



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

---

# House of Commons Debates

Official Report  
(Hansard)

Volume 152 No. 037  
Thursday, October 9, 2025

---

Speaker: The Honourable Francis Scarpaleggia



## **CONTENTS**

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

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, October 9, 2025

The House met at 10 a.m.

---

*Prayer*

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

• (1000)

[*English*]

### COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

#### PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

**Chris Bittle (St. Catharines, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the fifth report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs. The committee advises that, pursuant to Standing Order 91.1(2), the Subcommittee on Private Members' Business met to consider items added to the order of precedence on September 23, 24 and 25, and recommended that the items listed herein, which it has determined should not be designated non-votable, be considered by the House.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater):** Pursuant to Standing Order 91.1(2), the report is deemed adopted.

#### CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

**Julie Dzerowicz (Davenport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the second report of the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration in relation to Bill C-3, an act to amend the Citizenship Act, 2025.

The committee has studied the bill and has decided to report the bill back to the House with amendments.

[*Translation*]

#### PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

**John Williamson (Saint John—St. Croix, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the following two reports of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

[*English*]

The first report is entitled “The Benefits Delivery Modernization Programme”. The second report is entitled “Modernizing Information Technology Systems”.

[*Translation*]

Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to each of these two reports.

\* \* \*

[*English*]

### PETITIONS

#### AGRICULTURE

**Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, it is a huge honour today to table e-petition 6778, signed by over 6,203 Canadians.

The petitioners are deeply concerned about proposed regulatory changes to Canada's Plant Breeders' Rights Act. They note that the act currently grants plant breeders exclusive rights for 20 years, but it also protects farmers through a farmers' privilege clause, which allows them to save and replant seed from their own harvest.

The Canadian Food Inspection Agency is proposing to remove this privilege for fruits and vegetables, ornamental and hybrid varieties. The petitioners warn that this would force farmers to purchase seed annually, drive up production costs, restrict access to new varieties and undermine the ability of farmers to adapt to climate change. They argue that this change would unfairly erode the age-old practice of using farm-saved seed and that Canada should strengthen public plant breeding.

The petitioners call on the government to abandon these proposed changes.

• (1005)

#### INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

**Jamie Schmale (Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to table e-petition 6605, which was created by a constituent in my riding, Ms. Jo-Anne Green from Haliburton County.

The 1,100 signatories would like to bring attention to the issue of indigenous identity fraud. They would like the government to take action to ensure that there is legislation addressing first nations, Métis and Inuit identity fraud with clear definitions, mechanisms for enforcement and legal penalties for those taking advantage. They list a number of other actions they would like to see the House take as well.

*Business of Supply*

[Translation]

## AGRICULTURE

**Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support my colleague from Courtenay—Alberni this morning by tabling a paper petition along the same lines.

The petitioners are very concerned about the changes to the plant breeders' rights regulations. The proposals put forward by the Canadian Food Inspection Agency aim to prevent farmers from exercising their age-old right to use the products of their land to re-seed in future years, which would force them to pay extremely high fees to use seeds every year. A pattern seems to be forming here, and people are telling us they are concerned about that.

We want to protect the autonomy of agricultural producers, ensure our food resilience and, above all, ensure that the cost of agricultural production does not increase too quickly. The government has gone off on the wrong track with regulations. People are worried, and they are telling us so. I therefore formally ask the government members to consider this petition. It is very important. I thank the people who started the petition, as well as my colleague from Courtenay—Alberni.

\* \* \*

[English]

## 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 would ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater):** Is it agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

## BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

## OPPOSITION MOTION—COST OF DEFICITS

**Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC)** moved:

That, given that,

- (i) in 2015 the Liberals promised that deficit spending would fuel investment, yet investment per worker fell by 10.8%,
- (ii) Liberal deficits fueled inflation and drove up interest rates, while Canada had the worst economic growth per capita in the G7,
- (iii) the current Liberal Prime Minister is following the same plan and is already yielding the same results, with 86,000 net job losses, the second highest unemployment rate in the G7, food inflation doubled the Bank of Canada's target and \$53.9 billion in net investment leaving the country,
- (iv) every dollar that leaves the country means lower wages and lost jobs for workers,
- (v) every dollar the government spends comes out of the pockets of Canadians,

the House call on the Liberal government to stop plagiarizing Justin Trudeau's failed policies and recognize that deficits drive investment and jobs down and the cost of living up.

She said: Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to move this motion. I will be splitting my time with my friend from Calgary Crowfoot.

I am going to start with a sidebar and give a hometown shout-out that stretches right across the country, a big hype for the Toronto Blue Jays, which took down the Yankees last night and lifted the whole country with them. Canada's team is flying to the ALCS, and as a big fan, this team gives me all of the feels. I know that is true for everyone across the country. I congratulate them.

Unfortunately, members are not going to like the next part. Just like the Jays proving what teamwork and discipline can do on the field, imagine what Canada could achieve if the government showed the same focus. Unlike the scoreboard at the Rogers Centre, which we have been seeing go up and up, the only numbers going up in Ottawa, unfortunately, are deficits, unemployment and net investment flowing southbound rather than here.

I am going to tell a story, or, rather, a cautionary tale. Once upon a time in the not-so-distant past, in the year 2015, a trust-fund millionaire living in Liberal la-la land decided to run a radical experiment. He decided to spend billions of dollars of people's money to figure out whether budgets could truly balance themselves. Never mind that anybody with a background in finance or accounting or any part of the real world told him that it was not possible, Justin Trudeau was not going to be deterred.

According to the Trudeau school of economics, proudly located at the university of unicorns and fairy dust in a land of make-believe, spending ourselves deep into the red, lighting endless amounts of taxpayer money on fire and calling it "investment in spending" somehow makes us all richer. Ten years and hundreds of billions of dollars later, the most expensive and costly experiment in Canadian history has ended, and everyone with even an iota of common sense could have predicted what would happen. We did not get the promised utopia where everybody gets a job, nobody has to work and nobody thinks about monetary policy. Instead, the Liberals doubled the debt to give us higher inflation, higher taxes and smaller paycheques.

That is true today. Our living standard, as measured by economists, has stagnated and is getting worse. Rather than creating more prosperity, we lost half a billion dollars in foreign investment, investment per worker dropped by 10.8% and our labour productivity sunk. All the while, he said anybody who questioned any of this was talking down Canada and called them racist and alarmist, saying the planet would burn down. He called them every name in the book just for calling out the facts.

*Business of Supply*

When Canadians were finally freed of the high-tax, high-spend Justin Trudeau regime earlier this year, they breathed a short sigh of relief because the new guy was supposed to be different and better. He said he was an economist who knew how markets worked. He said he would cut back on reckless spending and make it easier to create investment here in Canada. He said that he would do things differently. He said that he would get a trade deal with the United States.

Here is where we are. First of all, he kept the old people from the old government: the finance minister, the trade minister, the jobs minister, the foreign affairs minister and the justice minister. Most of those on the front bench are the same, so it is not really a new government. Instead of fighting for Canada and keeping elbows up, the Prime Minister brought a calculator to a knife fight, as his minister said he would. He is adding up on that calculator a \$1-trillion gift to Donald Trump, subtracting 86,000 jobs here in Canada and multiplying American tariffs on our goods by two.

The Prime Minister is not spending less; he is spending more. Justin Trudeau was the most expensive prime minister in Canadian history. It was forecast this year that the Liberals would spend \$42 billion. The Parliamentary Budget Officer said the new Prime Minister is going to spend 60% more, and that amount is only growing. Somehow the new Prime Minister has found a way to spend more than the guy who spent more than all of the other prime ministers combined. For those watching at home, spending \$26 billion more means making the deficit bigger, not smaller. It means less money in their pockets. The Prime Minister is hoping that they do not notice that.

• (1010)

Liberals are telling Canadians again, just like they told them in 2015, that money is an investment and is supposed to create more jobs. This is how it adds up: We lost \$54 billion of net investment in just half a year, which went southbound, not here; 86,000 jobs are gone; and we have the fastest-shrinking economy in the G7 with the second-highest unemployment rate, instead of the strongest economy in the G7 like the Prime Minister stood at every podium during the election and promised.

These are not stats. They are connected to people's lives, families and paycheques. Every job loss in a place like Windsor, Oshawa or Ingersoll means that another family is not sure how they are going to put food on the table. It means a father is not sure how he is going to tell his kids their dad does not have work anymore. Every person who wants to work and cannot find a job does not have the dignity that comes with being employed.

These are the real stories of the effects of these big numbers. Every time somebody who is working one, two or even three jobs goes to the grocery store and cannot afford basic necessities, it is the failure of the principle that if someone works hard in this country they should be able to get ahead. That is why we fight. We fight for every single Canadian who is being forgotten and left behind by the big numbers the Liberals are putting on the board.

If someone measures their wealth by looking at stock indices or portfolios, the Prime Minister is their guy. However, if that comes from a paycheque, they are being sold out in this scheme. That is why it is so infuriating to see the Prime Minister and the Liberal

government doing the exact opposite of what they said they were going to do. It is especially galling that, after the Prime Minister went to Canadians in a time of crisis and offered them his word and hope, he then completely forgot about everything he said on the campaign trail. Worse, he possibly did not mean any of it at all.

The Liberal government has been spending all of that money for six months with no plan and no accountability on how it is doing this. The Parliamentary Budget Officer, who is the budget watchdog in this place, says that the government has zero, none, no fiscal anchors whatsoever. Someone who has been listening to the Prime Minister might have heard a bunch of talk about operational budget versus capital budget. I guarantee the Liberals will come back with that response nine times out of 10 when Conservatives talk about out-of-control spending.

This is not a plan to balance the budget. It is just an absurd proposal to move the goalpost. The Liberals are changing their reporting standards to what the non-partisan fiscal watchdog has said will lead to less transparency and does not even meet the international standard.

Why are the Liberals doing this? If we want to know the reason they are doing this, it is simple. They cannot stop the spending but want to brag about balancing a budget without doing that. If they are trying to do that, they are just changing the way they count. This is what we are seeing from the Liberals. It is like someone claiming they ran a marathon, but they quietly moved the finish line 20 metres up.

None of this is fiscal responsibility; it is all financial theatre. We are going to see that on November 4. The Liberals are trying to hide another broken promise of the Prime Minister and the government, which is full of Liberal ministers who still sit in that front row. They are not going to be able to hide it for much longer, because the fiscal watchdog says that we are "at the precipice" of a cliff. That means the government is spending more money than we can spend.

More debt and more interest payments equal higher taxes, higher inflation, fewer jobs for Canadians and less money spent on the very things we need it spent on in this country, like services for Canadians. We cannot keep doing this over and over again. That is what the fiscal watchdog said.

• (1015)

It is time to stop lighting taxpayer money on fire, and it is long past time to toss out the Justin Trudeau fantasy novel on economics, stop doing the same thing, stop plagiarizing his work and start living in the real world, where real people live paycheque to paycheque, where jobs are lost and where hope exists no longer.

*Business of Supply*

**Caroline Desrochers (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is sad that the opposition is continuing to spread a divisive message at a time when pride and grit should really unite all Canadians around the challenges we are facing. She said, “These are not stats”, and she is right. These are slogans.

The real stats are the following: We have the strongest credit rating in the world, AAA. We have the lowest net debt-to-GDP ratio in the G7. We have had one of the highest rates of growth in the G7 since 2020. The IMF and the OECD project that Canada will have the strongest economic growth in the G7 this year. These are stats. These are real.

The other thing she said is that the Prime Minister forgot what he said on the campaign trail. I would like to remind the member that we have increased the salaries of our armed forces, cut taxes for Canadians and launched the Major Projects Office and Build Canada Homes.

Will she support us?

• (1020)

**Melissa Lantsman:** Mr. Speaker, the Liberals are right that Canadian pride unites us. They can tell that to the Prime Minister, who moved his company out to New York because he realized his own policies would hurt the investors who invested in that company. They can tell the Prime Minister, who does not pay his taxes in Canada, about national pride. They can tell all they want to the worker in Oshawa who just lost his job because the Prime Minister cannot get a deal on auto. They can tell him all day long that the debt-to-GDP ratio is good, but what are they going to tell him when he cannot put food on his table? What are they going to tell him when he gets the pink slip? What are they going to tell the 86,000 workers who have been laid off in this country because the investment that has fled south?

What are they going to tell all those people whose livelihoods are on the line because the government cannot control its addiction to spending?

[*Translation*]

**Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the speech that my colleague from Thornhill made earlier was very interesting.

Finally, we have a Conservative motion that the Bloc Québécois can get behind. Of course, it is easy to say that this government's management is abysmal when everyone can see we are digging ourselves in deeper and deeper. This government needs to manage a financial crisis for families in Quebec and Canada and yet, early in its mandate, it decided to forgo close to \$90 billion in potential revenues, in particular by not imposing countertariffs, eliminating the digital services tax and so on.

The austerity proposed by the Conservatives is all well and good and we agree that we need stronger fiscal management, but what are the Conservatives suggesting to help grow the economy? Making cuts is not enough. We also need to implement measures that will help businesses thrive and choose to invest in the economy.

[*English*]

**Melissa Lantsman:** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that my hon. colleague is finally seeing the light on what the government is putting forward.

The Conservatives have said time and again that we have to build the Canadian economy with Canadian workers and Canadian investment here, with things like getting rid of the oil and gas cap so the pipeline that was potentially approved 10 years ago, which is back on the table, can be filled with oil, and so we can unleash the capacity of the private sector to invest here by cutting red tape and regulation.

The member has heard that time and again and I am glad he is finally standing up to oppose the government's reckless spending.

**Pat Kelly (Calgary Crowfoot, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I was quite surprised by the line of questioning that came from the Liberals. They would have us think that we have never had it so good, that everything is rosy in Canada and that, after 10 years of economic and fiscal vandalism, Canadians should congratulate the government for a job well done. The Liberals have broken every single promise they have made on deficits, debt and fiscal anchors or guardrails or whatever we want to call them.

Would the member have any further comments on that with whatever remaining time she has?

**Melissa Lantsman:** Mr. Speaker, I will say this: The Prime Minister stood in front of Canadians at a time of crisis and asked them for their support. He promised them that he was going to be the guy in the crisis to negotiate a deal.

Since he became Prime Minister, as I will remind the House over and over again, \$54 billion of net investment has fled south. He is promising to make that \$1 trillion without the promise of even one dollar coming back into our country. There are 86,000 jobs gone and we have the second-highest unemployment rate in this country. That is nothing to be proud of. Certainly, things have been much better in this country.

**Pat Kelly (Calgary Crowfoot, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it is \$100 billion. No, that is not Dr. Evil's ransom demand from the world. That is today's headline in the National Post. The potential deficit that will be tabled in the budget in November is \$100 billion. This is today's front page headline.

It is important to consider how we got here. A \$100-billion deficit is staggering. This is almost twice the national transfer to provinces for health care. This is the amount of extra borrowing being piled on. The interest from that will eventually make us unable to spend money on health care, national defence and all the things Canadians rely on from their governments.

How did we get here? The government, in 2015, promised it would run limited deficits for three years. It was the only party in that election promising to do so. Even the NDP back then knew we could not borrow with impunity forever. The Liberal Party was the only party promising a deficit. It said that deficits were okay. This was going to be a short-term deficit. It was going to make historic investments in national infrastructure. It was going to make investments. Its deficits were investments, and that would lead to the budget balancing itself and make people more prosperous.

Here we are, 10 years later. We have an out-of-control structural deficit closing in on \$100 billion annually.

