may require any person to provide...within any time...any information that [would help her make a decision] under section 15.1 or 15.2”.

It seems to me that if the legislation passes in its current, unamended form, the Minister of Industry could wake up one morning and decide that any of us or any other private citizen may be, possibly, as she is not quite sure, some sort of threat to our telecommunications system. With no warrant, no trial and no automatic judicial review, she could compel Rogers or Telus to give her that citizen's address book, their Internet search history or their browser history.

This is unreasonable, and it is shocking. This is the Liberal Party under its new Prime Minister. Meet the new boss, same as the old boss. In my first speech to the House, I beseeched the new Prime Minister to discard this darkness and turn toward the light. By reintroducing the Trudeau legislation, he has failed to make the turn.

It is not just me raising these concerns. The Liberals tried to ram the bill through the last Parliament. Multiple civil society groups wrote an open letter to former minister Marco Mendicino, alerting him to the problems. Signatories to the letter include the Canadian Civil Liberties Association, the Canadian Constitution Foundation, the International Civil Liberties Monitoring Group, Ligue des droits et libertés, OpenMedia and the Privacy and Access Council of Canada.

• (1045)

Here is a quote from a summary of that letter: “Bill C-26 grants the government sweeping new powers not only over vast swathes of the Canadian economy, but also to intrude on the private lives of Canadians.”

Here is another quote: “Time and again, we’ve seen federal governments try to grant themselves the power to intrude on our private lives in the name of ‘security’ — and time and again, people in Canada have come together to push back.”

The summary of the letter also says that the bill “lacks guardrails to constrain abuse”, “permits unknowable orders to trump public regulation”, “authorizes the use of secret evidence in Court”, “grants power without accountability” and “lacks justification”; that is, the bill would not even fix the cybersecurity problems it purports to solve.

Do the Liberals believe that creeping authoritarianism worldwide and on this continent is a problem, or do they not? If they do, why have they written a bill with such authoritarian provisions? Why

have they failed entirely to take the advice of these civil liberties groups?

Once again, the bill will go to committee. Once again, Conservatives will be called upon to do the Liberals' homework and repair the deeply flawed bill. The offending provisions that I have described would not make us any safer. The industry minister's turning off a private Canadian citizen's cellphone would do nothing to stop hackers in Russia, China and Iran from wreaking havoc on our telecommunications infrastructure. The Liberals cannot fix the problem, because they do not understand the problem. They do not even understand where the problem is coming from. In the relatively uncommon situation where the threat is indeed coming from a private Canadian citizen in his mother's basement, why would they cut off his Rogers account? We can get a warrant, arrest him, have a trial in open court and put him in jail.

It is the Conservatives who care about and understand cybersecurity. People with even a passing familiarity of the day's news will recall that Conservatives called to ban Huawei from our 5G networks for three years before the members on the opposite side deigned to take that threat seriously.

We will salvage what is good out of the bill, and we are happy to do that work for the good of Canadians, but this cleanup job should not be necessary. If the Liberals would merely live up to their apparently insincere reverence for our charter rights, we would not even need to have this conversation.

• (1050)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is always interesting to hear Conservatives make extreme, outlandish claims. The member opposite tries to say that the Liberal Party is going to take away the Internet, take away cellphones and deny people the opportunity to do their banking. The Conservatives have come up with a whole conspiracy theory on how big government is going to take everything away, when the legislation is all about protecting Canadians and protecting the economy.

Does the member see any merit in having cybersecurity legislation that would ensure that the interests of Canadians are being served? This includes our economy and economic transactions that take place every day by the thousands. Does he not see the merit in protecting that?

Matt Strauss: Mr. Speaker, I wish this were a conspiracy. I wish the Liberals had the shame to keep it secret. It is open and it is in the bill. Multiple civil society groups have written letters asking them to change this. They are sounding the alarm.

The member said I think it is a conspiracy that the Liberals might freeze bank accounts. They already did that; the federal court said it was a violation of charter rights, and they have no response to that. I am asking them to apologize. They should stand up; they have a lot to say. Now would be a terrific time to apologize for violating our charter rights in the last Parliament.

An hon member: Oh, oh!

Matt Strauss: I am serious. I do not know why you are laughing.

The Deputy Speaker: I will just remind members to speak through the Chair.

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

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

These are the types of things that bring us to the House. On the one hand, we recognize there is an issue. Cybersecurity is of concern to all Canadians. We do lag behind our Five Eyes allies in this regard. On the other hand, we have to balance that with civil rights, the charter, which sometimes the Liberals want to talk about, except when they are alienating charter rights from people as often happens.

Can my hon. colleague speak about that balance: the need to address a problem and to do so while also respecting rights?

Matt Strauss: Mr. Speaker, my learned colleague is a lawyer. He understands the balance. His whole work has been in the tension in this balance, and I respect very much what he has to say about it.

It is a centuries-old problem, the tension between rights and security, and we have centuries-old solutions to the problem. We have solutions like warrants, judicial review, open trial, open evidence and the right to a lawyer. The bill would preclude all of that. We do not have to reinvent the wheel; we need to build back into the bill the long-standing, charter-upheld guarantees of our liberty. There is nothing novel about that.

[Translation]

Madeleine Chenette (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages and to the Secretary of State (Sport), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in a world where Canadians, such as the people of Thérèse-De Blainville, believe that our Canadian institutions are robust and that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms is protected, the question is whether we need to do more to protect ourselves against cyberthreats.

Is my colleague willing to work with the government to find the best solution to protect Canadians from cyberthreats? The charter is fully protected by our laws.

[English]

Matt Strauss: Mr. Speaker, yes, Conservatives will work day and night to fix the bill to improve our cybersecurity, in the committee, in every committee and in the chamber. We are committed to improving cybersecurity. We are committed to not violating charter rights.

Statements by Members

• (1055)

Ziad Aboultaif (Edmonton Manning, CPC): Mr. Speaker, obviously the government likes more control over Canadians through Bill C-8. Can the hon. member, through his wonderful and detailed speech, explain to us where the government wants overreach and more control over Canadians?

Matt Strauss: Mr. Speaker, it has unfortunately been a theme with the current government. It is not just Bill C-8; it is also Bill C-9. It is also Bill C-5 in certain respects. With every problem the Liberals come across, they think the solution is to give themselves more power. They think that if they were to run the telecommunications system, it would be safer. They have been running the Post Office for the last 10 years. They have been running the passport office. I do not see any evidence that putting them in charge of things, like our telecommunications system, makes anyone any safer.

The Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on the motion.

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion be carried or carried on division, or if a member of a recognized party participating in person wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: I ask that it pass on division.

(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to a committee)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that we recess until 11 a.m. to get us to members' statements.

SITTING SUSPENDED

The Deputy Speaker: The sitting is suspended to the call of the Chair.

(The sitting of the House was suspended at 10:57 a.m.)

SITTING RESUMED

(The House resumed at 11 a.m.)

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

• (1100)

[English]

CHARTER OF RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS

Gurbux Saini (Fleetwood—Port Kells, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I rise in the House to stress the importance of protecting the fundamental freedoms guaranteed by our charter. Our government remains deeply committed to defending the rights of all Canadians and takes pride in upholding the charter.

Statements by Members

Last week, this House witnessed members of the official opposition, including members of visible minority communities, supporting a motion urging the Attorney General to cease defending the charter. As parliamentarians, our duty is to protect the rights and dignity of every Canadian. This government has a constitutional and moral obligation to defend the charter fully and without compromise. By consistently upholding the charter, we safeguard the freedom that belongs to all Canadians.

* * *

PHILIP “ARN” BROWN

Kurt Holman (London—Fanshawe, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Philip “Arn” Brown, a man remembered for his faith, his generosity and his lifelong dedication to serving others. Arn gave countless hours to his church and community, always leading by example.

He was also a long-time board member of the London—Fanshawe Conservative Electoral District Association, where his encouragement and steady resolve inspired everyone around him. Arn reminded us that perseverance matters and that no challenge is too great when faced with determination. It was at church, shortly after the last election, that I shared with Arn the news that London—Fanshawe had finally turned blue. Though he was unwell, the sparkle in his eyes and his smile said it all.

Arn leaves behind his wife Ellen, his children Sean and Vanessa, and his grandchildren.

On behalf of the people of London—Fanshawe, I extend my condolences to his family and loved ones. His example of dignity, service and resilience will continue to inspire us all.

* * *

MILTON EAST—HALTON HILLS SOUTH

Kristina Tesser Derksen (Milton East—Halton Hills South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a beautiful time of year in southern Ontario, and many communities are celebrating the season with fall fairs and harvest celebrations. This past weekend, I joined my community in Milton East—Halton Hills South at two such events.