When the Liberals were elected, this promise of limited deficits followed by a balanced budget was immediately discarded. It was never, ever acknowledged after that. Bill Morneau was the finance minister. I attended question period after question period. In the finance committee, there were appearances by that minister. He never acknowledged this solemn promise that, clearly, was a point of differentiation between parties.

That was part of what got the government elected in the first place, and it was a lie. What the Liberals had promised during the election was so obviously untrue compared to what they did in office. They were elected. They passed a bunch of anti-business, anti-job and anti-industry bills like Bill C-69 and Bill C-48. These led to immediate capital flight from Canada. Upon the election of the government, \$200 billion from the energy industry alone left this country. Half a trillion dollars of investment has left Canada since the government was elected.

We are here today to call on the government to quit plagiarizing the playbook that has brought us to the point we are today. These out-of-control, structural deficits began under the Liberal government. It inherited a balanced budget. This is clear. A balanced budget was tabled in 2015. The fiscal monitors who track spending showed that we were on track to balance it until the new spending of the Liberal government was brought in. It received a balanced budget. It inherited one. It blew it immediately.

The capital flight that resulted from the Liberals' out-of-control spending and anti-industry laws kicked in immediately and began to do what these policies always do everywhere they have been tried from time to time: They led to inflation. We have out-of-control deficits. We have inflation. We have a cost of living crisis now. We have the worst-performing economy in the G7 right now. The Liberals always talk about the G7 and say we are going to be the best in the G7. Well, we are the worst. Our economy is no longer growing per capita. In fact, it has shrunk. It is lower per capita than it was in 2014, the final year of the Harper government. Per capita GDP is lower now than it was in 2014.

Let us think about that. This means Canadians are getting poorer over time. I do not even think a 10-year window covering the Depression would even reveal a period that long and that sustained of declining per capita GDP, or GDP that has shrunk.

• (1025)

We have lower wages, lost jobs and lost investment under the government. We call upon it to reverse course and get serious about the budget.

### *Business of Supply*

That brings us to the current Prime Minister. As has been remarked by others, this was the guy who was supposed to know what to do. It had been 10 years of Trudeau, and we were done. We needed to actually have a serious person and have an adult in the room. They switched leaders, and this guy who was supposed to be the adult in the room, who knew finance and had a wonderful resume, came in. He said that this was a serious point of crisis, that we are going to get serious, that we are going to rein in spending and get control of the public finances so that we can grow the economy and deal with the current challenges.

What has happened since then?

He did not do any of that. This is a Prime Minister who promised Canadians that they were going to rein in the general bloat of government that has occurred under the Liberals. The size of the public sector in Canada is the only thing that grew under the government. They added 100,000 federal public servants, yet service gets no better for Canadians. They cannot run anything over there. There are 59,000 employees at the Canada Revenue Agency, and they still cannot answer the phone.

The government was supposed to have someone serious at the helm now, someone who would get control of our finances and bring the budget under control. It has not happened.

Liberals promised, in the election, to rein in and reduce the expenditures on consultants. In the first estimates that they tabled, they have gone from, I believe, \$19 billion to \$26 billion. I do not have it in front of me. That is what I recall.

They have increased their spending on consultants. They told Canadians that they were going to rein this in, that this was the whole point of the change of leadership, that there was a change of style.

They keep talking about a new government, even though it is the same front bench and there have been the same policies over the last 10 years. It has not happened.

We are getting close to a new budget. I might add that, on top of the \$500 billion in capital flight that has occurred under the government before the current Prime Minister arrived, it has accelerated since then. Another \$60 billion has left the Canadian economy.

When investment dollars leave the country, that means there is no investment in plant and equipment and technology, which would help drive up productivity so that Canadians can earn more and live better, fuller lives and cope with the increased costs that have crept in under the government.

It is not happening. Wages are not rising. Unemployment is rising, with 900 jobs lost in my city last week in one layoff, announced by Imperial Oil.

*Business of Supply*

These guys have spent the last 10 years chasing investment and jobs out of, especially, the energy sector. We call on them to fulfill the promise that they made in the election and start getting serious, finally, about the budget. We have had a PBO report and a PBO committee appearance, in the last couple of weeks, that are just devastating.

The Parliamentary Budget Officer has said that the government's fiscal plan is unsustainable. He called it “stupefying”. He said that it is “unsustainable”.

The Liberals always claim these different measurements, such as declining debt-to-GDP ratio. When the debt-to-GDP ratio started to come up, it was our AAA credit rating. We will see them bait and switch every time on their goalposts.

That credit rating is at risk. They are trying to trick Canadians with a new accounting methodology as their deficits continue to get even worse.

It is time for the House to call upon the Liberal government to stop plagiarizing Justin Trudeau's failed policies and recognize that deficits drive investment and jobs down and the cost of living up.

• (1030)

**Hon. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, let us talk about the deficits and how Conservatives left this great surplus, as the member alluded to in his speech.

Stephen Harper had three surpluses. The first one was a \$13-billion surplus. We ask ourselves how he ended up with such a large surplus. It is because Paul Martin left him with that \$13-billion surplus a year before. The second year that Harper was in the House, he ran a \$9-billion surplus. After that, it was deficit after deficit after deficit.

Finally, when it got to 2015, he referenced how a surplus was left. How did they leave that surplus?

They left it on the backs of veterans and by depleting our military investment to under 1% of GDP for the first time in recorded Canadian history.

Could the member please explain how this great surplus in 2015—

• (1035)

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater):** The hon. member for Calgary Crowfoot.

**Pat Kelly:** Mr. Speaker, the member's remarks reveal the exact point we are trying to make. There were five prime ministers between the two Trudeaus, and all five of them took fiscal responsibility seriously—

**Hon. Mark Gerretsen:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Brian Mulroney did not run a single surplus.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater):** Order. That is debate.

The hon. member for Calgary Crowfoot.

**Pat Kelly:** Mr. Speaker, the member is correct. Brian Mulroney inherited a basket case that is even worse than what we have today.

Nine years was not long enough for Brian Mulroney to undo the damage that Pierre Trudeau did to this country. Every time we have someone named Trudeau running this country, they destroy the energy industry in my city and wreak fiscal and economic vandalism on Canadians.

[*Translation*]

**Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, it is always fun to sit here and listen to my Conservative and Liberal colleagues argue about who ran the smallest deficit or the largest surplus. The fact is, every time there has been a surplus in Canada, particularly under Paul Martin, the savings came from cutting transfers to the provinces, nowhere else. That is my first point.

My second point involves my Conservative friend, whom I would like to congratulate on his speech. I agree with him. The Liberals' management of public finances is a disaster, and it has been for a very long time. Oil subsidies are one of the reasons for that.

Would my Conservative colleagues agree with me that sound fiscal management would require the government to stop handing out subsidies to oil companies?

[*English*]

**Pat Kelly:** Mr. Speaker, I will address one specific example that occurred under the Liberal government. From time to time, we hear its members patting themselves on the back over the Trans Mountain pipeline. They congratulate themselves for nationalizing what was private infrastructure and subsidizing it to a staggering sum, so we ended up using public money to build something that should have been built privately. It would have been built privately if the government did not chase the investment out of Canada.

**Dave Epp (Chatham-Kent—Leamington, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my colleague on his excellent speech, but I take no joy in it. I take no joy in us, as the opposition, having to bring this motion before this chamber.

My question is, why? Why is the Prime Minister taking this country to the precipice? He comes from the private sector. He has personal wealth. Is he not hurting himself by bringing these disastrous policies to our country?

**Pat Kelly:** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is probably pretty insulated from the damage he is doing to the country. As to why he is doing it or what the motive is, I would have to leave that to the Liberals. I have no idea why they are wreaking fiscal and economic vandalism on this country. I wish they would not.

**Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I have a ton of respect for my colleague, but he brought up the job losses of 900 people at Imperial Oil. At the same time, Imperial Oil just posted that it returned \$367 million to shareholders last quarter. When somebody wins, we all want to see them do well.

However, with excess profits such as this, will the Conservatives and Liberals ever agree that an excess profits tax could help reduce deficits?

*Business of Supply*

**Pat Kelly:** Mr. Speaker, the phenomenon of share buyback is symptomatic of just how horrific the investment climate is in Canada. Businesses would generally love to invest in plant, equipment, technology and things that would increase productivity, but in this country, there is no opportunity.

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is no surprise for members on this side that the Conservatives have somehow come up with another opposition day motion in which they want to say that we are different. I will be splitting my time with the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister. I appreciate the reminder although it is much to the disappointment of members opposite, I am sure.

The Conservatives have come up with a heck of an opposition motion that, once again, tries to portray the government in a false, negative light. I think they need a reality check. One of my colleagues said the Conservative Party is like a professional opposition party.

• (1040)

**Bob Zimmer:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would question the member's use of language and the term "false". I think we are not allowed to say something indirectly—

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater):** Order. The hon. parliamentary secretary can very briefly speak to the same point of order.

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker used the word "lie". Members will notice that I did not interrupt his speech.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater):** Order. We are delving into debate here. This is debate. The word "false" is not considered unparliamentary.

The member is correct that the word "lie" is, and that is something we should stay away from. If I missed it in the comments, shame on me.

The hon. parliamentary secretary can resume.

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, the member for Calgary Crowfoot could always stand and apologize as—

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater):** Order. I am hoping this is not going to be further debate.

The hon. member for Calgary Crowfoot.

**Pat Kelly:** Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I certainly did not refer to any member or statement, so I do not believe that a rule was—

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater):** Order. We are well into debate now.

**Pat Kelly:** It is withdrawn.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater):** Resuming debate, the hon. parliamentary secretary.

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, I take it that all these points of order are deducted and that I get a bonus minute for every time the opposition stands up.

The opposition talks about change. They say there is no change. That is just not true. The reality is that we had an election just a few months back. I will remind my friends on the opposite side of what happened during that election.

The leader of the Conservative Party and the leader of the Liberal Party had the opportunity to present to Canadians what they had to offer given the circumstances. There were many circumstances. We had the Trump tariffs and trade issues. We had issues surrounding crime and safety in our communities.

Canadians actually did a comparison. I believe, from when I was knocking on doors, that the people of Canada were looking at the background of those leaders. What they saw in the leader of the Liberal Party was someone who was a former governor of the Bank of Canada, a former governor of the Bank of England, an economist and someone who understands the economy. They contrasted that to the leader of the Conservative Party. What did they see? Not much. He is a politician. I have been a politician virtually just as long, maybe even a bit longer than he has. It is an honourable profession. However, at the end of the day, even I have more outside-of-politics experience than the leader of the official opposition does.

I can say that when Canadians looked at the environment we were in, they voted for the leader of the Liberal Party and the Liberal Party in record numbers. Never before has the Liberal Party of Canada received as many votes as they did in the last election. I look at that, and I take that as a responsibility for all of us, not only government but also opposition, to recognize that we all have a responsibility to Canadians, the people whom we represent.

The year prior, we had the leader of the Conservative Party going all over Canada, from coast to coast to coast, saying that Canada was broken. That was the message the Conservatives were sending out. That was their bumper sticker. They insulted Canadians in every region of the country. At the end of the day, we would think they learned something from that. However, once again, we have the Conservative Party, particularly the leader of the Conservative Party, being like the Prince of Darkness, casting a dark shadow over Canada as a whole. Nothing but the negatives is what it is all—

**Ted Falk:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I take exception to the language that the member on the opposite side is using. We all know what the reference to the Prince of Darkness is. He does too. I would ask him to withdraw that statement.

• (1045)

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, when I was an MLA, Gary Filmon, who was a Progressive Conservative, often called the leader of the NDP the Prince of Darkness. I honestly thought it was—

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater):** Order. Let us all be judicious in our language and avoid the use of words that could cause disruption.

I will ask the member to carry on, with five minutes and 49 seconds remaining.

*Business of Supply*

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives like to take the stats and give the impression that everything is still broken in Canada.

Let us look at the types of things done, coming out of the last election, by the Prime Minister and the government, whether it was getting rid of the carbon tax, something that was initiated virtually when the Prime Minister became the Leader of the Liberal Party, or the first substantial pieces of legislation brought in after the election, Bill C-4 and Bill C-5. Bill C-4 gave 22 million Canadians a tax break.

We also then brought in Bill C-5 to build one Canadian economy. On this side of the House, within the Liberal caucus, there is a build Canada strong mentality. We are determined to make Canada the strongest economy in the G7, contrary to what the Conservatives say day after day.

We can look at some of the very basic, fundamental stats. Let us take a look at the labour force participation and contrast it to that of the United States. Canada's labour force participation is far greater than it is in the United States. That does not mean we are not sympathetic to people who are losing jobs; of course we are. That is the reason we have developed five major projects, with more to come before the Grey Cup game.

Of course we are sensitive to the people who are losing jobs, just like we are concerned with the issue of affordability. Let us look at the reality of affordability, year over year. From July to July, inflation was 1.9%. That is well within the markers set up by the Governor of the Bank of Canada. That is why interest rates have gone down. That is why we are in the lower half. We are also doing better than most countries in the G7 on interest rates.

The Conservatives talk about debt. We have the lowest net debt-to-GDP ratio in the entire G7, and the Conservatives know that. They know some of the economic indicators. However, they still go around saying that things are so bad in Canada, and then they criticize the Liberals if we try to portray things in a little more of a positive light, accusing us of trying to pat ourselves on the back. We are expressing the reality of the situation: Canadians of all political stripes outside the chamber are coming together and working together to build one strong Canada.

We have a Prime Minister who went to the United States of America to meet with President Trump to begin negotiations in a very tangible way so we can be there for Canadians. What did the Conservatives say? They said that they want the agreement and that we had said we would have an agreement, and so on. They will just fold, capitulate and do whatever they want. We are not going to do that. We believe we have to be there and get the best deal for Canadians. If that means we have to wait an extra week, two weeks or a month or two, whatever it takes, we are going to achieve the best deal for Canadians. That is what the negotiations are all about.

On building our economy, let us take a look at the projects we have brought forward: LNG in B.C., copper in the prairie provinces, nuclear energy in Ontario, the port in Quebec, and a very aggressive, proactive Atlantic caucus pushing on a number of different projects, just like in Manitoba where we are trying to get into the second round of major projects. Premiers of different political

stripes and Canadians of all stripes are working together in order to recognize that these types of investments mean something: \$60 billion.

• (1050)

Yesterday in question period, the Conservatives were talking about foreign investment. More countries invested in Canada in 2023; according to the last numbers I saw, we were number one in terms of foreign investment coming into Canada. There is a private sector that the Prime Minister referenced.

Look at what is actually happening; there are a lot of good things taking place in Canada. We just need the Conservatives to open their eyes, or, I would suggest, if they have not learned anything from the last federal election, they will continue to be in opposition for many years to come. I will say that they are good in opposition—

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater):** Questions and comments, the hon. member for Skeena—Bulkley Valley.

**Ellis Ross (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I referenced the approval of LNG Canada, but we have met with the departments, and it is clear that there are no outstanding permits or authorizations needed for LNG Canada. I am assuming that phase 2 needs an approval in terms of emissions. Is this why LNG Canada phase 2 has been added to the major projects list? Is there going to be a decision on the emissions from phase 2, from phase 1 or from both?

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, the members opposite, when they start questioning the major projects, have to realize that the federal government has played the lead role in working with, in this case, the Province of British Columbia, indigenous community leaders and many other stakeholders and has put together a package that ultimately is going to see the extension and, I would suggest, the growth of LNG for the province of B.C. In fact, all of Canada will benefit by it. That is the—

[*Translation*]

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater):** The hon. member for Drummond.

**Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the Liberals are always bragging about all kinds of things and throwing numbers around. They are saying that they have lowered interest rates and curbed the massive inflation we have been experiencing in recent years.

However, the reality for Quebec and Canadian families is that prices are still very high. After the pandemic, prices did not go back down, but wages also did not go up. That means that groceries now cost a fortune and so do housing and social activities. Everything costs a fortune, but purchasing power did not adjust to inflation following the pandemic. That is what the government should do. That is what it should be focusing on.

I am hearing talk of austerity measures and I am hearing the Liberals brag about their numbers, which are not bad, but in all seriousness, what measures is the government proposing and taking to make life easier for Quebecers and Canadians?

[English]

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, the government, in particular the Prime Minister, has been very much focused on the issue of affordability. We do care very much about what is taking place in our communities. The issue of disposable income is something that we take very seriously, and that is why the Prime Minister actually got rid of the carbon tax. That is why we gave the tax cut for 22 million Canadians. That is all increasing the disposable income for Canadians. The Prime Minister, in a very short window, has already demonstrated compassion and a caring attitude in providing supports for Canadians.

**Hon. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, what I always find quite amusing is how Conservatives take an economic issue, completely dumb it down and try to explain things that in reality are not practical. I remember, a year ago, the countless number of times we heard the Leader of the Opposition say that the only thing that caused inflation was the carbon tax and that as soon as the carbon tax was gone all inflation problems would be gone.

Of course, the Conservatives neglect to reflect on the fact that inflation is a global phenomenon that is impacted by so many different events. What the parliamentary secretary did today was highlight a lot of the dumbing-down of economic issues, which, quite frankly, is probably why the Canadian people do not put faith in the Conservatives when it comes to the economy. I wonder whether the parliamentary secretary would agree with me on that?

• (1055)

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, yes, absolutely I agree with the sentiments that have been expressed by my colleague.

The global economy is changing. Whether the Conservatives want to stay in the past and continue to talk down Canada or not, we as a government, whether the Prime Minister, cabinet or the entire Liberal caucus, will continue to reflect the interests of the constituents whom we represent and of Canadians as a whole, because we understand and appreciate the importance of the changing world today. That is why the major projects are so important, why maintaining our social programs where we can is critically important, and why we are going to table a budget on November 4.

**Hon. Kody Blois (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is always a privilege to rise in this place and to bring the perspective of the good people of Kings—Hants to the day's debate.

### *Business of Supply*

Of course, today's debate is on an opposition day motion. My Conservative colleagues will know that I always enjoy the opportunity to engage with the text of the motion they put before the House. The text of today's motion tries to suggest that Canada's new government is similar to the last one. There are elements where that is true, and there are elements where that is wrong.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**Hon. Kody Blois:** Mr. Speaker, I hear some of the Conservative members yelling and jostling across the aisle. They would love to think the Prime Minister we have now is the same as the last prime minister, and they are trying to paint that picture in the House, but Canadians know that is not the case. I will highlight in my speech the differentiation between how the government is keeping policies we think are extremely important and how it is also making substantive changes that Canadians asked for and that we have a mandate to help deliver in the current Parliament.

I also want to reject the premise that the Conservatives are putting forward, the idea that any form of deficit somehow does not lead to investment or is somehow problematic for the economy, and I think we are going to have the opportunity to tackle that as well, but let us take a look at the government's record in the past. I look forward to highlighting this to my Conservative colleagues who voted against a number of measures that, I want my constituents to understand, the party opposite has been against.

There is the national child care policy. We talked about it for 50 years. It is helping deliver affordability for families. It has increased access to child care across this country. Is that a failed policy? The Conservative Party would suggest that national child care is a failed policy of the last government. The current government believes in it. We are working with provincial and territorial governments across this country, and I know it is making a difference. There is more work to be done, of course, but it is not a failed policy. I think parents, women's advocates and people who believe in youth and childhood development are not going to tell us it is a failed policy.

What about the Canada child benefit? It is helping to ensure that in Kings—Hants, \$17 million a month is provided to lower-income and middle-income families. I have had opportunities to talk to single mothers who have said to me that without the Canada child benefit, they would not have been able to put their child in organized sports or that they would perhaps not be able to buy more nutritious groceries.

**Some hon members:** Oh, oh!

**Hon. Kody Blois:** Mr. Speaker, Conservatives again are yelling. The member for Yorkton—Melville is suggesting that she supported it. No, she did not. I am happy to go on the record to say that they voted against that policy. Is it a failed policy? I think not. The Canada child benefit is one of the best policies the government has put forward.

*Business of Supply*

There is the old age security and the guaranteed income supplement. There are a lot of seniors in Kings—Hants. Those seniors matter. I try to be an advocate. We have to be a lot of different things to a lot of different people as members of Parliament, but I have tried to be an advocate for our seniors. I ask my Conservative colleagues, is that a failed policy of the government, the increase of 10% to OAS for seniors and the augmentation of the guaranteed income supplement? They voted against it. I guess they can explain why they did not think it was important.

There has been generational infrastructure investment in Kings—Hants, whether in waste water or infrastructure to support housing. There has been a housing boom in our communities. I would ask the Conservatives this: Is the investment under the Canada infrastructure program a failed policy? I would suggest it is not.

Income with respect to heating is important. In Atlantic Canada, the government has put forward programs that would actually help everyone below the provincial median income with up to \$20,000 to help move towards a heat pump and give people above the median income access to borrowing and to making investments to improve energy efficiency. This is most important for affordability, but it also reduces emissions at the same time.

Conservatives voted against the heat pump programs every single time. I guess that is another failed policy, yet I have seen the results in my own riding with respect to what it has meant for individuals who have been able to transition off a heating source that was costing \$7,000 or \$8,000 a year to heat their home, and it brought their energy bills lower. I guess the Conservatives suggest that it is failed policy.

I believe, and I would hope members of the House agree, that fiscal discipline is an important public policy measure. It matters. On that, I would extend an olive branch to MPs who want to talk reasonably and rationally about it, but to suggest that any deficit does not or cannot lead to economic success is a complete fallacy.

• (1100)

Let me give an example Canadians at home would appreciate. I cannot speak for every member in the House, but I can talk about the time when my wife and I bought our first house, and we did not have the money to pay for it. We ran a deficit. We took a mortgage. We borrowed to try to create a better future. I know that we have work to do on housing across the country, but many Canadians would be able to relate to a similar situation when they borrowed to try to build a better future. Governments are no different. Governments have to make choices about whether they want to make investments to create a better economic outcome.

As opposed to looking at this through a binary choice suggesting that any deficit is a bad thing, as opposed to looking at the investments to grow the economy, a better measure is the debt-to-GDP ratio. If we are running a deficit, is the economic growth outpacing the debt that is being taken on?

I am happy to tell my Conservative colleagues that Canada has the lowest net debt-to-GDP ratio in the G7. What does that mean? The economic growth is in proportion to the size of the economy. This is important, because I do not hear a whole lot of intellectual stuff coming from you guys in terms of the economic basis, I am

sorry to say. I have to be able to suggest that the size of the economy—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater):** Order. I will just remind colleagues to address their comments through the Chair, and we will avoid all of this.

The hon. parliamentary secretary.

**Hon. Kody Blois:** Mr. Speaker, I listened when colleagues spoke, although I certainly disagreed with a lot of different measures. The net debt-to-GDP ratio is the size of the Canadian economy versus the debt that exists. My measure for Canadians at home then is to say that Canada's debt position is actually sustainable. We have to be able to look at the cost. That is exactly what the government is doing.

It is interesting to hear the Conservatives yelling again in the House.

The budget has not yet been presented. The government was elected on a mandate very clearly to do two things, to separate operational spending versus capital investment. The government is going to be doing that. We have signalled that we are going to be, frankly, reevaluating operational spending while also setting aside the capital investments to build a future for a brighter tomorrow. That is extremely important.

The Conservatives stand up in this place to tell Canadians that, frankly, there is no economic hope, that the country is broken, and we have heard that same narrative. Canadians want politicians to talk reasonably about the challenges that exist. I will be extremely clear: The government understands that it has a mandate to rein in operational spending, while at the same time, to invest in capital projects that are important.

While the member from Saskatchewan, from Yorkton, continues to yell across this House—

**An hon. member:** Oh, oh!

**Hon. Kody Blois:** Mr. Speaker, I would tell her the reality is that we need to continue to put investments on the table to drive and catalyze private sector investments. That is where we have to go.

We also have the lowest deficit in the G7. We would never hear that from the opposition benches in terms of our position. I think it is important that the government actually addresses operational spending. It is coming on November 4. We are going to see that from the government. It is going to be a responsible approach.

*Business of Supply*

What I am hearing from the Conservatives is that they would just gut everything. They would gut it all. Canadians do not want that. They want a government that is going to walk the line between a reasonable fiscal approach, reining in operational spending, at the same time being forward looking about where the economy has to go, because we are in a difficult period. The world is a different place than it was six months ago. The U.S. government is changing its trade policy, which is having an adverse impact on certain sectors in the Canadian economy. The government was elected, and the Prime Minister was elected, to make sure that we are the best ones to move forward in terms of how Canada positions itself in the days ahead.

I think it is extremely important when we talk about what this government is doing, such as major projects. The Conservatives, I would hope, would be in support of that. LNG too, when fully completed, will be the second-largest LNG project in the world, and the lowest emitting. That is something we should be proud of. As to the Foran mine in Saskatchewan, we should be proud of the copper production there. In our neck of the woods in Atlantic Canada, it could be renewable energy that we could drive forward.

We have cut taxes for 22 million Canadians. We have removed the GST for first-time homebuyers up to \$1 million. We have removed the consumer carbon price, which again, was important for rural communities. It is a strong policy that I was advocating for. I am glad to see that the government and the Prime Minister have been able to find a pragmatic way forward.

The last thing I am going to say is that the Conservative motion talks about food prices. It is pretty rich to have members of the Conservative Party stand up here in the House on this. They had nothing to say in the election for farmers, not one single message. They stand up on their high horses, yet have nothing to say.

• (1105)

**Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it was interesting listening the member's speech. He spoke eloquently, but he did not have a basic understanding of finances when he referred to deficits and the accumulation of debt as being the same thing. They are absolutely very different from each other. I would hope that he would educate himself on the difference between deficits and debt.

The government has signalled that it is going to make a significant departure from the way it has historically and traditionally presented finances and budgets here in the House and to Canadians. It is going to use an asset-based, or capital, budget versus an operational one, which is the way it has traditionally been presented.

We know that figures do not lie, but we also know that liars know how to figure. I am wondering if this is an attempt to mislead Canadians as to what our country is really up to.

**Hon. Kody Blois:** Mr. Speaker, I can certainly tell the hon. member that I know what a deficit is, and Canada has the lowest one in the G7. On debt, we have the lowest net debt-to-GDP ratio in the G7.

There is still more work to do. The government is serious about making sure that we can tackle this and that we are going to have a fiscal track that will be sustainable over time. Frankly, that is going

to mean some tough choices, but the government was elected to put that position forward.

The member talked about how we are going through our budgeting process. I compliment the Minister of Finance for going on a fall budget cycle, which will allow us to meet construction time. The member opposite runs a construction business. I think he would appreciate knowing the programs and investments that would be in place. It would allow for a construction season when those businesses could take advantage of them. The public accounts will still be reported the same, but we are going to separate the capital, long-term investments from operation.

[*Translation*]

**Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, we are having some great discussions today. I have a rather fundamental question for my colleague.

The Liberal Party is saying that it is there for the middle class, that it wants to defend the most vulnerable, that it wants to help the poorest members of our society increase their purchasing power and that it wants to put money back in their pockets.

What does my colleague think about the government taking \$83 billion from Quebec and Canadian taxpayers to subsidize big oil companies, whose owners are likely among the richest people in the world?

Is that his idea of giving more money to the poorest and most vulnerable members of our society?

[*English*]

**Hon. Kody Blois:** Mr. Speaker, the natural resource sector, in all of Canada, helps to drive the revenues that matter for public spending for provincial and territorial governments across the country. The hon. member knows that Quebec is a recipient under the equalization formula. Frankly, we have natural resources, whether it is in western Canada or Newfoundland's offshore. This matters for the whole country, and we should take great pride in it. I know the member sits as a member of a sovereignist party, but within the federation, this is important for all Canadians to understand.

Also, I want to put on the record that I have heard members from the Bloc talking about the fact that they will not support the budget because they do not think it is fiscally sustainable, yet at the same time, they are asking for more spending, particularly, for example, Canada Post, which is a corporation that is losing \$10 million a day. They are suggesting that no change should happen there, but then they will not support the budget because they are suggesting that the government is not being fiscally responsible. What is it?

*Business of Supply*

• (1110)

**Hon. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, what I found most interesting during the member's discussion was when he was talking about the Canada child benefit, and the member for Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek started suggesting that it was Conservatives who brought in that program. Of course, Conservatives would love to go home to tell everybody that it was their program, but in reality, what the Conservatives created was the universal child care benefit.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**Hon. Mark Gerretsen:** Mr. Speaker, they are applauding it, but people should know that that program gave the exact same amount of money to every Canadian who had a child, which meant that, if a person was a millionaire, they were getting that money as well for their children. Of course, Conservatives would never want to have a program through which they were not able to give millionaires cheques.

I wonder if the member can highlight the importance between the two programs.

**Hon. Kody Blois:** Mr. Speaker, the Canada child benefit is perhaps one of the strongest legacies of the last government. It is a policy that will make a difference for generations to come.

As the chief government whip highlighted, the difference is that the Canada child benefit is actually income tailored, so there is a cut-off. Individuals who are making millions of dollars do not need \$100 a month from the government to be able to support their children. For lower- and middle-income individuals across the country, including those in Kings—Hants, the government has tailored that policy. It was a key change from the Conservative policy and platform. We have also augmented the amount that goes out to families.

I can tell the member that families in Kings—Hants understand and know the difference between the Canada child benefit and what the Conservatives had on offer in a previous government.

[*Translation*]

**Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with my colleague from Marc-Aurèle-Fortin.

First, I would like to go back to the discussions we just had. Quebec receives equalization payments. We always forget that when a Quebecker buys gas that comes from Alberta, Alberta receives royalties from the oil companies. At some point, we need to set aside the myth surrounding equalization payments and acknowledge that subsidizing the oil industry not only exacerbates the climate crisis, it financially benefits people who are already raking in record profits.

We have repeatedly heard our government colleagues celebrate the low inflation rates Canada has had in recent months. Incidentally, this supposed return to normal last August, when inflation sat at roughly 1.9%, enabled the Bank of Canada to lower its key interest rate to 2.5%. Let us take a moment to think about that.

We on this side of the House quickly realized that when the Liberals brag about Canada's low inflation, they are actually celebrat-

ing low growth. There is a bit of bad news buried in what may seem like good news. Prices have stopped rising excessively only because they are already far too high. The fact is, this stagnation shows how little spending power Quebec and Canadian families have right now. In other words, it means our constituents do not have enough money in their pockets.

The numbers speak for themselves. With almost zero growth, or just 1%, the GDP per capita will go down this year, and probably next year, too. The government can say what it wants. While Canada is not technically in a recession, the people certainly feel like they are in one. It is not complicated. Prices that are already too high are staying that way, and although they have stopped skyrocketing, people are getting poorer.

Even worse, the steepest rise has been in the price of basic necessities, particularly the cost of rent and food. All across Quebec and Canada, household debt levels have skyrocketed. Unfortunately, the lowest income earners are the hardest hit.