In Milton, I attended the 170th anniversary of the Milton Fall Fair, which has been a staple of the community since 1853. It continues to be organized by the Halton Agricultural Society and is 100% volunteer run and operated.

I was also pleased to join the residents of Glen Williams in celebrating its 200th anniversary at the Glen Williams Bicentennial Fair. Founded well before Confederation, along the banks of the Credit River, the original sawmill is still standing, now converted into the Williams Mill Creative Arts Studios, serving the community as it did 200 years ago.

These volunteer-run events provide a wonderful opportunity to reconnect with friends and neighbours and celebrate the bounty of nature that Canada is blessed with. I congratulate and thank all the volunteers who make it possible.

PUBLIC SAFETY

Branden Leslie (Portage—Lisgar, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals' reckless bail laws are destroying lives.

Kellie Verwey of Portage la Prairie was just 28 years old. She had a bright future and friends and family who adored her. All of that was ripped away when she was killed because of the actions of James Lorne Hilton, a repeat offender who should have never been free.

Hilton had a long criminal history. He broke his bail conditions again and again, yet the system looked the other way. Instead of protecting Kellie, it protected him. Because of that failure, her parents lost their daughter and her fiancé lost his soon-to-be wife.

Kellie's death was not fate; it was preventable. Her story serves as a painful reminder of the human cost of a broken system that puts criminals ahead of victims. Earlier this year, thousands of Canadians signed my petition calling on the government to act. Now is the time. There is simply no reason to wait. I plead with the Liberals to pass our Conservative jail not bail act because no family should ever get the call that their loved one is not coming home thanks to a broken bail system.

* * *

• (1105)

[Translation]

STÉPHANIE BACHER

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, September 29 was the second anniversary of the death of my wife, Stéphanie Bacher.

Stéphanie was incredibly bright and quick-witted. She was committed to a fair and just society. She was a woman of conviction who stood up for what she believed in. She was a passionate advocate for democratic principles, human rights and respect for everyone, regardless of their background, sexual orientation or religion. She firmly believed in the importance of committing to causes that matter, as well as the virtues of civic engagement.

She was a proud Montrealer living in Acadia, and she cared deeply about our beautiful French language. I have no doubt that she would have applauded the work I do to support the vitality of Canada's francophonie. Although she is no longer with us today, Stéphanie remains a constant source of inspiration, and everything I do in the House is to honour her memory.

[English]

FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION

Leslyn Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk, CPC): Mr. Speaker, across Canada, freedom of expression and freedom of religion are under attack. Since 2021, more than 100 churches have been burned or vandalized.

True democracy cannot survive without free expression, and Canada cannot flourish if Christians or other religious groups live in fear because of their faith. I stand here not just as a member of Parliament for the good people of Haldimand—Norfolk, but as a lawyer and a Christian who believes that freedom of expression is sacred.

It is a cornerstone of our democracy and a freedom that protects not only what we agree with but the truth that challenges us, the convictions that make us uncomfortable and the unbreakable spirit that stands unwaveringly with those who refuse to be silent in the face of injustice.

* * *

MILITARY SERVICE

Alana Hirtle (Cumberland—Colchester, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, for over a century the Ralston armoury has stood as Amherst, Nova Scotia's monument to national service, where the North Nova Scotia Highlanders answered the call and led the charge in two world wars and generations of young leaders have taken shape.

As our government works toward important NATO spending commitments, we will not only make the investments necessary for building up a strong, active-duty force; we have the opportunity to reimagine the structures and services these future veterans deserve. I am excited by the people and places ready to step up in this moment to answer a call to national service. The Ralston armoury is just one example of a place, and people, ready to serve.

I ask the House to consider supporting the motion I have put forward to help identify additional surplus resources to be mobilized for service.

* * *

COWICHAN LAND RULING

Chak Au (Richmond Centre—Marpole, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians work hard, save and sacrifice to buy their homes, and they expect their government to protect that investment, but Justice Young's ruling on the Cowichan land claim has shaken the very foundations of private ownership, what Canadians know as “fee simple title”, which guarantees the safety and security of their homes.

Instead of standing up for Canadians, this government chose politics over people's property rights. It issued a directive telling its lawyers to abandon the very argument that protects home ownership. Since that judgment was made, Canadians have heard nothing but silence. Families feel betrayed when their own government walks away from them.

Statements by Members

Will the government admit it was a mistake to give that directive, and will it now appeal the ruling with a full defence of home ownership and scrap that directive immediately?

* * *

[Translation]

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Marilène Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the tariff war is ramping up, but Ottawa is abandoning workers in rural areas as if the dispute were over.

Starting October 11, the federal government is cutting back on temporary employment insurance measures and lowering the unemployment rate that is used to determine eligibility. Worse still, it is creating two classes of workers by favouring those whom Ottawa describes as “long-tenured” workers over seasonal workers and workers in more volatile industries.

Once again, we need to remind the people in Ottawa that seasonal workers are “long-tenured” workers. Their jobs are seasonal, but the workers themselves are permanent, as are the needs of their families.

On October 11, instead of copying Stephen Harper's measures and depriving rural workers of EI, the Liberals must renew all the flexible measures for workers. Above all, they need to bring in the comprehensive EI reform they have been promising for more than 10 years.

* * *

● (1110)

[English]

OTTAWA CENTRE

Yasir Naqvi (Ottawa Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, even though the summer is in the rear-view, I want to share how exciting it was. Ottawa Tourism reports that from June to August, our city saw a 5% increase in hotel demand and a 7% jump in visitor spending compared to last year. July and August broke records. That is hundreds of thousands of people choosing to visit Ottawa. What brought them here? It was world-class events like Bluesfest, the inaugural Ironman Canada-Ottawa and the Canadian Track and Field Championships.

Thanks to the Canada Strong Pass, our national museums, including the Agriculture and Food Museum, the Museum of Nature and the War Museum in my community of Ottawa Centre, brought in unmatched crowds. We can add in the buzz of Metcalfe Plaza by the Downtown BIA, the new Uncommon event space by the Centretown BIA and countless festivals.

We are revitalizing our downtown through community and culture.

Statements by Members

[Translation]

JEAN-PAUL CROTEAU

Eric Lefebvre (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it was with great sorrow that I learned of the passing of Jean-Paul Croteau, former mayor of Victoriaville, on September 21, 2025. That same Sunday, I tried to call him but got no answer. Little did I know that that would be the last message I left for my mentor.

Mr. Croteau was the one who approached me in the early 2000s and asked me to become a city councillor in Victoriaville. He always wanted me to stop by and see him. Naturally, he would take advantage of every visit to make a few little political suggestions.

This amazing community builder served as the executive director of the Bois-Francs school board for over 22 years, while also serving as a municipal councillor for the former municipality of Arthabaska and then the city of Victoriaville for 15 years before becoming mayor in 1999. He was made a member of the Order of Canada in 1989 and awarded the Queen Elizabeth II Diamond Jubilee Medal in 2012 in recognition of his work.

From the bottom of my heart, I thank Mr. Croteau for everything. I extend my deepest condolences to his children, Jean-Sébastien and Anne-Marie, as well as to his grandchildren and friends.

* * *

[English]

FALL FLAVOURS FOOD AND DRINK FESTIVAL

Kent MacDonald (Cardigan, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is harvest time on Prince Edward Island. What better way to celebrate than the Fall Flavours Food and Drink Festival? The festival runs until October 11. This annual event highlights the best island flavours and hospitality with farm fresh produce and delicious seafood. In the Cardigan riding, communities are hosting many unforgettable experiences, such as the Taste of Georgetown in the historic Kings Playhouse theatre, the lively Whoa Nellie Fiddler's Feast in Murray Harbour, the Flavours in Concert in the hills of Caledonia, and the Ultimate Chefs Table in Greenwich overlooking Saint Peters Bay. Fall Flavours reminds us that, when Islanders come together to share food, music and tradition, we are strengthening our communities.

Visit Prince Edward Island this autumn season. Come across the Confederation Bridge for \$20 or take the ferry for half the cost and savour the best we have to offer. We are Canada's food island—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Edmonton Manning.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Ziad Aboultaif (Edmonton Manning, CPC): Mr. Speaker, when the Prime Minister promised the fastest-growing economy in the G7, we thought he meant Canada. He obviously did not. Canada has the fastest-shrinking economy, the second-highest unemployment, the worst household debt and the most expensive housing in the G7. It is just another broken Liberal promise.

The Prime Minister said to judge him by the prices at the grocery store. Food prices are rising faster today than before he came to office. It is just another broken Liberal promise. He promised to spend less, but record government spending is up an additional 8%. It is just another broken Liberal promise. He promised to build, but he cannot get shovels in the ground. He promised new homes, but cannot get them built.