As we know, the federal government is bloated, inflexible, costly, and often dysfunctional, and that is because it is out of touch with the reality of families, workers and communities. All too often, the federal government creates poorly designed programs that miss the mark. In its desire to standardize and centralize everything, the federal government forgets that each region has its own needs, its own unique features and its own priorities. The result: instead of solving problems, Ottawa's involvement nearly always makes them worse. Recent examples are self-explanatory and speak clearly to the situation we are in today.

This was notably the case with the international student file during the last session, when the Minister of Immigration at the time restricted access to post-graduate work permits for students who completed certain programs. At the same time, the federal government announced an across-the-board measure to address challenges specific to Ontario. This was a red flag for many stakeholders, who said that this change could adversely impact them, and that parts of Quebec, in particular, might suffer.

What this decision confirmed was that, as usual, before implementing these measures, the minister and his colleagues did not consult anyone directly involved on the ground or the institutions that were going to be impacted by the measures. For Liberals, the word "consultation" usually seems to mean hiring more consultants. They forget to consult the actual stakeholders, the ones who are on the ground and who are affected by all these measures.

Turning back to the matter of international students, it soon became clear that the citizenship and immigration minister's response was totally improvised. Worse still is the fact that the federal government did not even seem to know what was going on. I observed this myself in committee: The officials present were not familiar with Quebec's education system and its differences. The answers I received in committee were mind-blowing. The officials were unable to tell me what a CEGEP is. This is quite astonishing. People wonder why we want to make Quebec its own country. This was a blatant example of the lack of understanding of Quebec's unique differences that exists in the rest of Canada.

• (1115)

That is unfortunate, because too many of this government's decisions over the past few years have sent that same signal. It was then as it is now. The government still has no coherent plan.

Let us return to today's topic. The Bloc Québécois does not agree with every statement in the Conservative Party's motion, but we will vote in favour of it anyway. The federal government's mismanagement and the recurring deficits it is generating are a serious problem that we need to find solutions for.

The entire preamble of the Conservative motion is true. People are experiencing high levels of financial anxiety, and middle-income households are suffering the most. It is also true that inflation is currently under control and has dropped below 2%, which led the Bank of Canada to lower its interest rates by 25 basis points last week.

However, it would be false to say that the families everyone here represents are better off financially. That picture is misleading. Families' two most basic expenses, housing and food, are far too high.

We absolutely have to protect the most vulnerable people. The lower a person's income, the greater the proportion of that income they have to spend on food. It is basic math.

Meanwhile, here are two examples of transfers to individuals that would help the most vulnerable people cope with rising food prices, for which the federal government is to blame. First is employment insurance. The reform we have been waiting for, which has been promised since 2015, is still not on the table. This would make a big difference, especially in the current economic climate. We also have old age security, of course. Pensioners and seniors, the people who built the society we have today, are in a tough spot. These seniors are now facing very challenging situations, and that is unacceptable. Each and every one of us has a duty to fix this. This issue should be above partisanship, as the majority of federal members who supported the previous bill introduced by my colleague from Shefford understood.

Earlier, I heard the Liberal member say that that the Bloc Québécois wanted more spending. We are proposing is targeted spending. Liberal members voted for the bill introduced by the member for Shefford to increase OAS for seniors aged 65 to 74 to address this inequity. They did that. What I heard earlier is that they were going back on their word. Once again, they are failing the most vulnerable people and that is unacceptable.

### *Business of Supply*

What is also unacceptable is the \$83 billion in oil subsidies that I mentioned earlier. We have to stop that. This industry does not need money. It is making record profits and, moreover, it is contributing to the climate crisis in a very negative way. That also costs taxpayers money. Meanwhile, the government is going to build a pipeline that will cost a fortune, which cost 10 times more than it was supposed to. The private sector did not even want to build it. Given its spending and current fiscal management, this country is heading straight for a wall.

The member for Shefford also had a great proposal that would allow pensioners who wish to re-enter the workforce to be less impacted at tax time. This is targeted spending but, ultimately, it is actual investment that helps retired people make more money and put more food on their own tables. This would also be good for their mental health and physical health. It would help businesses and facilitate the transfer of expertise from this generation to a younger generation entering the workforce.

There are plenty of things that can be done to save money, but subsidizing the oil industry at the expense of the seniors and retirees who built the society we live in is certainly not one of them. We will gladly vote with the Conservatives, because the current government is doing a very poor job of managing public finances. The way it is acting right now is intolerable.

I get the impression that the Liberals are forgetting that it was the public that decided to give them a minority. At some point, they are going to have to get that into their heads.

• (1120)

[*English*]

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in recent months, we have seen a cozying up in the relationship between the Conservatives and the Bloc. The fact that the Bloc is voting with the Conservatives does not necessarily surprise me, but it does disappoint me.

The member made reference to disposable income. We have a new government and a new Prime Minister who provided significant tax breaks to Canadians in every region. Some 22 million Canadians will benefit from them. We saw the cancellation of the carbon tax, which provides more disposable income for Canadians.

I am wondering if my friend could explain to the people of Quebec, and all Canadians, how the Bloc has already decided to vote against the federal budget despite not having seen it.

*Business of Supply*

[Translation]

**Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe:** Mr. Speaker, I was ready to faint just then. It is a good thing I was sitting down. I have been here for six years, and I have lost track of the number of times that that member has worked himself into a frenzy telling the Conservatives how important the carbon tax was, how fundamental it was, and how this government policy was one of the greenest in the world. However, he just stood up and told me that the Liberals did a very good thing by getting rid of the carbon tax.

Let us take a look at the blues together. That member has made about 14,000 speeches defending the carbon tax. He just stood up, looked me in the eye and said that getting rid of the carbon tax was a good thing in the end.

I do not want anyone to tell me that we vote for the Conservatives or with the Liberals. We vote for what is good for Quebec and against what is not good for Quebec.

[English]

**Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, today is one of those days when the Conservatives oddly agree with the Bloc. I do not think Canadians give the Liberals credit at all for cutting the carbon tax. It was an entirely Conservative idea.

I agree with the member when he is completely incredulous at the hypocrisy, double standard or complete turn on a dime. Today, we have some sort of odd agreement. I wonder what his comments are on that.

[Translation]

**Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe:** Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to elaborate.

Former prime minister Justin Trudeau also used to work himself into a frenzy over the carbon tax. I remember how worked up he would get and how passionate his speeches were when he talked about how important it was.

The Liberals are criticizing us today for voting in favour of a Conservative motion. However, looking at the Liberal platform, roughly half of what it proposes was in the Conservative election platform.

That is why I do not pay any attention whatsoever to that kind of rhetoric from the Liberals. What I cannot abide is that, while the most vulnerable people in our society have no money in their pockets, the government has decided to help the wealthy.

**Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, here is another example of Liberal hypocrisy.

It is true that in committee, the Liberals voted in favour of the bill to increase OAS. That vote took place in the Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities.

However, when the time came to defend their position in the House and take responsibility for their decision, only a few Liberal MPs stood up to support my bill. Since the rest of the Liberal MPs did not support it, the bill failed. That is Liberal hypocrisy.

In my riding, an organization called SOS Dépannage recently told me that they have been getting more requests from seniors in need of food. I am eager to see the conclusions of my colleague from Abitibi—Témiscamingue, who is organizing a conference.

Has my colleague also heard about this issue of seniors' groups requesting help from food banks in his constituency?

● (1125)

**Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe:** Mr. Speaker, yes indeed, the same thing is happening in Lac-Saint-Jean. I think this problem exists everywhere, in every region of Quebec and probably in the rest of Canada too. Once again, I want to commend the member for Shefford for all the work she is doing to protect seniors, retirees and the most vulnerable among us. She is so caring and dedicated to helping others.

I mentioned caring and dedication, but unfortunately, some people on the other side of the House are missing both of those qualities. However, what they lack most of all is courage. They unanimously voted for the bill in committee, but they are going to present us with a budget that likely does not mention what the bill proposed. They were just pretending. I almost used an unparliamentary word.

Sadly, the members on the other side of the House are not living up to their word. Honestly, it is disappointing, coming from people who are supposed to be representing the public.

**Carlos Leitão (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is now my turn to speak, and I want to say that I am a bit surprised to learn that our Bloc Québécois colleagues will vote in favour of the motion, but so be it.

The global economy has changed and Canada must change too. We need to build more housing and infrastructure and support industries that are essential to our economic growth. This spring, Canadians called for a serious and ambitious plan, and we are working hard to prepare and implement that plan.

First, as our colleague, the Minister of Finance, has already announced, our new government will table a budget on November 4. Second, as was also indicated this week, the budget will be based on a new capital investment budgeting framework. This framework will distinguish between current operating expenditures and capital investments, which will help the government prioritize investments that will deliver long-term benefits for Canada. Operating expenditures will be balanced by 2028-29.

I would also like to point out that this new way of presenting a budget only adds information. Nothing is being taken away. The final numbers are still there. No one is trying to hide anything. We are adding information so that Canadians can have a better understanding of public finances and the government's role. Ultimately, after all the discussions we have here, which can sometimes be a bit heated, we are getting back to the basics.

*Business of Supply*

What matters most is understanding the government's role. What role should the government play in the current economic environment? The Conservatives have an opinion, a perspective, on that role. They believe it should be minimal. The government should do nothing. It should cut taxes as much as possible and let the economy decide what happens. We have a very different view of the government's role. It is a different concept because the environment today is very different from what it has been for the last 15, 20 or 30 years.

Let us look at what has happened, especially over the past 10 years. Our colleagues keep going on about inflation, deficits, and this, that and the other. However, there are a few things to keep in mind. There was a pandemic. In 2020, the global economy came to a standstill. It was not pleasant, and the governments of all the OECD countries and the world were at a bit of a loss as to how to get out of this situation.

We did end up getting out of the situation. However, the global economic recovery was hampered by supply chain disruptions, which caused inflation. The inflation stems from that period, from the disruptions to global production. We had a heavily integrated global economy that disintegrated somewhat with the pandemic. When demand rebounded after the pandemic, prices rose because there was not enough supply. Everyone wanted to buy the same thing at the same time.

Just as we were beginning to recover, what happened? The war in Ukraine started and energy prices soared. It was not the Liberal government's policies that caused energy prices to rise around the world. Give me a break. Ukraine was also a major grain producer. Global grain prices also rose. Then, just as we were starting to recover a little, what happened? A new American president took office and told everyone on the planet that his favourite word is "tariffs".

● (1130)

The new U.S. administration's goal was to opt out of the global trading system. The Canadian economy, which is highly integrated with that of the U.S., has suffered and continues to suffer a great deal as a result of these issues. Since the partners we have been counting on for decades are no longer reliable, we need to change directions.

The government has a role to play in that. Right now, the Government of Canada is taking responsibility. We want to help the Canadian economy transform itself, diversify and seek out new markets. That is the direction that November's budget will take.

Let us now come back to the Conservative motion, because I find it very interesting, even though I will vote against it. It states:

(ii) Liberal deficits fueled inflation....

As I just said, the Liberals did not fuel inflation. Inflation is global and stems from the effects of the pandemic and from rising transportation costs due to increased crude oil prices after the invasion of Ukraine. Inflation also stems from the American tariffs. In case our friends have not noticed, the price of aluminum in North America has increased dramatically for all consumers of aluminum because of the American tariffs. This is not a Canadian phenomenon, but a global one.

The motion states:

(iii)...food inflation doubled the Bank of Canada's target....

Come on. The Bank of Canada does not have a food inflation target. The Bank of Canada's mandate is to keep inflation within a predictable range and under control at 2%. Global inflation is calculated on the basis of a basket of consumer goods. There is no specific target for food inflation, which, as my colleague already mentioned, is also starting to get back under control.

Lastly, in their motion, the Conservatives say:

...deficits drive investment...down....

No, deficits do not drive investment down. Private investment is currently low because of uncertainty caused by our neighbour's tariff policies. We will provide guidance and help the private sector invest. The private sector will invest, and the government will be there to make our economy strong and resilient.

The November 4 budget will provide a lot of clarity on this issue.

● (1135)

**Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I know that my colleague is very knowledgeable about the economy and about austerity measures, considering his background. I would like him to reassure us about the future budget, if he knows what is in it, and tell me what he thinks about the subsidies and tax exemptions being given to western oil companies, to the tune of \$83 billion over five years.

Could this money not be used to help people who are struggling to make ends meet, for example, by transferring it to old age pensions or directly to Canadians?

**Carlos Leitão:** Mr. Speaker, I am bit surprised that our Bloc Québécois colleagues are criticizing us because we have a budget that will have a deficit, a very large deficit, and yet they are also asking us to spend more. I find this rather contradictory.

The oil sector is a key sector for Canada's economy. It generates significant wealth. It also generates significant tax revenues, so we will be staying the course.

[English]

**Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, those of us who have to run our own budgets know that it is never wise to invest borrowed or printed money to dig ourselves out of bad debt. As to the capital expenditures the government is speaking of, where is that money coming from? The Liberals talk about direct private investment. The wealth that has already been removed from the country by the government will not be offset by what the government is attempting to do.

Will this budget indicate clearly, with those capital investments, how much of the investment is dwindling tax dollars, how much is borrowed money and how much is printed money?

*Business of Supply*

**Carlos Leitão:** Mr. Speaker, there were many things in the member's question.

Modern Canadian governments, like all governments in the OECD these days, do not print money. Let us get that clear. Governments do not print money. Credit is a way for governments to address their situation. When private investment is faltering because of great uncertainty, the government has a very important role to play to assist private businesses in investing. It is private investment that will drive the economy.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Kody Blois (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like my hon. colleague to give us his perspective on our fiscal situation and the fact that Canada has the lowest net debt-to-GDP ratio in the G7 and the lowest deficit in the G7. I would like him to explain to Canadians what that means in practical terms.

Of course, we must address the reality of our fiscal situation, but it is also true that Canada is in a stable position.

**Carlos Leitão:** Mr. Speaker, indeed, the reason why the Government of Canada will be able to announce major investments in its budget is because the nation's finances are under control. Our debt-to-GDP ratio is among the lowest in the OECD.

Our debt is not excessive. We can control and manage the situation.

[*English*]

**Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, big banks, big grocery and big telecommunications companies are posting record profits. Meanwhile, people are getting squeezed at the pump. They are getting squeezed at the till. They cannot afford to pay their bills.

When will the government charge an excess profits tax on the big corporations that are squeezing everyday Canadians when they are trying to make ends meet?

• (1140)

**Carlos Leitão:** Mr. Speaker, I am so surprised. I think we should use this clip. The Conservatives want the government to overtax excess profits. Is that really what you want?

**Gord Johns:** I'm NDP.

**Carlos Leitão:** I am sorry about that.

**An hon. member:** Now does it make sense?

**Carlos Leitão:** It still does not make sense.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater):** Order. We will carry on that debate another time.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Simcoe North.

**Adam Chambers (Simcoe North, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but weigh in on the most recent intervention. I have heard many great things about the hon. member who just spoke, but surely he would know what happens to the money supply when the Bank of Canada purchases the debt that the government issues. While there is no money printer printing physical bills, the money

supply increases substantially, which is, in effect, like printing money.

It is a pleasure to stand before members here today. It is my first time making an intervention of this nature in the chamber since the election, so I would like to take a moment to thank some of the wonderful people who helped send me here from the beautiful town of Penetanguishene. Paul Lefaive went to the Penetanguishene Curling Club and signed up members for my nomination papers. Kirk Ruston, Infinity Golf Lab and all of the people at the hangar make sure that I know what is going on in town and what real people think. Serge Moreau and Frank St. Amant were my sign chairs. Frank is the president of the compound. I just want to thank them. Because of them, I am happy to be here today speaking on behalf of the wonderful constituents of Simcoe North.