Everything the Prime Minister says is another broken Liberal promise.

* * *

ALFIE MACLEOD

Mike Kelloway (Sydney—Glace Bay, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise today to mark the passing of Alfie MacLeod. Alfie's life was rooted in service to others. During his many years in politics, he embodied the values of hard work, humility and a very deep love for Cape Breton. Alfie never lost sight of the people behind the issues, and he approached every challenge with both determination and compassion. I had the privilege just last year of presenting him with the King's medal. That honour reflected not only his years of service but also the respect, admiration and affection he earned across Cape Breton island.

Alfie's humour, kindness and unwavering commitment to Cape Breton will not be forgotten. He leaves such a great void. Alfie was a unifier. He was not a divider.

To his wife, Shirley, his children, Sandra, Jessica and Daniel, and all his family, I extend my deepest condolences. Alfie's impact will be felt for a very, very long time.

Rest easy, Alfie.

* * *

● (1115)

COST OF FOOD

Tony Baldinelli (Niagara Falls—Niagara-on-the-Lake, CPC): Mr. Speaker, every dollar the Liberals spend comes out of the pockets of Canadians and inflates the price of everything, including food. The Prime Minister told Canadians when he was sworn in that they should judge him by the cost at the grocery store. Well, the results are in after six months in office. Food Banks Canada has given the Prime Minister and his Liberal government a D on poverty and food insecurity after both rose by almost 40%. Sadly, organizations such as the Daily Bread Food Bank in Toronto said it expects to exceed four million visits in 2025, twice what it saw two years ago. In my own community of Niagara Falls, one in seven residents visit our local food bank, Project Share.

The Liberals should be ashamed of themselves. Conservatives have offered a simple solution, which is to stop the hidden Liberal food taxes on fuel, fertilizer and farm equipment. Instead, the Liberals voted against our recent Conservative motion.

Conservatives will keep fighting for affordability, even when the Prime Minister and the Liberals will not.

* * *

CANADIAN WALK FOR VETERANS

Ernie Klassen (South Surrey—White Rock, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the community of South Surrey—White Rock came together for the eighth annual Canadian Walk for Veterans, a tribute to the brave men and women who have served our country. This walk is not only a moment of reflection and appreciation but also a commitment to ongoing support for our veterans and their families.

I would like to take this moment to sincerely thank Marc Burchell, whose vision and leadership continue to inspire this walk, and Dr. Matthew Kane, co-founder of the walk and a Royal Canadian Navy veteran who understands the challenges of transitioning to civilian life, for their dedication and tireless work in supporting veterans. I would also like to thank the City of White Rock for its continued partnership and support and all the volunteers and dedicated supporters who show up not just today but every day for our veterans. This year, over 20 Canadian cities from coast to coast to coast hosted events, raising over \$100,000.

I thank all veterans for their service and sacrifice.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[English]

EMPLOYMENT

Chris Warkentin (Grande Prairie, CPC): Mr. Speaker, before the election, the Prime Minister said that it was “elbows up”. That was his solution to save Canadian jobs.

After the election, it has been elbows down, and since then he has been flying all around. He met with the Chinese and, after that meeting, they raised tariffs on Canadian farmers and seafood. He met with the Americans and, after that meeting, they raised tariffs higher on Canadian lumber. He met with the British, and they said they were not dropping the tariffs on Canadian beef.

The Prime Minister is elbows up, elbows down, flying all around, and it has cost 86,000 Canadians their jobs. Everywhere he goes, things get worse.

When will the Prime Minister just stop and park the jet before he costs more Canadians their jobs?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the idea that the Prime Minister is flying around the world without bringing back, to Canada, productive results is a ludicrous one.

We have signed landmark agreements in Europe. We have signed landmark agreements in Asia. We have gone to Mexico and signed landmark agreements with the administration there.

Oral Questions

The Prime Minister is active. He is out there building export markets. He is out there building opportunities for Canadians. He is building Canada strong.

Chris Warkentin (Grande Prairie, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister promised that he was going to fix the disaster that Justin Trudeau left, but 86,000 Canadians have lost their jobs since the Prime Minister took office.

Just this last week, 900 Calgarians lost their job at Imperial Oil, 300 jobs are threatened at Kap Paper, and GM has announced that it is moving jobs from Oshawa back to the United States.

The Prime Minister was elbows up, elbows down and flying all around. This guy promised that he was going to be different than Justin Trudeau, but just like Trudeau, he has been jet-setting, talking to fancy people and taking care of his Liberal friends while Canadians are losing their jobs.

Why will the Prime Minister not admit that he is just like Justin Trudeau and just another Liberal?

Karim Bardeesy (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is for this exact reason that we are doing the work of going around the world to attract new investment and to do these major deals. We are always going to stand on the side of Canadian workers and Canadian employers.

That is why we put together one of the most comprehensive response funds with a strategic response fund of \$5 billion. We will always be there for Canadian workers and Canadian businesses.

• (1120)

John Brassard (Barrie South—Innisfil, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as impossible as it may seem, things are worse under the Prime Minister than they were under Justin Trudeau.

While those connected to the Prime Minister, his corporate buddies, Liberal-connected insiders and lobbyists, are doing just fine, 86,000 Canadians have lost their jobs since he became the Prime Minister. Canada now has the second-highest unemployment rate in the G7. Our productivity as a country is nearing developing-nation status.

Why are the policies of the Prime Minister designed to benefit his corporate buddies and Liberal insiders while Canadians pay the price?

Oral Questions

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Health announced that five million Canadians are now getting affordable dental care in this country.

I just want to tell the story of one individual I met in my own riding just before the last election. He had just had his teeth fixed after 20 years of not having a plan. This fully employed worker did not have benefits that could provide for him to have oral health. He said to me, “I sure hope you win again, so that I can get my lower teeth fixed.” That is exactly what we did for this man.

John Brassard (Barrie South—Innisfil, CPC): Mr. Speaker, they are also checking the stock price of Brookfield-related companies. Nearly \$60 billion in investment has fled the country, mostly to the place where the Prime Minister has 93% of his investments, the United States.

He promised he would handle Trump and negotiate a win by July 16, then it was July 21 and then August 1. It is October 3. He promised strength but has shown weakness.

Oshawa, Kapuskasing and Calgary have all been devastated with job losses this week. How many more families need to lose their jobs and how many more businesses need to close before the Prime Minister wakes up to the reality that what he is doing is not working?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would simply point out to the member that Canada's economy continues to grow, wages continue to grow, interest rates are down, and the Prime Minister is creating opportunities for Canadians in export markets and for Canadians here at home.

We are going to be building major projects. We are going to be building them with Canadian steel, Canadian aluminum, Canadian lumber and with Canadian skilled trades men and women.

The Prime Minister is on the job on the economy. The Conservatives need to wake up to that.

[*Translation*]

Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent—Akiawenhrak, CPC): Mr. Speaker, during the G7 summit, the Prime Minister stated that he would reach a successful deal with the United States by July 16. This did not work out. Then he said that it would be done by July 21. Again, this did not work out. Lastly, he said that it would be done by August 1, and once more it did not work out.

The bottom line is that 86,000 Canadians have lost their jobs since he became Prime Minister.

Why are Canadians losing their jobs? Is it because of the Prime Minister's failed diplomatic efforts or because of his bad economic policies?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians chose the Prime Minister and government that they believed would be the best at standing up for Canada.

We have announced agreements with Europe, Asia and Mexico. Yes, the Prime Minister will be going to Washington next week to continue the admittedly arduous process of negotiating with the United States.

I know that Canadians have great faith that our Prime Minister will carry out this mission.

Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent—Akiawenhrak, CPC): Mr. Speaker, let us talk about the Prime Minister. He got himself elected six months ago by saying “elbows up”. What did he do when he got to the White House? He put his elbows down and gave Mr. Trump a thumbs-up. Now he is crawling back. He went from elbows up to knees down.

That is the reality. Canadians were misled by the “elbows up” Prime Minister. The results prove it. The tariffs have doubled since the Prime Minister took office. Some 86,000 jobs have been lost in Canada. That is the reality today for Canadians.

Will the Liberal government wake up and finally take action for Canadian workers?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind my hon. colleague that, of all the countries in the world, Canada has the best agreement with the United States and the lowest tariffs: 85% of our economy is exempt from the U.S. tariffs.

I think that all the Canadians watching us know that the situation with the United States is complicated right now, but despite that, our country is faring the best.

Every month since the beginning of the year, Canadians' incomes have outpaced the cost of living. The Prime Minister is the best person in the world to help us face these challenges.

* * *

• (1125)

FORESTRY INDUSTRY

Alexis Deschênes (Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Lestiguj, BQ): Mr. Speaker, our forestry industry just got more catastrophic news. Donald Trump just announced an additional 10% tariff on our lumber, on top of the existing illegal 35% tariffs. This is devastating news, especially since the funding that the Liberals announced at the beginning of August has still not been released.

Unifor is calling on the federal government to wake up. Its Quebec director says that the industry urgently needs help now, not two weeks from now.

When will the federal government finally implement a real strategy to support our forestry industry?

Karim Bardeesy (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Industry and other ministers are fighting for workers, particularly in the softwood lumber industry. For example, in the case of Kap Paper in northeastern Ontario, meetings are being held with management.

We have the backing and support of the strategic response fund. We are providing a great deal of support to workers at these companies. We will always work on behalf of workers and businesses.

Alexis Deschênes (Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Lis-tuguj, BQ): Mr. Speaker, let us hope that the Prime Minister's trip to Washington next Tuesday will be more fruitful, because so far, Canada has been negotiating so poorly that it is easier to import European lumber into the United States than Quebec lumber.

In the meantime, the assistance for the sector is stuck in Ottawa's coffers, while Quebec's entire forestry industry is in jeopardy. Tariffs have caused the price of lumber to drop by 15% since July across the board, even for companies that do not do business in the United States. Our sawmills are operating at a loss, even when they sell domestically.

When will the federal government get the financial support out the door?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, obviously, the forestry industry has not been doing well when it comes to foreign trade for quite some time now. We believe that the tariffs and the actions taken by our neighbours to the south are completely unjustified, wrong and bad for consumers in the United States.

We will always stand up for our forestry sector. In my own region and in that of my colleague from Pontiac—Kitigan Zibi, in Maniwaki, we have workers who are affected.

We will always stand up for our workers and the forestry industry.

* * *

CANADA-U.S. RELATIONS

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot—Acton, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in June, the Prime Minister said that he would reach an agreement with Donald Trump within 30 days. Since then, he has chalked up one defeat after another.

Our softwood lumber industry is being hit with new tariffs, talks are under way to allow more American milk into the country, Ottawa has eliminated the digital services tax, and now it is backtracking on a global minimum tax for U.S. giants that use tax havens. It is just one defeat after another.

The Prime Minister is meeting with Donald Trump on Tuesday. He cannot afford another defeat.

What is he going to bring back from Washington?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have always said that we intend to work relentlessly to negotiate and sign agreements with the United States. We believe that

Oral Questions

the steps it has taken toward the forestry sector, and the tariffs in general, are completely unjustified.

The Prime Minister will, of course, be visiting the White House next week to continue this process. Canadians can rely on our Prime Minister, our diplomatic team and the Minister responsible for Canada-U.S. Trade to negotiate and sign agreements that will secure our economic future.

* * *

[English]

JUSTICE

Leslyn Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-75, the Liberal soft-on-crime bill, allows violent offenders to be released on bail. These offenders are not being punished; the good people of Canada are. My community of Haldimand—Norfolk is still heartbroken by the murder of 28-year-old Greg Pierzchala, a constable at work who was killed by a violent offender released on bail.

The Prime Minister promised to reverse Liberal bail laws. Will he finally keep his word or get out of the way so Conservatives can fix this crime mess?

Patricia Lattanzio (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we recognize the seriousness of intimate partner violence. Addressing it requires tough laws and thoughtful laws developed with survivors, communities and all levels of government to achieve real solutions.

With Bill C-75, we strengthened Canada's response to IPV by defining an intimate partner in the Criminal Code, creating a reverse onus for repeat offenders and ensuring that judges consider prior convictions. Penalties are higher for repeat IPV, and it is shameful the Conservatives want to repeal this provision.

● (1130)

Leslyn Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my question was about a police officer who was killed in the line of duty, and it was not answered.

The Prime Minister promised to fix the justice system and the bail system, and every day, victims continue to die. Gun crimes are up 130% under Liberal bail laws. Lives are at stake and Canadians cannot wait another day.

If Liberals are serious about bail reform, why will they not support our common-sense Conservative Bill C-242, the jail not bail act? When will the Liberals scrap their failed bail laws or get out of the way so Conservatives can do it?

Patricia Lattanzio (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging to see there is an alignment between the Conservative opposition and this newly elected Liberal government when it comes to improving public safety, including through the adoption of stronger laws to build safer communities.

Oral Questions

I have good news for my colleagues. The Minister of Justice will be introducing new legislation this parliamentary session to strengthen bail reform in this country and have harsher sanctions for violent repeat offenders to make sure that we have the support to help keep communities safe and make direct investments in law enforcement.

They want to do the work. We want their support.

Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, business owners in my province feel like they are under siege. There are break-ins, theft, arson, smashed windows, extortion and open drug use. Prolific offenders are wreaking havoc on our streets. In Kelowna, a recent report reveals that just 15 criminals were responsible for over 1,300 police reports in 2024. The Liberals' catch-and-release Bill C-75 forces courts to release violent career criminals at the earliest opportunity under the least onerous conditions.

Will the Prime Minister scrap his failed hug-a-thug policies and adopt our jail not bail bill, or will he get out of the way and let Conservatives do it?

[Translation]

Jacques Ramsay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, everyone in Canada deserves to feel safe. We heard Canadians and we are acting on that. We are taking action. We are bringing forward bail reforms. We are going to introduce longer, tougher sentences for repeat offenders and violent criminals, and we are taking action in communities to stop drug trafficking, limit illegal firearms and get assault weapons off the streets.

We are taking action for Canadians. We are listening to Canadians.

[English]

Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister promised bail reform, and he has broken that promise.

Last fall, a senior in my riding, Bob Hubbard, returned home to find his home being robbed. When he tried to stop the perpetrators, they ran him over, dragged him down the road and left him for dead. They were caught that same day and released hours later, while Mr. Hubbard lay in hospital with life-threatening injuries. This is the Liberal government's legacy.

Conservatives are proposing a solution. Will the Prime Minister scrap his failed bail policies or get out of the way so we can do it?

[Translation]

Jacques Ramsay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our condolences go out to the victim and to the families. These are unbearable situations. We are going to do everything we can to keep them from happening.

The Conservatives have a single solution to all the problems: build prisons. We are going to do a lot more than that. We are going to reform the bail system. We are going to impose harsher sentences. We will also ensure that law enforcement, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the Canada Border Services Agency are better equipped. We are going to make sure that Canadians feel safe.

[English]

Michael Kram (Regina—Wascana, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Liberal bail has unleashed crime and chaos on our streets. The Liberals' law, Bill C-75, requires courts to release violent career criminals at the earliest opportunity under the least onerous conditions. Just two weeks ago in Regina, a man under a probation order terrorized a neighbourhood by chasing multiple people down the street with a machete.

The Prime Minister promised to flip-flop on bail, but his bail laws are still in place six months after taking power. Will the Prime Minister scrap Liberal bail, or will he get out of the way and let us do it?

Patricia Lattanzio (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, will we let them do the work? We will take no lessons from the Conservatives' outrageous record on crime legislation. In 2008, the tackling violent crime with firearms act was struck down in the Nur case. In 2009, the Truth in Sentencing Act was struck down in the Safarzadeh-Markhali case. In 2011, the ending sentence discounts for multiple murders act was overturned in Bissonnette. The list goes on and on.

Let me assure the House that we are working on a serious bail reform bill that is fully constitutional and strong against repeat violent offenders. This is the kind of—

● (1135)

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Regina—Wascana has the floor.

Michael Kram (Regina—Wascana, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister promised criminal justice reform, but half a year later he has broken that promise. Liberals are obstructing the jail not bail act from passing, keeping in place Liberal soft-on-crime, catch-and-release laws. Because of lax Liberal bail laws, homicides are up nearly 30%, auto theft is up 25% and sexual assaults are up 76%.

Today, Conservatives are proposing to pass the jail not bail act immediately to keep Canadians safe. Will the Liberals scrap their failed bail policies, or will they get out of the way and let Conservatives do it?

Oral Questions

Patricia Lattanzio (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have said it time and time again: Canadians deserve to feel safe in their communities. Our government is cracking down on repeat violent offenders with new legislation to strengthen bail, sentencing and court efficiency. We are working closely with provinces and territories to reform bail and sentencing and address delays, giving police and prosecutors stronger tools to keep violent offenders off our streets. This is what Canadians elected us to do: improve public safety, restore confidence in the justice system and ensure violent offenders face real consequences.

We are ready to do the work and we will do it.