I would also like to mention that I will be splitting my time with the wonderful hon. member for Regina—Wascana, who sits beside me.

This is an important time for the country. We know there are a number of threats economically. It is not an easy task to deal with them, but we have seen this movie before.

The former prime minister, Trudeau, said that he would spend just a bit of extra money and have small deficits to get big economic gains. What did we have? We had a decade of very poor economic performance, \$100 billion of deficits before we hit COVID and multiple hundreds of billions of dollars of deficits during COVID.

We had multiple commentators, including the Bank of Canada and well-known economists, telling the government that its spending was contributing to inflation. The Bank of Canada went so far as to ask why we care about inflation so much. It is because it hurts low-income and vulnerable Canadians the most. That is why we should care about inflation.

Do we know who benefits from inflation? The government and people who own assets benefit from inflation. Government revenues have never been higher. They exploded during the inflationary environment, and the government could not help but spend all of that money and more.

In 2015, before the government took over 10 years ago, the federal government spent about \$300 billion on its expenditures. That number today is expected to be \$530 billion for the fiscal year that just ended. That is a substantial increase in spending, yet the Liberals are still so far away from balancing the budget. We are not even in a recession. What is going to happen to the federal fiscal finances if, heaven forbid, a recession takes place?

The Parliamentary Budget Officer has warned that government finances are “unsustainable”. For example, in 2015, the federal government spent 7.5¢ out of every expense dollar to pay interest on the debt. Today, that number is over 10¢, and it is expected to go to 14¢ out of every dollar in just a few years. In real dollar value, \$80 billion a year will be paid in interest on the debt in just a few short years.

Why is that the case? It is because the government took on too much debt in the first place. It is not just that. It is that when the government took on the debt, it did so absolutely negligently, borrowing in all short-term debt. We had countries during COVID, like Austria, issue 100-year bonds. The average term to maturity in Mexico is 18 years. In Canada, the average term to maturity is six. Heck, even the provincial government in Ontario is 12 years.

What the government has done to the management of this nation's finances is nothing short of embarrassing. We will be doubling the amount the government spends on interest on the debt in a decade. That means less money for social services. The IMF, which members of the government love to tout as a wonderful multilateral institution, has already acknowledged that for every single penny that is spent on interest on the debt, a corresponding amount is cut from social services.

• (1145)

That is why we care about spending. The individuals in this chamber and the individuals outside who were warning that the government was spending too much a few short years ago were laughed out of the room because our debt-to-GDP ratio was falling or we were not spending that much on interest on the debt. Now look at where we are, and this is before we are even in a recession.

In May, the Bank of Canada warned that 40% of the government's debt issuance is purchased by hedge funds. Why should we care about that? It means that 40% of the debt issued by the government is purchased by financial speculators, who do not hold the debt for very long. They buy it and sell it immediately in the repo market. What is going to happen to our interest rates if something outside of Canada, such as a sovereign debt issue, a crisis somewhere else or global economic uncertainty, causes these hedge funds and financial speculators to not have liquidity or not be able to sell the debt they purchase? Who is going to buy the debt then?

Yields will increase, interest on the debt will increase and social services will have to be cut. Of course, we could get back to the central Bank of Canada purchasing the debt of this nation and monetizing the debt, which is, in effect, printing money. What happens when we print money? Inflation goes up and a massive gap is created between those who hold assets and those who do not.

For all of the government's focus on low-income individuals, its absolute blindness to and not recognizing the negative effects of inflation on low-income and vulnerable Canadians is deplorable. The government has overseen an increase of wealth and income disparity in this country over the last 10 years. Over the previous Harper administration, it went down. Wealth and income disparity did not go up under the previous Conservative government. They have gone up under the Liberal government in the last 10 years, because its policies and inflationary deficits have made those who hold assets richer and those who do not poorer.

That is what happens. This is simple economics. It is not what I would have expected from a well-regarded, well-renowned Prime Minister who has all of these accolades and says he knows better than everyone else. He did not run on spending double what Mr. Trudeau spent in terms of deficits.

### *Business of Supply*

Other Liberal policies are leading to inflation everywhere. It is not just food. Let us think about insurance costs. Because the government has made this country uninvestable, reinsurers have left it. That means there is less competition in insurance, which is why rates for commercial and auto insurance are going through the roof. This is in addition to the fact that the government does not seem to care, or has only recently seemed to care, about stolen cars.

I was at my favourite watering hole last night, called Stolen Goods. What a wonderful place. People there were telling me they spend about one-third of their equivalent rent payments just to ensure they have commercial insurance for their enterprise. This is unsustainable.

These economic policies and outcomes are a direct result of the government's lack of focus on the economy, believing it can solve every problem by spending more money.

The Prime Minister just went down to the Oval Office. I would be embarrassed if I was a Liberal MP sitting here today. The Prime Minister campaigned and said that Conservatives would kneel before the altar of Mr. Trump, but what did he do? Here are a couple of headlines. "It's humiliating to kowtow to Trump. But what choice does Carney have?" That is in the *Globe and Mail*. Althia Raj writes, in the *Toronto Star*, that the Prime Minister and Donald Trump "put on a show of affection". She even called it a "bro-mance". I think it is reasonable to point that out.

• (1150)

We are here today to stop the unnecessary inflationary deficits. That is what Conservatives are here to do.

[*Translation*]

**Carlos Leitão (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I just want to come back to the issue of printing money. I would like to remind my colleague that it is called quantitative easing, and it is a policy central banks implemented. The U.S. Federal Reserve also adopted this policy, as did many European countries.

Does my hon. colleague believe that quantitative easing measures are harmful?

[*English*]

**Adam Chambers:** Mr. Speaker, I had the wonderful opportunity to work for finance minister Jim Flaherty, who said what everybody knew at the time: Quantitative easing is inflationary and harmful to the overall economy.

The central bank never did quantitative easing until COVID. It is doing quantitative tightening now. The government's fiscal policies are putting the bank in a very difficult position whereby it may have to restart quantitative easing again, and we have seen the results of that all across the world.

*Business of Supply*

[Translation]

**Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, we are talking about expenditures and revenues. Obviously, the public coffers need to be managed responsibly, but those who manage them must also take into account the people hardest hit by the economic crisis, which seems to be having an impact on a considerable segment of the population.

Does my colleague agree with the position of his own party, which supported the member for Shefford's bill to restore fairness between seniors aged 65 to 74 and those aged 75 and over with regard to OAS benefits? Even though it is an expenditure, does he think it is a good expenditure that could in turn benefit the Canadian economy, since those people are going to spend that money here?

[English]

**Adam Chambers:** Mr. Speaker, as Conservatives, we want to make sure that a government spends its money properly so that it has money to spend on health care and social services for those who need them the most, including seniors, young people and those with families. We have to be judiciously focused on every single line item so that the government has the money to spend on vulnerable people and those in low-income situations, especially seniors.

I would add to my colleague's point that for those who qualify for the guaranteed income supplement, the amount is not high enough.

**Fred Davies (Niagara South, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I am following up on the quantitative easing issue. The Government of Canada went into a stimulus program. In January, the bank said it had normalized and finished its quantitative tightening process, but during the Speech from the Throne, I warned that this was an indication that the government was going to go on a spending spree again. From what I have seen over the last couple of months, as the fiscal house of cards has fallen apart, we are on the verge of massive new quantitative easing.

I wonder if my colleague might comment on the impact of that, particularly in the current context of the economy.

**Adam Chambers:** Mr. Speaker, the risks he raises are important. The reason we had quantitative easing in the first place is that no one else who was willing to purchase our debt. That might happen again. With 40% of those who purchased our debt being hedge funds or financial speculators, if they are unable to purchase our debt, who is going to?

We will see rates increase or we will see the Bank of Canada forced to purchase Canadian government debt, which, of course, is quantitative easing. Maybe we will see both. That money supply, M2, will increase, and that is, in effect, money printing.

• (1155)

**Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, Imperial Oil posted profits of over \$7 billion in 2023, almost \$5 billion in 2024 and almost \$1 billion in the last quarter. It has returned \$367 million to shareholders. What is the excess profits threshold for Conservatives before they would charge an excess profits tax, so they could support the very vulnerable people the member is talking about?

**Adam Chambers:** Mr. Speaker, never before in history has there been an example of increasing taxes on businesses resulting in lower prices to consumers. I do not think we are going to get to a full discussion of that issue here today, but I welcome follow-up discussions with the member at a future date.

**Michael Kram (Regina—Wascana, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin my speech this morning with a movie review, if I may. The movie stars Leonardo DiCaprio and Kate Winslet, is widely considered to be James Cameron's masterpiece, won 11 Oscars and brought in \$2 billion at the box office. Of course, I am talking about *Titanic*.

One of the most memorable scenes from that movie is when the ship is first coming up on the iceberg and the lookout yells, "Iceberg, right ahead!" All of a sudden, the captain and crew spring into action, reverse the engines and turn the wheel and rudder as hard as they can to try to save the ship from hitting the iceberg. Unfortunately, it is too late. The ship crashes into the iceberg and sinks to the bottom of the ocean.

Historians have long agreed that if the lookout had seen the iceberg just a few seconds earlier, the ship could have turned in time and the disaster could have been avoided. Imagine for a minute if, instead of seeing the iceberg only one minute or two minutes before the crash, they had seen the iceberg 10 years in advance. How would events have turned out differently? It would not have made for a very good movie. If the lookout could have seen the iceberg from miles and miles away, it would have been pretty easy, presumably, to avoid crashing into it.

Ten years is how much warning the Liberal government has had about the dangers of Justin Trudeau's reckless spending and the continuation of those reckless policies under the current Prime Minister for the past six months. However, it was not always like this.

A generation ago, the Chrétien-Martin Liberals were the party of fiscal responsibility. Former finance minister Paul Martin once said the Liberal government would balance the budget "come hell or high water." Tough choices were made in the 1990s, but eventually, the books were balanced, because the government understood that a nation cannot spend its way into prosperity with money it does not have. Conservatives may have disagreed with some of the decisions that were made along the way, but on the core principle of fiscal responsibility, there was support from both parties.

Unfortunately, in more recent times, Justin Trudeau said the budget would balance itself. In 2015, he said the Liberals would run three small deficits for three short years and then the budget would be balanced. Fast-forward to December 2024, when the Liberals were to present their fall economic statement. By that time, their deficit had ballooned to the figure of \$62 billion, an amount so embarrassing that the finance minister chose to resign that morning instead of facing the embarrassment that would inevitably come with a deficit so massive and out of control.

That raises the question of how much the deficit is in 2025. Sadly, no one knows, because the Liberal government has until this point procrastinated, postponed and delayed the tabling of a budget and has continued to sail full steam ahead as though nothing was the matter.

We got a glimpse of it recently from the Parliamentary Budget Officer when he testified before the government operations and estimates committee. He described the government's finances as "unsustainable". He went on to say:

It's not a funny fiscal outlook. It's a really serious fiscal outlook. We don't lightly use the word "unsustainable". Unsustainable means you don't have the option of saying, "Maybe I'll wait a couple of years and see how things go." It means, if you don't change, this is done.

The Parliamentary Budget Officer might as well have stood up and yelled, "Iceberg, right ahead!"

The Liberal government needs to change course before it crashes the ship into the iceberg, but unfortunately, the current captain of the ship is continuing on the same course Justin Trudeau had us on. We are already seeing the harms caused to our economy and our standard of living.

• (1200)

In 2015, the Liberals said that their deficit spending would lead to investment, but 10 years later, investment per worker has fallen by 10%. The burden of debts and deficits on our economy over the last 10 years has caused us to have the worst per capita economic growth rate in the G7. Under the current Prime Minister's watch, since he took office earlier this year, 86,000 net jobs have been lost, leaving Canada with the second-highest unemployment rate in the G7.

Food inflation has doubled. In fact, in a recent report from Food Banks Canada, the government received a failing grade when it comes to food insecurity, down from a C grade just two years ago.

Since the Prime Minister took over six months ago, \$54 billion in net investment has left the country. Without investments in new factory equipment, new farm machinery and new businesses, the productivity of the Canadian worker and the standard of living of Canadians will continue to decline.

Another unfortunate thing about the Liberals' massive, out-of-control deficit is that the number has gotten so big that it is difficult for people to understand just how big it is. When the price we pay at the grocery store, gas pump or a favourite restaurant goes up, we understand right away how much money that is. This is because people make these purchases all the time and notice when a tank of gas or a favourite meal costs more than before. However, when we are talking about the size of the federal deficit, the number is so huge that it almost becomes meaningless to ordinary people. That is especially true when the Liberals refuse to table a budget and hide how much the deficit actually is.

For argument's sake, let us take the \$62-billion deficit from last December's fall economic statement. How much is \$62 billion? How big does that amount of money look?

The largest-denomination bank note issued by the Bank of Canada is the \$100 bill. If someone were to go down to the bank,

### *Business of Supply*

go to the ATM and withdraw \$62 billion in \$100 bills, it would be 620 million \$100 bills. Each \$100 bill is about 0.1 millimetres thick, which means that if we were to stack those 620 million \$100 bills one on top of the other, the stack would reach 62 kilometres high. Put another way, that is about seven times the height of Mount Everest. If we were to use \$10 bills, we would have 70 Mount Everests. Using rolls of toonies, there would be enough toonies to wrap around the entire planet. If the rolls were loonies, there would be enough loonies to wrap around the entire planet twice.

Fortunately, pennies have been taken out of circulation, so I will stop my analogies there, but I hope I have made my point about the enormity of this economic iceberg Canada is sailing into. The Liberal *Titanic* may have gotten a new captain last winter, but the course that was charted 10 years ago under Justin Trudeau has not changed. We are still sailing straight into an Everest-sized economic iceberg. It is time to change course.

I encourage members today to support the Conservatives' motion.

• (1205)

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we could use that iceberg analogy for Canada, as the member just did, the United States, England or any of the G7 countries. What we find is that, when it comes to net debt-to-GDP ratio, Canada has the lowest in the entire G7.

The member kind of makes the point that I was trying to make earlier. Conservatives try to make Canada look as if it is broken. Canadians sent us a very strong message back in April that they want us to work together to build a strong Canada.

I wonder if the member could provide his thoughts on the other G7 countries' debt compared to the iceberg.

**Michael Kram:** Mr. Speaker, this reminds me of the elementary school student who comes home with an F on his report card and says to his mom and dad that other kids flunked their report cards too. It does not mean someone is doing a good job just because they can point out someone who has a record that is just as bad.

It is true that governments around the world have struggled with reining in unnecessary spending, but that is no comfort to Canadians struggling to make ends meet, struggling with the cost of groceries and struggling to pay rent. The fact that other countries are having similar problems is cold comfort and is not an excuse for the government to not get our fiscal house in order.

**Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Liberals would have us believe that everything is great in Canada. If we listen to them, they are constantly promoting the big projects window they have put in place.

They also talk about LNG Canada. I would like to point out that when the Liberals came into power, there were 14 applications for LNG plants across this country. In the last 10 years, only one of those has been built.

*Business of Supply*

Does my hon. colleague have comments on that?

**Michael Kram:** Mr. Speaker, there is nothing more frustrating than world leaders from Germany, Greece, Poland and other countries saying they would like to buy Canadian oil and gas so they can stop buying from Russia and dictators in the Middle East, and the response from the Liberals being that there is no business case for oil and gas exports to Europe or other allies around the world. There is nothing more frustrating than having all these economic opportunities literally sitting underneath our feet while the Liberals keep making up excuses about why we should not be developing our resources and why we should not be making life better for Canadians.

It would be wonderful to get these opportunities and projects off the ground to make life better not only for Canadians but also for our allies around the world.

[*Translation*]

**Carlos Leitão (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk of fiscal irresponsibility from the last two speakers.

However, I would like our colleagues to explain this. If Canada is such a basket case, how do we still have a AAA credit rating?

[*English*]

**Michael Kram:** Mr. Speaker, it is interesting how the Liberals keep moving the goalposts. I remember when Paul Martin was prime minister. The goalposts were to balance the budget “come hell or high water”. A few years later, the Liberals said they were not going to balance the budget, but it would be a function of GDP. They would keep it under a certain percentage of GDP. Now they are talking about separating the deficits between operational deficits and fixed assets, or whatever the term is.

It is so frustrating that, as we are sailing straight toward an iceberg and straight toward a \$62-billion deficit, the Liberals are trying to play a bait-and-switch game and move the goalposts. It is time for the Liberals to take some responsibility for the fiscal mess we are in and turn this ship around.

• (1210)

**Gord Johns:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I want to make sure we get to speakers in the right order, so I want to time this point of order now.

The member of Parliament for Marc-Aurèle-Fortin, when I asked him a question after his speech about out-of-control corporate greed, responded identifying me as a Conservative MP.

I could not be farther from a Conservative MP. I want to give him an opportunity to correct the record, if he could.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The member's political affiliation is noted.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Guelph.

[*Translation*]

**Dominique O'Rourke (Guelph, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Berthier—Maskinongé.

I am very pleased to participate in today's debate. Our government is well aware of the fact that many Canadians are struggling to make ends meet. They have a lot of bills to pay, housing is expensive and it costs a lot to buy groceries to feed their families.

However, this is something that is happening around the world. We understand this reality and we are looking at all the issues. That is why we are proposing many measures to help Canadians keep more money in their pockets.

[*English*]

Canada's new government is focused on delivering a plan to address the cost of living challenges impacting Canadians across the country. That is what we are interested in, not cherry-picking data.

Let me give a few examples.

Very early on, the government delivered a middle-class tax cut to allow hard-working Canadians to keep more money in their pockets. Nearly 22 million Canadians are already benefiting from our middle-class tax cut. This tax cut will save two-income families up to \$840 in 2026. Going forward, it is expected to deliver over \$27 billion in tax savings to Canadians over the next five years. This rate reduction will benefit Canadians across the country. The bulk of the middle-class tax cut will go to those with incomes in the two lowest tax brackets, including nearly half to those in the first bracket of \$57,375 and below in 2025.

With this middle-class tax cut, the lowest marginal personal income tax rate was reduced from 15% to 14% effective July 1. Now this tax cut is helping hard-working Canadians keep more of their paycheques to spend where it matters most.

[*Translation*]

Our government is also well aware that there is a housing crisis in Canada. Although we have seen improvements recently in some cities, too many Canadians, especially young people, are having a hard time finding housing that they can afford. That is why our government is implementing an ambitious new approach to increase Canada's housing supply.

[*English*]

For example, the government is moving forward to eliminate the goods and services tax for first-time homebuyers of new homes at or under \$1 million and to reduce the GST for first-time homebuyers of new homes between \$1 million and \$1.5 million. We need the support of the budget to do that. We are talking about significant support, as first-time homebuyers can save up to \$50,000. Altogether, it is expected that this tax cut will deliver \$3.9 billion in savings to Canadians over five years. With this targeted support measure, the government is allowing more young Canadians to enter the housing market and, by doing so, realizing the dream of home ownership. Through this GST relief, we are ensuring that first-time homebuyers have lower upfront housing costs and more money in their pockets for related expenses.

In addition, there are a number of measures to increase the supply of housing. I am delighted to note that this GST relief will also have a dynamic effect on increasing supply, spurring the construction of new homes across the country.

[*Translation*]

Our commitment to helping build more homes from coast to coast to coast does not stop there. We recently launched Build Canada Homes, a brand new federal agency tasked with building affordable housing at scale. This is wonderful, and it has been too long in coming.

Build Canada Homes will quickly build affordable, prefabricated housing on federal land. The agency will also help fight homelessness by building supportive and transitional housing in collaboration with provinces, territories, municipalities, and indigenous communities. In my riding of Guelph, we have had great success in recent years in creating essential supports to combat homelessness, and we need to see much more of this across Canada. This program will help maintain very affordable community housing for low-income households.

In short, Build Canada Homes will accelerate housing construction and give private builders the certainty they need to build even more homes. With Build Canada Homes, our government is transforming public-private partnership. The program has been very well received by everyone in the sector. Our approach is to use modern construction methods while fostering the emergence of a whole new Canadian housing industry.

• (1215)

[*English*]

The government also cancelled the consumer carbon price to refocus carbon pricing on large emitters.

In Guelph, the child care support program this year saw daily child care costs reduce from \$35 to \$22 per day. That means thousands of dollars in savings for people who have children in child care.

With all of these measures, the government is delivering lower taxes, bringing down costs, putting money back in the pockets of Canadians and supporting them through a number of initiatives like trades retraining and investing in industries that are struggling right now, in order to make sure we keep those jobs. However, it is important to understand that to continue supporting Canadians, we need to manage Canada's fiscal finances carefully. When I was on a city council, I brought in value-for-money audits and went line by line through the budgets. I really care about this.

We on this side of the House are guided by fiscal discipline. We will spend less and invest more. We are going to balance the government's operating spending with revenues over the next three years by cutting waste, capping the public service, ending duplication and deploying technology to improve public sector productivity. The Minister of Finance and National Revenue will deliver the details of the new government's plan on November 4 by presenting budget 2025 in the House. It will be a comprehensive, effective, ambitious and prudent federal budget that will focus on growth, productivity and long-term prosperity.

### *Business of Supply*

I will also add an additional point with respect to housing.

As announced by the Minister of Finance and National Revenue earlier this week, the updated fall budget cycle will more closely align with construction season and provide increased certainty and predictability for developers and investors.

[*Translation*]

As you can see, our government has already invested and will continue investing to help Canadians weather challenges associated with the high cost of living and to support our industries. We have lowered taxes and are supporting new housing construction. However, we are also aware of the need to manage public funds prudently.

[*English*]

With budget 2025, our government will lay the groundwork for building a new industrial strategy that will transform our economy. I am a member of the industry committee, and we are looking at that right now. We have to go from an economy of reliance on specific trade partners, such as our neighbours to the south, to one that is more resilient to global shocks; the new Canadian economy will be built on a solid foundation of strong Canadian industries and bolstered by international trade partners. I believe that is exactly what our country needs now. This is what Canadians need.

[*Translation*]

**Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my colleague on her speech.

I always find it a little strange when I hear the Liberals boast about providing relief to the middle class with tax cuts, when it is the middle class that is currently struggling the most because of the cost of living. They are drowning.

Despite that, right after the election, the Liberals decided to forgo nearly \$90 billion in potential revenue. Countertariffs were to be put in place, but we have yet to see any of that money. Then there was the digital services tax, which has been scrapped. There are plenty of measures that could have helped and that could have been used to ease the burden on middle-class families, the majority of whom are living \$200 away from bankruptcy.

With every paycheque, most Canadian families are \$200 away from being in the red. This is no joke. The government boasts about having eased the burden on the middle class. Meanwhile, it is sending \$83 billion to the oil industry. The member for Marc-Aurèle-Fortin says that this generates revenue. Wow. For an economist, that is impressive.

I would like to know what measures will actually be put in place to support and provide relief—

**The Deputy Speaker:** I have to give the member a chance to respond.

The member for Guelph.

*Business of Supply*

**Dominique O'Rourke:** Mr. Speaker, the city of Guelph is one of the most vulnerable to the U.S. tariffs that are hurting our industries. However, the Canadian Chamber of Commerce has been telling us for several months that countertariffs are not necessarily the best way to protect our industries, which employ all these people in my city and in my colleague's city.

We need to look at the bigger picture. We have an inflation rate of 1.9%, which is down from 8.1% in June 2022. The rate has been within the Bank of Canada's target range for over a year and a half. Even during and after the pandemic, Canada had one of the best inflation rates among G7 countries. The Bank of Canada was the first bank—

• (1220)

**The Deputy Speaker:** I have to interrupt the member because we need to move on to questions and comments.

The hon. member for Peace River—Westlock.

[*English*]

**Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, we hear, again, another Liberal who is standing up and saying that things have never been better in Canada. However, we are consistently saying that inflation is out of control and unemployment is up dramatically. We have seen billions of dollars leaving this country and being invested in the United States.

I want to get the member on the record clearly. Does the member think that things are going well in Canada? If she does not, what is the cause of that?

**Dominique O'Rourke:** Mr. Speaker, we have to look at Canada in a global context. Are there things that could be going better? Absolutely, but Canada has the second-largest foreign-investment-stock-to-GDP ratio among the G20 nations. In 2024, we had a record of foreign direct investment in Canada of \$85.5 billion, which was up 36% from 2023.

Are things rosy? No, but how about bringing back rent control in Ontario? How about paying people in Ontario reasonable Ontario disability supports or Ontario Works?

The Conservative Party wants to lay all of these challenges at the feet of this government, and that is very narrow-minded.

**Hon. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I agree completely with the last comment that my colleague made, in particular about how the Conservatives, no matter what the issue is, will stop at nothing to suggest that the only cause of the struggles people might be having is squarely the Liberal government.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**Hon. Mark Gerretsen:** Mr. Speaker, we heard them cheer; yes, they do agree with that.

However, the reality is that there are many other factors that affect people's lives, such as global economic factors. We have a war in Ukraine, which is a country that produces one-third of the world's grain. Definitely, when there is a war going on, there will be inflation as it relates to products. I wonder if the member would like to expand on that.

**Dominique O'Rourke:** Mr. Speaker, the fact is that there is absolutely food inflation, but what is driving some of this food inflation? There are supply chains, climate change and lobbyists for Loblaws, which was caught price fixing. We need to look at what is happening on a global scale. We need to tackle the issues we can tackle. We are doing that. We are investing in Canadians. We are investing in industry. I invite the members opposite to support our budget.

[*Translation*]

**Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to speak to today's Conservative motion. This is kind of an emotional moment for me, because, for once, we will finally be able to vote in favour of a Conservative motion. It is not too populist and it contains pretty accurate information. It also contains some very important statements.

I will not reread the entire motion because that has been done several times today. However, I will read my favourite sentence, and I would like members of the House to pay attention and to take a moment to think about what it means: “[E]very dollar the government spends comes out of the pockets of Canadians”, Quebeckers and citizens.

I deliberately paused for a moment so that members could think about that. That sentence still applies when the government gives contracts to its friends, to two or three guys working out of a basement whose only job is to get government contracts and then subcontract them out while keeping a cut for themselves. Everyone know what I was talking about there. Every dollar spent comes out of citizens' pockets. When we talk about the cost of groceries and the cost of housing and members are pointing fingers at everyone else, the fact remains that the citizens are the ones who bear these costs.

I see members here in the House of Commons voting against minimum indexing, not even decent indexing, for old age pensions starting at age 65. However, groceries are not any cheaper at age 65, 66 or 67 than they are at age 76. One could even say that they are more expensive because it seems as though people generally eat less and less as they get older. I am being somewhat ironic here, and I hope that everyone takes it that way, but these are serious and important issues.

I am concerned. I am concerned about the new Prime Minister. I will not say “the new government”, because another sentence in the motion says that this so-called new government is following the same plan as the old one. I quite agree with that statement as well. The Liberal leader may have a new face, but putting a new label on a jar of peanut butter does not change the fact that it is still the same old peanut butter in the jar. That analogy has been used in the House before, and I really like it. I want to remind people that this is the same government that we have had since 2015. The Liberals will boast about how interest rates have just gone down and about how wonderful they are, but when interest rates go down, it is because the economy is slowing down. When it comes right down to it, we have a government that is bragging about a downturn in economic activity and that seems to take pride in the fact that the GDP per capita is falling. That is not supposed to happen in a well-run G7 country. Everything I said in that last sentence is true except for two words, “well” and “run”.

*Business of Supply*

This country is badly run. That is why we are happy to vote in favour of the motion. I say this for the benefit of my Conservative colleagues who are listening. I am not joking. I am genuinely happy to be able to vote with them. Often, only half of what is in the motions they present to us is true. They choose extremely important topics, but then they throw in a bunch of populist rhetoric and facile statements that force the adults in the room, by which I always mean the Bloc Québécois, to vote against them, because we cannot vote in favour of things that are not true. Today, though, we are happy. I congratulate the Conservatives. I want to give them a pat on the back and encourage them to keep going like this. That is what we call positive reinforcement. Today is a good day.

Ordinary folks are stretched to the limit, even if inflation is under control. We are glad it is under control, but it was so out of control for so long that prices are still too high compared to wages. That is the problem, and for the members opposite who are making such bold claims today, I would like to remind them of a little concept relating to public administration. It is possible and normal for a government, whether it is the federal government or the government of Quebec or a province, to run the occasional deficit. A deficit is a buffer that is there to help the economy. However, it is not normal to have repeated deficits, especially when the economy was already doing well to begin with. That is the problem. A government should run a deficit to stimulate economic growth when the economy is not doing well.

• (1225)

However, deficits have now been run so regularly and for so long that the government is in the process of inventing new ways to do accounting. The Liberals are going to present them on November 4, and I am looking forward to seeing what they have come up with. I hope Canadians will be savvy enough to see through the scam. The Liberals are going to present a deficit that will probably exceed \$100 billion, but it will not show up because they will have separated the good debt from the bad debt.

When we pay a debt, we have to actually pay the debt. The money has to be there. Furthermore, every time a government goes into debt, it means less money for direct services to the public, for direct transfers to the public. This is appalling. I am using that word advisedly, and I do not think it is too strong. We are sick of seeing this, we are outraged, and we would like the truth to be told. We are here as elected representatives of the people. An election campaign is supposed to last a month and a half. Now it is over, so can we talk now and look at what we can do for the common good? I know I am very naive, but that is part of my charm.

People are hurting, and if we want to help them cope, we need to address the root causes of this problem. One of the ways that the government can help low-income individuals in a time of crisis is to give them direct support. I spoke about old age security earlier, but I also want to talk about employment insurance. How many years has this government been promising to reform employment insurance? To answer my own question, it is now 2025 and they started talking about reform in 2015, or even before that. That is over 10 years ago. There has been no progress on that front, and yet people are required to contribute to the EI program even though nearly half of contributors are not even entitled to benefits.

Imagine people shopping around for home insurance and being told by one insurance company that it cannot reimburse them if their house burns down. Obviously, they will immediately move on to the next company. However, workers in this country are bound hand and foot. They are stuck with this lousy government.

If the government is incapable of managing money, it should transfer it to Quebec. Quebec will know how to manage it. In fact, the money ought to have been sent back to Quebec anyway because the federal government has a tendency to take advantage of crises and tough times to further centralize power. Do members know why the government centralizes power? It is because it has too much taxation power relative to its responsibilities. The government is not going to win many votes by making transfers to the provinces and Quebec based on the principle of sound administration. That just sounds like something that would be done by someone who is capable of managing their affairs properly.

The government members just want to make grand announcements from a balcony, outside on a sunny day, with the wind in their hair as they proclaim, “We’re going to help Canadians, we’re here for Canadians, we’re going to help the middle class”. However, what we are seeing is that the middle class has been getting poorer the entire time. People are now turning to food banks. The list goes on.