* * *

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Alex Ruff (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as I am speaking, there is a ceremony going on in Owen Sound paying tribute to Corporal Robert Thomas James Mitchell, who made the supreme sacrifice in Afghanistan 19 years ago today. Over 100,000 Canadians have made the supreme sacrifice in service to Canada. On Remembrance Day in my hometown of Tara, 200 names will be read out.

Many ridings have dozens of cenotaphs that request wreaths for Remembrance Day. The Liberals are now telling MPs that VAC will only pay for two.

Veterans Affairs uses the tag “Canada Remembers” on social media, so why is the Liberal government now choosing to forget our veterans?

Hon. Jill McKnight (Minister of Veterans Affairs and Associate Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for his service.

I remain committed to ensuring that all those who have served and continue to serve are honoured meaningfully and respectfully. Proposed changes for the wreaths for parliamentarians program were made with the understanding that MPs would work directly with the Royal Canadian Legion, with proceeds supporting their local branches.

I am learning the changes could be significantly disruptive to Remembrance Day. I have instructed my department to revert to the previous format for this year.

This Veterans' Week, I encourage all Canadians to support their local legions and support the work our veterans have done for this country.

* * *

[Translation]

CANADA POST CORPORATION

Marilène Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of the week, the Prime Minister and the Minister of Jobs have been asking Canada Post and the union to go back to the bargaining table to settle the general strike. Before this government got involved, there was no general strike. Before last week, the parties were negotiating. The union was waiting for an offer from the employer, and mail was being delivered.

Will anyone on the government side recognize that the Liberals are the only ones responsible for the crisis at Canada Post?

Hon. Joël Lightbound (Minister of Government Transformation, Public Works and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my colleague has a short memory. In November 2024, Canada Post employees were on strike in the weeks leading up to Christmas. This labour dispute has been going on for 20 months.

As far as we are concerned, it is now essential that we modernize this institution, which, I would remind the House, is losing \$10 million a day. Canadians are paying \$10 million a day to keep the lights on at Canada Post. I understand that the Bloc Québécois has never had to think about a budget. I understand that the Bloc members have the luxury of not taking things seriously and that they find this situation acceptable, but it is unacceptable to us. It is important that the union and management come to an agreement in the interest of all Canadians.

Marilène Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I hope the minister will not always be this arrogant. We are talking about thousands of workers who are at risk of losing their jobs and who have been calling for reform for 20 years. It is not like Canada Post only started losing \$10 million a day one year ago.

It takes some nerve to ask the two parties involved in the postal dispute to be reasonable and return to the bargaining table when it was the government that got them into this mess. This dispute is solely, completely and absolutely the Liberals' fault.

Even though we do not make budgets, we are all aware that Canada Post's business model needs a major overhaul. Did the Liberals give the union just two minutes' notice of their plans to—

● (1140)

The Deputy Speaker: The Minister of Government Transformation, Public Works and Procurement.

Hon. Joël Lightbound (Minister of Government Transformation, Public Works and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again, I would like to note that the labour dispute at Canada Post has been going on for 20 months.

If we wish to preserve this institution, which is essential across the country, reform is necessary. Although the Bloc Québécois may believe that Canada Post losing \$10 million a day is acceptable, it is not acceptable to us. I believe that the vast majority of Quebecers and Canadians would also not find this acceptable.

Moreover, many of the member's colleagues have been asking in committee for years that we transform and modernize Canada Post. That is exactly what we are doing. At this stage, I believe that the union and Canada Post's management need to find common ground that serves the best interests of all.

Oral Questions

[English]

EMPLOYMENT

Helena Konanz (Similkameen—South Okanagan—West Kootenay, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister promised he would negotiate a win by July. It is October and Canadians are losing their jobs. Canada has the second-highest unemployment in the fastest-shrinking economy in the G7. Mills are closing in communities throughout B.C., putting hundreds of people out of work.

Why are Canadians losing their jobs? Is it because of the Prime Minister's failed diplomacy abroad, or is it the job-killing economic policies at home?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, every time the Conservative Party has had a chance to vote with workers, they voted against them. Whether it is for skills training, investment in unions and union training, or investments in major projects, they vote against these things time and time again. The member's question is a little hollow, I would say. Conservative Party members know it too.

We are sitting on this side of the House because Canadians believe in governments that invest in them. We will keep doing that.

Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the minister is talking verifiable nonsense. She knows or should know that our platform clearly committed to significant increases in support for union-based training.

The minister should listen better, because yesterday, business leaders from Toronto came to committee and ripped into the government. They described how 10 years of bad Liberal policies have created worsening structural unemployment. Canada has the second-highest unemployment in the fastest-shrinking economy in the G7.

Will the minister now admit that failing economic policies at home and broken promises on the world stage are causing an unemployment crisis?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, unlike the member opposite, Canadians understand there are structural changes in the global economy. They are counting on a government that will put the investments into their lives, into their workforces, into their training and into their families to ensure they get through this tough time. That is what Canadians know. They know they need a government that believes in them and their capacity, and that empowers them to reach their full potential. That is why, in the last election, they chose the Liberal government.

Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the minister loves self-congratulations, but I have a simple message for her: It is not working. Canadians are not working because Liberal policies are not working. It is simply in the numbers. We have the second-highest unemployment rate in the G7. We have effectively lost over 100,000 jobs in the last month. Youth unemployment is at its worst level in 25 years. EI claims among working-age women just jumped by 12%.

Regardless of the Liberals' intentions, the facts show that their policies are not working. When will they change course?

Leslie Church (Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretaries of State for Labour, for Seniors, and for Children and Youth, and to the Minister of Jobs and Families (Persons with Disabilities), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are not going to accept lectures from that side of the House when the record is crystal clear. Under the last Conservative government, Canada lost hundreds of thousands of manufacturing jobs.

It will not be on our watch. That is why we are building major projects that are going to create tens of thousands of good-paying union jobs right across the country. We are building affordable homes at a scale that we have not seen. We are creating good union jobs and investing in skills training.

Canadians chose a government that is going to move forward on these proposals. That is what we are going to do.

* * *

FINANCE

Aaron Gunn (North Island—Powell River, CPC): Mr. Speaker, last week it was revealed that Canada's budget deficit under the Liberal government is expected to increase to more than \$68 billion, a result of billions more in inflationary spending with no plan whatsoever to pay it back. On top of this, the Prime Minister is now planning to borrow another quarter of a trillion dollars over the next four years, almost double what Justin Trudeau was planning. There is no plan for balanced budgets and no sign of fiscal restraint.

When will the Liberals stop mortgaging our future and get Liberal spending under control?

● (1145)

Ryan Turnbull (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance and National Revenue and to the Secretary of State (Canada Revenue Agency and Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I know that the Conservative leader must be a little insecure about the size of his economic credentials, or lack thereof. I recognize that he will not listen to a former Bank of Canada governor, but maybe he will try listening to the current one.

Last week, the Governor of the Bank of Canada said that our government's plan to diversify trade and invest in large-scale infrastructure is going to help encourage businesses to take risks and would help boost productivity and growth. He said that productivity gains and the higher real incomes that come with them are "the only way to make everything more affordable".

Aaron Gunn (North Island—Powell River, CPC): Mr. Speaker, \$1 billion every single week is how much taxpayer money this government is wasting paying interest on the debt. We are now spending more in interest payments than we are on our entire health care system, the result of Liberal governments borrowing more money over the past 10 years than every other government in the history of this country combined. Now they want to borrow billions more.

When will the Prime Minister stop looking out for the big banks that lend the money and start looking out for the next generation of Canadians he is sticking with the bill?

Ryan Turnbull (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance and National Revenue and to the Secretary of State (Canada Revenue Agency and Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we know that Canada has the lowest effective tariff rate of any country in the world. We have a great, AAA credit rating and the lowest net debt-to-GDP ratio.

We cannot help it that the opposition and the opposition leader have no vision for the future of the Canadian economy. It is clear that Canadians understand who does have a vision for the Canadian economy. That is why they voted for this party to run the government. We have cut taxes and moved forward on the first round of major nation-building projects. What did the Conservatives say when we launched major projects worth—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Compton—Stanstead.

* * *

[Translation]

CANADA POST CORPORATION

Marianne Dandurand (Compton—Stanstead, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government recently announced measures to mitigate the financial crisis at Canada Post, which is losing \$10 million a day. Those measures include lifting the moratorium on rural post offices.

I want to remind members of the critical role that these post offices play in rural communities by maintaining services and social ties. In my riding, municipalities like Compton, Stanstead, North Hatley and Chartierville are currently subject to the moratorium.

Can the government's Minister of Transformation reassure the people in my riding that essential services in the regions will continue and that steps will be taken to ensure that rural residents are not left behind?