Regarding grocery prices, as the Bloc Québécois agriculture and agri-food critic, I want to mention that the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food has taken a very smart, meticulous approach to studying this issue and that we have identified issues and put forward solutions. This may not be of interest to everybody, but we have found solutions.

For example, the code of conduct aimed at improving the bargaining power of small suppliers with respect to big grocery chains is still being implemented. It is a long and arduous process, but it is a measure that could change things. Let me give another example. If we want to tackle the cost of food, we need to stop increasing the cost of inputs. When we choose to tax fertilizers, we should not be surprised when food products become more expensive. There is a logic to all this.

I would also like to correct some misinformation that we are being given. The government is telling us that Canada's debt is acceptable because it represents about 45% of the GDP—it was 42% before, so it is still 3% higher—and it is comparing us to other G7 countries. In France, for example, there are no provinces that can incur debt. In other words, we are talking about total debt. In Canada, if you add the debt of Quebec and the provinces to that of the federal government, you reach about 100% to 110% of GDP. That is equivalent to France's and the United Kingdom's debt, and close to that of Italy, so things are not going so well after all. We need to start taking this seriously and helping people who need it.

I still have a lot more to say. Let us start by cutting the infamous \$83 billion for oil companies.

*Business of Supply*

• (1230)

[English]

**Pat Kelly (Calgary Crowfoot, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, toward the end of his speech, the member was getting on to some of the financial trickery we hear in the Liberal government's talking points. The Liberals speak of declining debt-to-GDP, yet the debt-to-GDP ratio is going up. The per capita GDP is lower now than it was in 2014.

I wonder whether the member could comment further on the Liberals' selective use of accounting and, maybe perhaps in particular, the distraction the finance minister has brought up, where he is distracting Canadians by trying to trick them with changing the method by which the Liberals publicly disclose their finances.

[Translation]

**Yves Perron:** Mr. Speaker, let me begin by sincerely thanking the member for asking a relevant question that also allows me to continue my explanation. The debt-to-GDP ratio is used to determine whether we are capable of paying our debt. Someone who earns \$150,000 a year and owes \$50,000 is in a much better position than someone who earns \$65,000 a year and owes \$50,000.

Right now, the government is using double-talk by only mentioning the federal debt. The truth is that Canadians pay more than just the federal debt. We also pay the debts of the provinces and of Quebec. The ratio is a lot higher than we are being led to believe. The Liberals are going to hide part of the debt in the upcoming budget. I will continue my explanation the next time I speak.

• (1235)

**Natilien Joseph (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the budget has not even been tabled yet and the Bloc Québécois is already trashing it. Would the Bloc oppose any budget at all simply to play its opposition role, regardless of what that budget contains? It is a yes or no question.

**Yves Perron:** Mr. Speaker, this is going to make my colleague happy. My answer is no.

If his government could present us with a budget that sounds reasonable, that provides decent health care transfers to the provinces, that respects the people who built our society by increasing OAS and that provides for common-sense EI reform, we would vote for that budget in a heartbeat.

If the Liberals have questions, we can answer them. Bloc members are pretty decent economists. We can tell them what they need to know and advise them on what to do.

**Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my colleague on his excellent speech. What spirit.

Earlier, my colleague asked a question of the member for Marc-Aurèle-Fortin, who is an economist and former Quebec finance minister. He lived through the period of austerity, which he helped create.

My colleague mentioned the \$83 billion in support that is being paid out to the oil industry. The member for Marc-Aurèle-Fortin replied that it generates revenue for society. I would like my colleague from Berthier—Maskinongé, the agriculture and agri-food critic, to talk to us about the impact that the oil industry has on the

environment and climate change, as well as its direct impact on the agriculture sector.

**Yves Perron:** Mr. Speaker, what a great question. It is practically poetry. I am stammering with emotion.

The government needs to get serious about climate change. As the agriculture critic, I can confirm that we are seeing these impacts. At the same time that the government is subsidizing oil companies to the tune of \$83 billion over five years, it is neglecting to support farmers so they can adapt to climate change. This is serious.

Then, of course, it says that fruits and vegetables are expensive. Of course they are. Only one harvest every five years yields a good crop, a profitable crop. That is the whole problem. We will be reviewing the agricultural business risk management programs in the coming months. It seems like we do not start working on what needs to change in 2028 until the end of December 2027. Can we sit down and work properly and take the long view?

Long-term thinking is a difficult concept for governments in power, because they always want to make statements and announcements to win votes in the short term, unfortunately.

**Carlos Leitão (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have a very brief question for my colleague.

Does he really believe that the Conservative Party would agree with everything he said, particularly with regard to tax policy and employment insurance? Does he really think his new partners would agree with him?

**Yves Perron:** Mr. Speaker, I want to reassure my colleague from Marc-Aurèle-Fortin. No, I did not say that, so allow me to correct him.

However, I would like him to answer me at a future opportunity and explain why statutory appropriations and transfers to individuals and provinces have increased by only 2.6%, while budgetary appropriations for the bureaucracy have increased by 16% and procurement spending, including contracts for Liberal cronies, have increased by 300%.

Why is he talking to me about how the government will keep giving money to oil when I am asking him about increasing old age pensions?

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, for centuries, alchemists promised to transform lead into gold, and they failed. What is surprising is that after each failure, they still managed to convince one group of people after another with their promise.

Today, the chief alchemist, the Liberal Prime Minister, is promising to transform deficits into investments. He presents this as a new promise, but in reality, it is the same promise the Liberals have been making for 10 years, since October 2015. Given that we have been hearing the same promises for a decade, it is high time to consider whether or not all this is working.

*Business of Supply*

Let us take a look at the results. Among the G7 countries, Canada has seen the slowest growth in per-capita investment. Of the G7 countries, we have had the worst GDP per capita. Canada invests \$15,000 for every worker here. That is about half of what is invested in the United States, where they invest \$29,000. It a third less than the OECD average.

Since coming to power, the Prime Minister has doubled the deficit. Has there been an increase in investment? No. We have lost \$54 billion. He promised the American President that his government's policies would take an additional \$1 trillion out of Canada over the next five years. More deficits mean less investment.

The Liberals did not manage to get the budget to balance itself nor did they manage to spend less to invest more. The alchemists failed to transform the lead of debt into the gold of investment.

• (1240)

[English]

For centuries, alchemists promised and failed to transform lead into gold, but that is not the surprising part. What is surprising is that after each debunking, they would manage to repeat the same promise and convince even more people. It would always come with a new salesman and some flashy new jargon, always designed to dupe yet another group of people who had dreams of gold.

Today's alchemist-in-chief, the Liberal Prime Minister, promises to transform deficits into investments. This is not a new promise; it is exactly the same one that Justin Trudeau ran on in 2015. We remember that he said the budget would balance itself. To be fair to him, we all thought it was just a gaffe. What he actually meant was that deficit spending would spark investment which would grow the economy, generating enough money for the budget to balance itself.

The current Prime Minister has a slightly more sophisticated-sounding but similar idea, which is to spend less and invest more, but given that he has now taken office, accelerated the spending and doubled the deficit, it is now time for us to consider the actual results. What actually happened? Well, since the Liberal government took office, the debt has doubled, growth has stalled, investment has fallen, the budget did not balance itself and, of course, lead did not become gold.

Let us look at the facts. The core facts are these: Under the government, Canada has had the single-worst growth in investment per capita of any country in the G7. I will be splitting my time with the member for Newmarket—Aurora, who will tell the House that in fact the reality is that if we take total investment divided by the number of workers in Canada, we get about \$15,000 in investment per worker, which is barely half of the \$29,000 in the United States and a third lower than the \$24,000 across the OECD.

The result has been that we have had the worst per capita GDP growth in the G7. Dressing up the deficits in a banker's suit has not made any difference, because since the Prime Minister took office, doubling the deficit, which is the rate at which we add new debt, we have actually seen investment drop by \$54 billion. Just the other day, he promised that his policies would drive another trillion dollars out of this country into the United States, proving once again, the result, that deficits do not equal investment. Why is this?

There are a number of reasons. First, everything comes from something. There are only two ways for governments to run deficits: print money or borrow it. If it prints it, it causes inflation, which drives up interest rates, which drives down investment. If it borrows money, it has to borrow it from somebody. If the government borrows it out of the private economy to put it into the government economy, this means that the money that has been borrowed away from private investors is no longer available for productive investments in factories, mines, pipelines, new technology or other income-generating assets.

In other words, when government runs deficits, it does not create net economic activity; it simply shifts the activity away from productive private sector activity towards unproductive bureaucratic inactivity. It moves the money from where it is efficient to where is inefficient. By the way, that is called the crowding out effect. It is well known that this happens, and it is why deficits have coincided with drops in investment in most countries around the world.

The second reason is that today's deficits are tomorrow's taxes, and everybody knows that. What businesses and individuals do when they see governments racking up massive deficits is hoard their cash, waiting for the eventual tax bill. We saw this during COVID, when small businesses would say that with all the debt, they were holding onto their wallet because they knew a big tax hike was coming. They would put their money under their bed, not investing or spending it. They waited for it to be taxed away later on.

This is what economists call the Ricardian equivalence, and it very much proves that there is no net economic activity that results from government deficits; in fact, it only subtracts from the productive investments that people might otherwise make, but they are suspended in terror that they will have a future tax liability, and they therefore do not make those investments at all.

What we have seen is that when deficits are cut, investment is actually increased. Governments across Canada slashed deficits in the 1990s, and we saw a resulting boom in investment. The greatest example of all is Israel. In the 1990s, Israel was running massive deficits that required the government of that country to pay out 6% yields on its bonds. Investors could, in a very lazy way, simply buy government bonds instead of taking risks on productive investments, and that led to poor economic growth.

*Business of Supply*

When Israel started to cut the deficits and in fact balance its budget, the investors could no longer lend to the government, so they had to invest in productive assets. This caused a boom in start-ups, to the point where Israel now has the single-highest density of high-tech companies in the world. As a country of 10 million people, it has more companies listed on the NASDAQ than does all of Europe combined, a continent with 75 times more people. Cutting deficits forces investors to invest in productive assets like the technological booms in Israel.

The Prime Minister will say that he can get a better return on investment with his government-made investments in big economic projects, but there are questions. If the projects he wants to invest in are money-losers, why would the government want to invest in them? If they are money-makers, why would the government need to invest in them? If a project is going to lose money, then going forward with it makes us all poorer. If it is a megaproject, it makes us a lot poorer. The logic of going ahead with massive projects that lose money is like the businessman who says he loses money on every single sale but makes it up in volume.

We do not need money-losing projects; we need money-making projects by having the fastest permits in the OECD, getting rid of the capital gains tax on reinvestments and having lower and marginal taxes on our highest achievers. In other words, the government only needs to get out of the way and stop telling us that it is going to turn deficits into investments or lead into gold. All it needs to do is get out of the way and allow Canadians to dig the beautiful gold mine that is right under our feet in Canada.

• (1245)

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, no one in Canada has travelled Canada more to tell Canadians that Canada is broken than the leader of the Conservative Party.

I challenge the leader's comments today. Think of the deficit. Canada has the lowest net debt-to-GDP ratio out of any of the G7 countries. The G7 includes the U.S., the United Kingdom, Germany and others. We are the lowest. Would he argue that all of those other countries are broken too?

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre:** Mr. Speaker, first of all, the Liberals' argument that they are not as bankrupt as the other countries is not actually true, even if it were a good argument. To start with, Canada's debt is much higher than we see in most G7 countries when we include all debt levels, both public and private, because the Liberals have indebted our households with high taxes and high inflation.

I will give a lesson to the members across the way. We have one economy that has to pay the interest on all the debt in the country. The Government of Canada does not have a monopoly on the entire GDP. The GDP has to fund interest and debt servicing for households, businesses and governments. Because the Liberal government has indebted our businesses and households to the level that we are now one of the most indebted nations in the world on a per-GDP basis, we run very real risks that higher interest rates will absolutely cripple our economy. We need a paycheque economy, not a debt economy.

• (1250)

[*Translation*]

**Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, the Liberals are doing a lot of boasting about lower interest rates. They are boasting about having eased the tax burden, the financial burden on middle-class families. In reality, people are more in debt and are having a tougher time taking care of their responsibilities and meeting their financial obligations at the end of the month.

The Conservatives are proposing to make huge cuts to the public service. I would like the opposition leader to explain what he plans to do to ease the financial burden on Canadian and Quebec families.

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre:** Mr. Speaker, we will cut bureaucracy, consultants, foreign aid, corporate welfare, funding for bogus refugees and the list goes on. We will reduce the size of government to bring down the cost of living, inflation and taxes. We know that the government is causing inflation by printing money.

The member mentioned interest rates. The Governor of the Bank of Canada is not saying that inflation is low. He is saying that the unemployment rate is high and that is why he needs to lower interest rates.

Despite the Liberals' promises, we have the weakest economy in the G7. We need to turn things around with a new Conservative government.

[*English*]

**Michael Guglielmin (Vaughan—Woodbridge, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a theme emerging. We have capital flight at an alarming rate in the country. We have a productivity crisis. From the Liberals on the other side of the aisle, all we hear is that it is not their fault.

I am wondering if the Leader of the Opposition could highlight all of the negative consequences of Liberal policy and the one simple thing they could do to fix them.

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre:** Mr. Speaker, it seems to be the current Liberal Prime Minister's approach, just like the prior Liberal prime minister, that they cannot do anything about the fact that we have lost half a trillion dollars of investment, cannot do anything about the fact that we are the fastest-shrinking economy in the G7 with the second-highest unemployment and cannot do anything about the fact that we have the lowest investment per worker of any country. If they cannot do anything, maybe it is time for them to get out of the way, because we can over here.

*Business of Supply*

I will tell members what we will do. We will cut taxes on work, investment, energy and homebuilding. We will eliminate the production cap, the ban on the offshore shipping of oil, and the industrial carbon tax. We will rapidly approve projects and have the fastest building permits anywhere in the world. We will open Canada up for business and make this the richest nation on earth.

**Sandra Cobena (Newmarket—Aurora, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, if I were to describe an entity that changes its fiscal reporting midway through the year, alters the financial metrics by which it judges itself, repeatedly misses every fiscal anchor it sets, racks up unsustainable debt and refuses to provide transparent answers to basic financial questions, one might assume that I was describing a corporation on the brink of collapse. However, those are the defining characteristics of the government. This would never be acceptable in the private sector, and it should have no place in our government.

Year after year, the national debt keeps climbing. Interest payments now exceed what we transfer to provinces for health care. The deficit, once promised by the Liberal government to be modest and temporary, has now doubled. Instead of restoring discipline, the government is rewriting the rules and stretching the definition of capital investment so far that even subsidies, tax breaks and housing incentives are being rebranded as capital formation. What a joke. These are accounting tricks, a deliberate attempt to make the books look better than they are. More blatantly, the government knows it has lost control of Canada's finances and is now redefining capital investment as a communications strategy to confuse Canadians.

The independent Parliamentary Budget Officer described this change as "overly expansive and exceeds international practice such as that adopted by the United Kingdom." When a government starts changing definitions to hide the scale of its recklessness, it erodes the trust that underpins every dollar of public spending.

Canadians deserve honesty and transparency. They deserve a government that manages the nation's finances, not manipulates them. While the Liberals manipulate the way they will present the budget, the deficit is set to balloon to \$68.5 billion. This debt will be carried by my generation and by my children's generation. It is generational debt. It is generational betrayal. A mortgage placed on the future of our children is a failure of duty.