Hon. Joël Lightbound (Minister of Government Transformation, Public Works and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for her question and for all the groundwork she did to help the government transform Canada Post while ensuring that services in remote rural communities would continue. That is essential.

The objective is to give more flexibility to suburban and urban communities that are covered by the moratorium. We certainly do not want services in rural communities to be impacted. That is why I have asked Canada Post to come up with a plan to maintain these

Oral Questions

services in the regions, in my colleague's riding and in all rural ridings across the country.

We also have an accommodation program for seniors to ensure that people with limited mobility can get their mail. That is essential.

* * *

[English]

JUSTICE

Frank Caputo (Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals have unleashed crime and chaos on our streets. Bill C-75 said that repeat offenders need to be released at the earliest possible occasion on the least onerous conditions. Just this week in Kelowna, it was reported that 15 offenders were responsible for over 1,300 police calls. The Liberals promised we would get bail reform. We have seen nothing. Talk about a bait and switch.

Conservatives have a common-sense plan to scrap Liberal bail reform. Will the Liberals get behind us or let us do it for ourselves, yes or no?

Patricia Lattanzio (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have said it time and time again: The Minister of Justice will be introducing bail reform legislation this fall. We hope that if the Conservatives are really serious about doing the work, they will support this new legislation.

Let me remind the member opposite that the reality is this: In former Bill C-75, we strengthened Canada's response by defining "intimate partner violence" in the Criminal Code and created a reverse onus for repeat IPV offenders.

Canadians deserve a debate based on the facts. If the Conservatives want to repeal a bill that makes it harder for IPV offenders to get bail, they should do so and face the backlash from Canadians.

Frank Caputo (Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe the minister just said that. I just tabled a bill that would protect Canadians and victims of intimate partner violence. Instead of debating it next week, Liberals should vote for it right away.

So many Canadians have realized that the Liberals have broken their promise. They say what they are going to do. Why do they say what they are going to do? It is because they have not done anything. They have done jack squat when it comes to bail. They want to consult. They should read the newspapers.

Liberals need to get out of the way or support Bill C-242 so that we can get rid of Liberal bail. Will the Liberals support us, yes or no?

Oral Questions

● (1150)

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member knows full well that we have important, crime-fighting legislation before Parliament. He should get behind Bill C-2, the strong borders act. Just as my colleague indicated, we will be inviting him to get behind bail reform and measures to prevent intimate partner violence.

The problem with Conservative legislation is that it always ends at the Supreme Court. It gets struck down and laughed out of court because it is against the Constitution, against Canadian values and against the things we hold dear in terms of managing the justice system.

Mel Arnold (Kamloops—Shuswap—Central Rockies, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal bail law, Bill C-75, unleashed crime and chaos on our streets, releasing violent criminals at the earliest opportunity. While out on bail in Kelowna, a man convicted on domestic violence charges just hours before allegedly killed Bailey McCourt with a hammer. The Prime Minister promised Liberals would flip-flop on bail, but the Liberal laws are still in place six months after he took power.

Will the Prime Minister scrap Liberal bail or get out of the way so Conservatives can get it done?

[Translation]

Jacques Ramsay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, allow me to offer my condolences to the victim's family. We strongly condemn such actions and, above all, we want to keep them from happening again.

We are going to reform the bail system. It is coming. It is just around the corner. The Conservatives are dwelling on this issue, but there is no need. The legislation is coming.

We will also ensure that there are harsher sentences for repeat and violent offenders. We are going to hire 1,000 more people for the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and put 1,000 more people at the border. We are going to limit imports of illegal weapons—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Montmorency—Charlevoix.

Gabriel Hardy (Montmorency—Charlevoix, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canada has long been a country where families could walk the streets in peace, a country where people could get a coffee, go to the grocery store, go to the gym or even go out on the town without fearing for their lives.

However, after 10 years of Liberal attacks on our justice system, our country is becoming increasingly violent. There has been a 55% increase in violent crime, a 30% increase in homicides, a 76% increase in sexual assaults, and so on. Canadians no longer recognize this country, which once had strong laws, a serious criminal justice system, and harsh sentences.

Do the Liberals realize that they have failed to protect our people?

Jacques Ramsay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are taking plenty of measures to counter these events.

I would like to take this opportunity to address a few words to the family of Denis Blanchette and to Pauline Marois, former premier of Quebec. Having served as coroner during the Metropolis attack, I can finally tell them that we will be collecting the CZ 858, the weapon used by Richard Henry Bain at the Metropolis. I hope this will be some small consolation to them after all the anxiety and grief they have endured.

Canadians' safety will always be our top priority.

Gabriel Hardy (Montmorency—Charlevoix, CPC): Mr. Speaker, governing means looking ahead. Well, when it comes to justice, the Liberal government is not looking ahead very much. Its soft-on-crime laws allow the same violent criminals to be released over and over again.

When an individual is arrested 30 times, violates his conditions more than 15 times and is charged with domestic violence six times, no one should be surprised when irreparable harm is done. That is exactly what happened in Saint-Jérôme. The Liberals' soft-on-crime policies cost Gabie Renaud her life.

When will the Prime Minister realize that his policies have failed?

Jacques Ramsay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my thoughts are with Gabie Renaud's family and loved ones during this painful time. No one should have to experience such a tragedy.

Gender-based violence simply has no place in Canada. We will soon be introducing legislation to make it harder for violent offenders to get bail. We are going to make hate-motivated murder, including femicide, a first-degree murder offence.

We will always stand with victims.

* * *

● (1155)

[English]

THE ECONOMY

Rachael Thomas (Lethbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister said that he would be judged by the price of food at grocery stores as to whether or not he is successful. The data is in, and it does not look great. Due to the Liberals' hidden food taxes, Canadians are paying more than ever when they go to fill their fridge. The hidden carbon tax is applied to the production of food; the hidden plastic tax is applied to packaging, and the hidden tax known as inflation is applied to everything because of the government's out-of-control spending. All of these things add up, and Canadians are stuck with the bill.

Yesterday the Liberals blocked our Conservative motion to make food more affordable by scrapping these taxes. Why are the Liberals so hell-bent on making things tough for Canadians?

Oral Questions

Ryan Turnbull (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance and National Revenue and to the Secretary of State (Canada Revenue Agency and Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me be clear from the top: There is no tax on food.

Conservatives have obviously forgotten how fixed-income household budgets work. When families save money on their taxes, on gas at the pump, on child care, on school lunches and on dental checkups, they have more money to spend on groceries. All of these savings are Liberal Party and government initiatives, and all of them have been unanimously opposed by the Conservatives.

Why is it that every time Conservatives have a chance to stand up for Canadians, they get weak in the knees?

Rachael Thomas (Lethbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would invite the member to give that same passionate speech and those condescending talking points to the four million Canadians lined up at food banks in order to be able to feed their families. It is despicable and he should be ashamed.

Since the Prime Minister came to power, food prices have only gone up. Food prices are rising twice as fast as they did under former prime minister Justin Trudeau. Food insecurity is up by 128%, and one in four Canadians cannot even provide the very basic necessities of life for themselves. Meanwhile, the member opposite rolls his eyes and shakes his head as if I am saying something that does not matter to him.

Why does the government not—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Secretary of State for Sport.

Hon. Adam van Koevorden (Secretary of State (Sport), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, caring for Canadians means that we are putting forward actual measures that are going to support affordability, and we are also going to be honest with Canadians. We are not going to make up taxes like this made-up, “make plastic bags free again” motion the Conservatives put forward last week in order to pretend to care about food prices.

When the Conservatives read the Food Banks report, it would be really good if they read some of the recommendations. What the Food Banks report says is that we should strengthen our social safety net, build more affordable housing and support programs such as dental care, child care and the programs that are supporting lower- and middle-income families at the grocery store.

Kevin Waugh (Saskatoon South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, every single dollar that the Prime Minister spends comes out of the pockets of Canadians in the form of higher Liberal taxes and inflation. The Prime Minister said he would be judged by prices Canadians pay at the grocery store. A visit to the supermarket confirms that sugar is up 19%, strawberries are up 18% and even salad dressing is up 13%.

This week, the Liberals voted against our motion to stop taxing food and remove their hidden food taxes. Why?

Leslie Church (Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretaries of State for Labour, for Seniors, and for Children and Youth, and to the Minister of Jobs and Families (Persons with Disabilities), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let us be clear right off the top that there are no

hidden taxes on food and that this is a phantom that is created by the Conservatives.

Do members know what is true? What is true is the fact that the Conservatives have voted against the very things that are supporting families in my riding, whom I hear from all the time. There are families who talk about making sure their kids are getting a good lunch in school. They talk about the dignity of Canadians' having access to dental care, which is up to five million Canadians now. They talk about our tax-free Canada child benefit, which is helping put groceries on the table. They talk about affordable child care, which is saving families more than \$10,000 a year. That is our plan to help families.

Dave Epp (Chatham-Kent—Leamington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, with Thanksgiving just around the corner, let us reflect on some of the costs of the staples of the season: Apples are up 13%, sweet potatoes are up 8%, and chicken is up 10%. These increases are a direct result of the government's hidden food taxes: the industrial carbon tax, fuel standards regulations, the plastics ban and, especially, inflationary deficits.

Given these costs, what exactly are Canadians supposed to be thankful for this year as they struggle to put a turkey on their table and the necessities in their refrigerator?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as all Canadians and the good people of Chatham-Kent—Leamington know, there is no tax on food.

* * *

● (1200)

[*Translation*]

PUBLIC SAFETY

Hon. Greg Fergus (Hull—Aylmer, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, every October is Cybersecurity Awareness Month in Canada. This initiative aims to educate us all about the importance of good cybersecurity practices.

Can the parliamentary secretary tell us about the steps our government has taken to strengthen the cybersecurity of individuals and businesses in the face of increasingly sophisticated threats?

Jacques Ramsay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question. Bill C-8, an act respecting cyber security, is being debated today in the House. This legislation aims to secure Canada's critical infrastructure by bringing the Canadian telecommunications sector in line with other critical sectors of the Canadian economy.

Oral Questions

This bill will allow us to notify operators of threats and vulnerabilities so they can protect their systems and more importantly so they can avoid falling prey to nefarious actions. In recognition of Cybersecurity Awareness Month, I hope that our colleagues across the aisle will support Bill C-8.

* * *

[English]

THE ECONOMY

Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister said he would be judged by the prices at the grocery store, but I find it interesting that the Liberals do not think there are any hidden taxes. There is the industrial carbon tax, the food packaging tax, the second carbon tax and their inflationary deficits, which make prices at the grocery store higher and higher.

Why will the Liberals not scrap their hidden carbon taxes so that Canadians can afford to put food on the table?

Ryan Turnbull (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance and National Revenue and to the Secretary of State (Canada Revenue Agency and Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians know there is no tax on food, but all the food security experts in the country have been saying for generations that the answer to food insecurity is income security. That means jobs, but when the government announced the first round of major nation-building projects in the country, worth tens of thousands of well-paying jobs, the Conservative leader called those jobs “pathetic”. He called major nation-building projects worth tens of thousands of jobs for Canadians “pathetic”.

Members do not want to know what I think is pathetic.

Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, what an idiotic response. A thousand people just lost jobs—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Deputy Speaker: The member has to watch his words carefully in the House. I am just going to ask the member to retract the words, and he can restart his question.

Warren Steinley: Mr. Speaker, what a tone-deaf response that is. A thousand people lost jobs in Calgary. Under their failed Liberal policies, 86,000 people have lost their jobs. In Saskatchewan, 35% of people are food insecure, so he can go and tell them that he is going to take their jobs with the Liberals' energy policies.

My question is this: Will they scrap the hidden carbon tax and maybe have a heart for people who do not have jobs, so Canadians can put food on the table?

Leslie Church (Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretaries of State for Labour, for Seniors, and for Children and Youth, and to the Minister of Jobs and Families (Persons with Disabilities), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member opposite talks about having a heart. Let me tell members about having a heart for kids and our national school food program. That program is going to help half a million kids across the country. It is going to save parents up to \$800 a year. The Conservatives voted against it.

If the member opposite wants to talk turkey and wants to talk about how supply chain costs are coming down, let us talk about

how gasoline prices are down right now because we eliminated the carbon tax. Even the Bank of Canada does not think inflation is our core problem right now; it cut interest rates.

We are there for families; we are creating jobs. That is our plan—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Richmond—Arthabaska.

[Translation]

Eric Lefebvre (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Mr. Speaker, is the Prime Minister aware that every dollar he spends comes out of Canadians' pockets? Is he aware that Canadians are on a budget but that they still cannot make ends meet?

Is the Prime Minister aware that, since he took office, food prices have been rising steadily? Is he aware that over two million Canadians are using food banks every month?

Is the Prime Minister aware that, since the new government took office, food insecurity has increased by 128%? Is he aware—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Minister of Government Transformation, Public Works and Procurement.

Hon. Joël Lightbound (Minister of Government Transformation, Public Works and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I understand that my colleague is rather new in the Conservative Party but he has quickly learned the tricks, that is, repeating the same talking points using the same words as his colleagues. I give him credit for that.

In terms of his question, I have something to tell him. For the past 10 years, the party he is a member of voted against all measures to support Canadians, whether it be the Canada child benefit, the guaranteed income supplement or the school food program for children in schools. They voted against all of these measures to support Canadians.

On this side of the House, we know that we need to grow the economy and offer quality public services. That is exactly what we are doing.

• (1205)
[English]

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Ron McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as we prepare to mark Veterans' Week and Remembrance Day, young Canadians are learning about the invaluable contributions our Canadian Armed Forces have made around the world and here at home. How is the Minister of Veterans Affairs increasing youth engagement this year to help the next generation understand what it means to serve?

Hon. Jill McKnight (Minister of Veterans Affairs and Associate Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last week, I unveiled the 2025 Veterans' Week poster at Pinewood Elementary in Delta, B.C., joined by members of the 4th Canadian Ranger Patrol Group and the 39 Canadian Brigade Group. This year's theme, "Canadian Armed Forces in the Americas", recognizes the CAF's military supports across continents, from national security to disaster relief to humanitarian aid.

By helping young people understand more about who serves and why, we inspire the next generation of service and remembrance.

* * *

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Scott Reid (Lanark—Frontenac, CPC): Mr. Speaker, last week, I asked why there is still a 35% tariff on Russian fertilizer when it is clear that it is causing neither a net decline in Russian exports nor a fall in the price paid worldwide for Russian product. In Canada, no meaningful displacement of Russian imports with domestic production has taken place, so the result is that eastern Canadian farmers pay more for imports from third countries, creating a shortage in their markets, which is then filled by a full-priced product from Russia.

No other G7 country imposes this burden on its farmers. Why does the Liberal government continue to do so?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am going to withhold more severe judgment. The member may well know there is a war going on between Russia and Ukraine.

Canada is an important supplier of potash and Canada will continue to be one of the world's most important suppliers of potash. The member should well know that the only realistic fertilizer option for Canada is Russian or Belarusian fertilizer.

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, farmers have saved and replanted seeds for generations, but the government is proposing changes to plant breeders' rights that threaten this age-old practice. To make matters worse, consultations were scheduled during the summer and the harvest season, when farmers are busiest and least able to respond.

Does the Minister of Agriculture support the right of Canada's fruit and vegetable farmers to continue saving and using their own seeds, and will he abandon these reckless and harmful changes?

Sophie Chatel (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Food Inspection Agency is taking a balanced approach after having

Oral Questions

consulted more than 100 value chain stakeholders for over four years. Following the release of its report this summer, called "What we heard", the CFIA is currently engaging with stakeholders to modernize the regulation system in Canada with all of the input from stakeholders.

* * *

LABOUR

Leah Gazan (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals continue to punish workers for exercising their charter right to fight for fair wages and safe working conditions by abusing section 107 of the Canada Labour Code and forcing workers back to work. This undermines collective bargaining and the right to strike.

From Air Canada to Canada Post and from railways to ports, the Liberals side with big corporate executives. If the Liberals stand with workers, will the minister repeal section 107 of the Canada Labour Code now?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this government has supported organized labour in a number of ways, including, most recently, by standing with Canada's Building Trades Unions as we announced five major projects with their full support. We have invested in union training. We have invested in union supports. We have reversed harmful Conservative union-busting legislation.

Union members know we are there for them. As the minister of labour, I will work hard to make sure we get the balance right.

* * *

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Deputy Speaker: I draw the attention of hon. members to the presence in the gallery of the Hon. Ken Cheveldayoff, Minister of Advanced Education for the Province of Saskatchewan.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

*Routine Proceedings***ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

• (1210)

*[English]***FOREIGN AFFAIRS**

Hon. Adam van Koevorden (Secretary of State (Sport), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2) and consistent with the policy on the tabling of treaties in Parliament, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the treaty entitled “Amendments to Annex I of the International Convention Against Doping in Sport”, notified on October 1, 2023, and November 1, 2024.

* * *

LEADERS' DEBATES COMMISSION

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the Leaders' Debates Commission report, entitled “Debates - Democratic Exercises Serving the Voting Public: A report on the Leaders' Debates Commission 2025 federal election experience”.

* * *

PETITIONS**PUBLIC SAFETY**

Dan Mazier (Riding Mountain, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to present a petition on behalf on the constituents of Riding Mountain.

The people of Swan River are experiencing an alarming increase in violent crime, which has threatened the safety and well-being of families across our region. A recent report by the Manitoba west district RCMP found that over an 18-month period, four offenders in Swan River were responsible for 239 offences.

The petitioners continue to suffer the consequences of soft-on-crime Liberal policies like Bill C-5, which repealed mandatory jail time for serious crimes, and Bill C-75, which forces judges to release violent repeat offenders right back onto the streets. The petitioners in the Swan Valley want to see the end to the Liberals' reckless catch-and-release policies so that criminals can stay behind bars. That is why the people of Swan River are demanding jail, not bail, for violent repeat offenders.

I support the good people of Swan River.

COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to table a petition from Canadians who are deeply concerned about growing foreign ownership of our commercial fisheries.

The petitioners note that while the Department of Fisheries and Oceans is mandated to protect the stability and viability of Canadian fishing operations, in the Pacific region, there are no limits on the foreign acquisition of licenses and quotas, nor does Canada track the citizenship of those involved. They argue that this lack of oversight undermines Canadian-owned operations, hurts harvesters,

families and coastal communities, and conflicts with reconciliation efforts as first nations seek access. Foreign ownership also threatens food security and reduces Canadian fish processing jobs.

The House of Commons fisheries committee, in 2019, recommended that fisheries remain a common property resource for Canadians. The petitioners call on the government to immediately ban further transfers of Canadian licenses and quotas to foreign interests.

NATURAL HEALTH PRODUCTS

Michael Cooper (St. Albert—Sturgeon River, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition from petitioners who call upon the government to repeal Bill C-47 so that natural health products are no longer regulated in the same manner as therapeutic chemical drugs. The petitioners note that natural health products are already appropriately regulated and that the legislation would jeopardize Canadians' access to NHPs, would threaten the Canadian natural health product industry and would make the supplements and vitamins Canadians rely on more costly.

Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition today in support of Bill C-224, put forward by my colleague from Ponoka—Didsbury. This is a bill about natural health products.

I tried to submit a notice to jointly second the bill, as I sometimes do with great pieces of legislation, but the bill was so popular among Conservative MPs that all of the seconding slots were quickly filled before I had a chance. I want to table the petition to highlight my support and the support of my constituents for this excellent legislation on natural health products.

The Liberals are, petitioners say, threatening access to natural health products through their new rules, which will mean higher costs and fewer products available on store shelves. The changes they made in a previous omnibus bill, as well as through new so-called cost recovery provisions, will simply impose massive costs on producers of essential natural health products, undermining Canadians' access to these products.

The petitioners want to see the Liberal government reverse the changes it made on natural health products. Bill C-224, from my colleague from Ponoka—Didsbury, would do exactly that.

• (1215)

MEDICAL ASSISTANCE IN DYING

Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the next petition I am tabling raises concern about the government's approach to euthanasia, in particular the dangerous effects the current euthanasia regime has on Canadians living with disabilities.

The petitioners observe how the government's policy, which presents facilitated dying as a so-called solution to disability or chronic illness, reduces incentives to improve treatment and care for people with these conditions, and substantially devalues the lives and experiences of those living with disabilities.

The petitioners further observe that all major disability rights organizations have expressed serious concerns about so-called track 2 MAID.

The petitioners therefore ask the government and the House to protect all Canadians whose natural death is not reasonably foreseeable by prohibiting medical assistance in dying for those whose prognosis for natural death is more than six months.

HUMAN RIGHTS IN NORTH KOREA

Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, finally, following an event that I had the honour of speaking at earlier this week here in Ottawa, I am tabling a petition drawing attention to the horrific human rights situation in North Korea, highlighting the human rights record of the Government of North Korea and calling for action.

The petitioners note that North Korea prioritizes food distribution to those considered useful to the survival of the current political regime, and this leads to extreme starvation in so many cases. There is a vast state apparatus that is associated with the suppression of dissent, public executions, forced imprisonment of citizens in political prison camps and the terrorization of the population. State-sponsored abductions of citizens of other nations also occur.

The petitioners are also highlighting concerns about how defectors from North Korea who have gone to the People's Republic of China have been sent back. They are calling for action in response to this. The petitioners are raising concerns about how the Government of China deals with the situation of North Korean defectors.

Routine Proceedings

The petitioners call on the government—

An hon. member: That is a long petition.

Garnett Genuis: Mr. Speaker, as my colleague from Winnipeg North points out, this is a long petition. These are important issues, and I appreciate the opportunity to bring them to the House.

The petitioners call on the Government of Canada to table regular reports in Parliament on the situation of human rights in North Korea, as well as their response to it, including the state of political prison camps, Kwan-li-so and Kyo-hwa-so.

The petitioners want Canada to take action to support North Korean defectors, including calling on the Government of China to allow safe passage for North Korean refugees to South Korea, where they are recognized as citizens; to monitor ongoing human rights issues; to support international efforts to defend the rights of the people of North Korea from crimes against humanity; and to do more to promote political freedom in North Korea and political change there.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

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

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I suspect if you were to canvass the House, you would find unanimous consent to see the clock at 2:30 p.m.

The Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: Accordingly, the House stands adjourned until next Monday at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 12:20 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Friday, October 3, 2025

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

An Act Respecting Cyber Security

Bill C-8. Second reading	2341
Ramsay	2341
Guglielmin	2342
Deschênes	2342
Deschênes-Thériault	2342
Johns	2342
Savard-Tremblay	2343
Chenette	2344
Johns	2344
Lamoureux	2345
Lloyd	2345
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	2345
Lamoureux	2346
Aboultaif	2346
Chenette	2347
Strauss	2347
Lamoureux	2348
Caputo	2349
Chenette	2349
Aboultaif	2349
(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to a committee)	2349
Sitting Suspended (The sitting of the House was suspended at 10:57 a.m.) ..	2349
Sitting Resumed (The House resumed at 11 a.m.)	2349

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Charter of Rights and Freedoms

Saini	2349
-------------	------

Philip “Arn” Brown

Holman	2350
--------------	------

Milton East—Halton Hills South

Tesser Derksen	2350
----------------------	------

Public Safety

Leslie	2350
--------------	------

Stéphanie Bacher

Deschênes-Thériault	2350
---------------------------	------

Freedom of Expression

Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	2351
---------------------------------	------

Military Service

Hirtle	2351
--------------	------

Cowichan Land Ruling

Au	2351
----------	------

Employment Insurance

Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan)	2351
---	------

Ottawa Centre

Naqvi	2351
-------------	------

Jean-Paul Croteau

Lefebvre	2352
----------------	------

Fall Flavours Food and Drink Festival

MacDonald (Cardigan)	2352
----------------------------	------

The Economy

Aboultaif	2352
-----------------	------

Alfie MacLeod

Kelloway	2352
----------------	------

Cost of Food

Baldinelli	2352
------------------	------

Canadian Walk for Veterans

Klassen	2353
---------------	------

ORAL QUESTIONS

Employment

Warkentin	2353
MacKinnon	2353
Warkentin	2353
Bardeesy	2353
Brassard	2353
Hajdu	2354
Brassard	2354
MacKinnon	2354
Deltell	2354
MacKinnon	2354
Deltell	2354
Guilbeault	2354

Forestry Industry

Deschênes	2354
Bardeesy	2355
Deschênes	2355
MacKinnon	2355

Canada-U.S. Relations

Savard-Tremblay	2355
MacKinnon	2355

Justice

Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	2355
Lattanzio	2355
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	2355
Lattanzio	2355
Doherty	2356
Ramsay	2356
Doherty	2356

Published under the authority of the Speaker of
the House of Commons

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

The proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees are hereby made available to provide greater public access. The parliamentary privilege of the House of Commons to control the publication and broadcast of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees is nonetheless reserved. All copyrights therein are also reserved.

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the Copyright Act. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the Copyright Act.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

Also available on the House of Commons website at the following address: <https://www.ourcommons.ca>

Publié en conformité de l'autorité
du Président de la Chambre des communes

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

Les délibérations de la Chambre des communes et de ses comités sont mises à la disposition du public pour mieux le renseigner. La Chambre conserve néanmoins son privilège parlementaire de contrôler la publication et la diffusion des délibérations et elle possède tous les droits d'auteur sur celles-ci.

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la Loi sur le droit d'auteur. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre des communes.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la Loi sur le droit d'auteur.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

Aussi disponible sur le site Web de la Chambre des communes à l'adresse suivante :
<https://www.noscommunes.ca>