Let us stop pretending the numbers do not matter. We cannot spend our way to affordability. We cannot manipulate the books and pretend our performance has improved. We cannot betray future generations by burying them beneath mountains of debt and calling it investment.

For 10 years, the Liberals promised that deficit spending would fuel growth. However, after a decade of their investment, investment per worker has fallen by 10.8%. Their deficits have fuelled inflation, driven up interest rates and left Canada with the worst economic growth per capita in the G7. Now the Prime Minister is continuing with the same mistakes and producing the same failures.

The Prime Minister likes to talk about the private sector. Let us be clear. It is the private sector that is condemning his ideology, not with words but with actions: 86,000 job losses, the second-highest unemployment rate in the G7 and \$54 billion of investment fleeing this country. It is saying no to reckless spending. It is saying no to a

lack of transparency. It is saying no to excessive regulation and a government that is obsessed with punishing success.

• (1255)

Capital is leaving because confidence in the Prime Minister has left. Businesses will not invest in a government that punishes success and calls it fairness. Businesses will not invest when projects can be held in regulatory purgatory. They will not build under a government that spends without restraint and calls it compassion. The job losses, unemployment, food bank use and investment withdrawal numbers are not Conservative numbers, Liberal numbers, NDP numbers or Bloc numbers. They are reality, and reality has a way of catching up.

They tell us that a young couple in Aurora, Ontario, working five jobs between them, still cannot afford to start a family. They tell us that small business owners, once the backbone of our economy, are shutting their doors because they simply cannot keep up. They tell us that a generation is losing faith, not in their abilities but in their government and in their future.

I would like to share a special message I received last night from a young woman. She said she tried to do everything right: get married, have a family, go to school and get a career. Her husband makes six figures, and once upon a time, that was a dream. They are now unable to afford the house they desperately need for their young family. She said she knows life gives us curveballs, but she did not think her own government would be her undoing.

Every dollar that leaves this country means lower wages and fewer jobs for Canadian workers. Every dollar the government spends comes straight from the pockets of those same workers, with families already stretched to the limit. Let us be honest: A government that cannot live within its means will never make life affordable for those who must live within theirs.

This week, Canadians watched as the Prime Minister visited President Trump and promised \$1 trillion of investment flowing from Canada to the U.S. We in Canada need a counterweight to bring investment to Canada, and the Prime Minister's lack of action has failed to deliver.

*Business of Supply*

Canada needs decisive leadership now. We need our natural resource sector opened; our housing sector unleashed from taxes, excessive development charges and permit delays; our domestic capital reinvested here at home, not in the U.S.; and a Canada where investors see stability, opportunity and transparency.

Canada can be strong. We can restore discipline. We can restore trust. We can restore the promise of this beautiful country, but only if we have the courage to face the truth. Instead, we have a Prime Minister focused on manipulating the budget to hide the extent of his reckless spending from Canadians.

It is time to stop the illusion that Ottawa can spend its way to prosperity. It is past time to bring truth, discipline and integrity back to our public finances. It is what our children and their children deserve from us.

• (1300)

**Hon. Kody Blois (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the Canadian public at home that Canada has the lowest deficit in the G7 and the lowest net debt-to-GDP ratio in the G7. However, the government recognizes that there is really important work to do to make tough choices. That is why our budget is going to be coming out November 4.

The member mentioned that the government is not trying to be transparent. It is actually trying to be more transparent by showing Canadians where operational spending is and where long-term capital investments are happening to grow our economy.

I find it a bit rich when Conservatives talk about balancing budgets and deficits. Can the hon. member explain why they promised to spend \$106 billion in their platform a few months ago? How was that fiscally responsible? How can she stand in this House and suggest the Conservatives are the moral authority on budgeting?

**Sandra Cobena:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the member that the Parliamentary Budget Officer is non-partisan. He is independent, and he himself has said that the government's finances are very alarming, that they are “unsustainable”, “stupefying” and “shocking”.

In the financial sector, the integrity of financial statements is crucial. If we start to change the definitions of what “expenses” are, that is a problem. An expense is an expense. An expense does not become an asset. When we start to change the timing of financial statements, there is no transparency because we cannot compare them to prior years and we cannot compare them to benchmarks of the past. That is the problem.

• (1305)

[*Translation*]

**Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, there has been some verbal sparring between the various parties since the beginning of this debate. However, there is one thing that has not been mentioned, and that is the fact that this is a minority government. The government received a minority mandate from the people.

Normally, in that sort of context, the government must ask an opposition party for help in passing the budget. I have not heard any

rumblings about the government deciding to consult with any given opposition party to determine whether they have demands and whether they could agree on the budget.

My question is this: Is this government behaving like a majority or a minority government?

[*English*]

**Sandra Cobena:** Mr. Speaker, that is one of my main concerns. I truly wish that the government would be honest and would focus on balancing the budget and reining in spending so that we can actually have a future for our children.

We cannot spend our way to affordability. We cannot continue to spend and spend and pretend there are no consequences. There are consequences. It is generational debt. It is generational betrayal, as I said. That is mortgaging our children's future, and the government does not seem to be concerned about this at all. That is irresponsible.

**Anna Roberts (King—Vaughan, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my new hon. colleague from Newmarket—Aurora. They voted her here today to represent her community.

Seventy-six per cent of seniors are having to support their families today because of the Liberal government's affordability crisis. They do not understand budgets. My colleague does. She comes from the banking sector, so I would like to ask my colleague how she might be able to teach the Liberals to balance a budget.

**Sandra Cobena:** Mr. Speaker, all I hear from across the aisle is arrogance and no desire to actually work together for a better future for Canadians.

Fiscal responsibility is important. It has long-term consequences, but the Liberals seem to be laughing and think that it is a joke.

On the topic of seniors, there is a senior in my riding who shared a story with me. He said that his father taught him to work hard and give it his all to achieve what he wanted in life. He gave it his all, and he is still struggling, and those are the consequences of the failed policies of the Liberal government.

**Taleb Noormohamed (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Artificial Intelligence and Digital Innovation, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have been following this conversation with a lot of interest, and I am quite surprised by what we are hearing from members opposite. They claim to know the economy, fiscal prudence and what investment is about, but as we heard in question period yesterday, they do not seem to know what the private sector really is.

*Business of Supply*

I suppose one thing I might share with my colleagues across the way is some fact. The fact is that Canada's economic position right now is the strongest relative to other G7 countries. It is in the strongest position in the G7 right now in terms of economic growth. We heard statistics that are inconvenient for the opposition, such as the fact that Canada is now among the top nations for foreign direct investment. Opposition members talk about investment leaving the country, but the reality is that more and more people want to invest in Canada.

Why is this? People want to invest in this country because of clear facts. First, there is a stable government run by somebody who actually understands how the markets work. Second, people understand that Canadians are not just resilient but also understand innovation and what it takes to be able to deliver the goods.

I will be sharing my time with the member for Trois-Rivières, who will also, I am sure, have lots to add on this point.

The reality we see right now, the facts on the ground, are that when we look at Canada's position globally, we are the strongest economy. We have the strongest potential economy in the G7 and are in the best economic position. Members heard the metrics already from my friend from Kings—Hants regarding the debt-to-GDP ratio.

The reality the Conservatives refuse to accept is that Canada is actually well positioned to deal with global uncertainty. We can look at economic instability south of the border and the economic instability caused in Europe as a result of the Russian invasion in Ukraine; people are looking to Canada as an island of stability. They are looking to Canada as a place where workers are ready to roll up their sleeves and do great things, where innovators are building for the economy of the future. We are making transformational investments in digital and AI, which is where the world needs us to be.

Why Canada? It is because Canada has proven itself to be a trusted partner, a reliable ally and a place where our word matters. That matters to the world. It matters in trade, in commerce and in business when someone's word is their bond. People are looking to this country and saying that they know they can place their investment dollars here. They know they can place their interests here because Canadians know how to value those investments and build with those investments, and they know they can trust their investments will be safe and secure, because the fiscal position of this country is in outstanding shape.

Conservatives would like to be able to spin a narrative that Canada is broken. We all saw how that worked in the last election. Canadians believe in Canada. The government believes in Canada, and the Liberals believe in Canada; that is why Canadians returned us to lead this country. They did not buy the "Canada is broken" mandate, because they know Canada is not broken. They know Canada is the place that will lead when the world is in trouble.

Canada is going to lead, and that is why Canadians put their confidence in us. Had they believed the Conservatives' narrative, the members opposite would have been sitting on this side. That is an unfortunate reality for them. It is a fortunate reality for Canadians,

because Canadians see a government that is leading with optimism and pragmatism. They see a government leading with fact.

Let us talk about some of the facts. Conservatives talk about failed policies. They think providing dental care to five million Canadians is a failed policy. They are saying to more than 16,500 residents of my riding that it is a failed policy that they can now access dental care. They are talking to tens of thousands of parents who have benefited from \$10-a-day child care and saying that it is a failed policy. I wonder how many of their voters are taking advantage of those very same \$10-a-day day care spots.

**An hon. member:** There are 3,000 on a wait-list, bud.

**Taleb Noormohamed:** Mr. Speaker, the member opposite is yelling that there are 3,000 people on a wait-list. This shows there is demand for a government program. That is clearly not a failed policy.

On top of that, Conservatives talk about caring about Canadians and young people in this country. They talk about their concern about the prices of food. They voted against a school food program. They voted against a program that gave parents the ability to ensure that their kids, where necessary, would have food in their bellies. That is who these Conservatives are. They are no longer the Progressive Conservatives of old, who understood that strong social policy and strong economic management can be matched.

• (1310)

The Conservatives have turned their back on economic management. We saw some of the largest deficits in Canadian history under the previous Conservative government. They have turned their back on caring for Canadians. That is what this new right-wing Conservative opposition has become, and that is why Canadians have turned their back on the Conservatives.

Let us talk about the future. Let us talk about what Canadians are looking for. In a world where sovereignty matters, digital sovereignty is at the top of what we are investing in. Why are we investing in that sovereignty? We are investing in that sovereignty because Canadians' data, important information about Canadians; Canadian research; and Canadian innovation need to be protected from governments that may not act in the best interest of Canadians.

When we were investing in the sovereign cloud, when we were investing in compute capacity in this country and when we were investing in quantum in this country, we were investing in data centres to make sure that Canadians know they can be protected in a world where technology and artificial intelligence are everywhere. What we are saying is that we are building for the future, not just for Canada but for the world. We are saying to European partners that they can trust Canada, they can trust our rules and they can trust our guidelines. We understand that innovation should not come at the cost of workers, and it should not come at the cost of values. One can innovate and still treat people with dignity and respect. That is the balance we are trying to set on this side of the House when it comes to investing in Canada.

*Business of Supply*

Investments, as we all know, require all of us to think about the future for the long term. While members opposite may be thinking sound bite to sound bite, our government is thinking generationally for what matters to Canadians and for the future of this country. That is why the investments that we are making matter to Canadians. We are ensuring that we are able to maximize our natural resources while also protecting our environment. We are investing generationally in building homes for Canadians, something that the Conservatives would know nothing about. We are investing in the technologies of the future today. Those investments are creating the jobs of the future. We are setting up Canadians for the jobs of the future by ensuring that they have the money to train and retrain. Therefore, we are putting the money of the economy where our mouth is.

We are not just saying that tax cuts are going to solve everything, but we did that. We have put more money into the pockets of Canadians by cutting taxes while also investing. It proves that we can think about investing in the future while also making life more affordable today. That is what the premise of this government is. We are spending less and investing more. For people who do not understand the difference, it is very clear. Families may spend less at home on things like a Starbucks coffee so that they can invest in their RSPs. In our family when we are talking about prudence, that is how it works. People take money that they do not need to spend on the day-to-day so they can put it into things that are going to deliver a return for them in the future. That is how families plan. That is how governments plan. That is how we are planning for the future of this country.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**Taleeb Noormohamed:** The Conservatives may laugh, Mr. Speaker. They may laugh because they think it is funny to think about the concept of managing our economy in a responsible way, making prudent investments that are going to be there for the future of Canadians. That is okay because they are not running this country; thankfully, we are.

The reason that we are in this position is that Canadians trusted the vision of the Prime Minister. They understood that pragmatism and thoughtfulness can be paired with compassion and resilience. They understood that in the time we are in, when we are facing the significant challenges to our economy from the United States, strong stewardship, building a Canadian economy and working together across jurisdictions in a way that is unprecedented would be best handled by our government and best handled by our Prime Minister and by the members on this side of the House.

I look forward to the opposition motion being defeated, as it should be, as the Conservatives were in the last election, so that we can continue the hard work and the important work of building Canada in a way that works for all Canadians.

• (1315)

**Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I really appreciated hearing the comments with regard to sovereignty. I would like the member to provide the House and Canadians with a definition of what the government means by Canada being a post-national state. I think he is capable of doing this. Could he please define that?

**Taleeb Noormohamed:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the member opposite commenting on my capability. That is much appreciated.

When we talk about what Canada is, it is very different from the Conservatives' vision of Canada. The Conservatives talk about the Canada that was, not the Canada that could be. On this side of the House, we talk about the Canada that could be, the Canada that can be and the Canada that will be. It is a Canada that is prosperous and dynamic, that looks at differences as strength, that invests in the economy of the future, that takes the steps required to ensure that Canadians are trained for that and that does not turn its back on Canadians in their moment of need. We do not say that when Canadians are in need, we are going to turn our back on them and say good luck. We believe in investing in Canadians.

[*Translation*]

**Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my colleague on his speech and his ability to focus. For a guy who celebrated his birthday yesterday and must have gone to bed very late, he seemed very focused despite the noise in the House. Good on him.

Now, he is part of a government that has given up about \$90 billion in revenue, according to the most reasonable estimates. His government is still going to provide \$83 billion in financial support to the oil industry over five years despite the industry's significant impact on climate change.

We have been told that the upcoming budget will include a deficit of about \$100 billion, maybe more, yet the government is bragging about its AAA credit rating. Given this Liberal government's track record, does my colleague think Canada will maintain its AAA credit rating?

**Taleeb Noormohamed:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for his question.

In difficult times, families and governments alike must make difficult decisions. To have a more effective government with clear priorities, we may end up doing less than was done in years past. However, maintaining our fiscal position with banks and investors is also important. It is very important.

The November 4 budget will show us how the government plans to achieve that. I hope that my colleague will support our budget, because it is there to protect our economy, Canadians and Quebecers.

• (1320)

**Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

I waited for the conversations to end but there was chatter on both sides while my colleague was asking his question. No consideration was shown for the question asked. The noise was very loud.

If people want to talk, I urge them to go outside. One member is shaking his head at me as if to say no, yet he was shouting his head off while my friend was asking a question. If he cannot behave with decorum in the House, he should go outside.

**The Deputy Speaker:** I would remind all members that if they wish to engage in discussions, they are invited to do so in the lobby or outside the chamber while the debate continues in the chamber.

[*English*]

**Hon. Kody Blois (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for Vancouver Granville, and I would like to wish him a happy belated birthday. He is looking pretty good for just one year shy of 50, and I think the whole House would agree with that.

I really appreciated the fact that the parliamentary secretary acknowledged that the government is focused and working on a budget for November 4. Also, he said that we are going to have to make some difficult choices to make sure we can protect Canada's fiscal position, differentiating from the Conservative view that the country is broken. Conservatives are not highlighting the fact that Canada has the best debt-to-GDP ratio in the G7 and the lowest deficit.

My question to the hon. member is this: Does he find it a bit facetious that he has to listen to the Conservative benches talk about deficits when the Conservatives actually proposed \$106 billion in new spending in their platform just a few months ago? Does he find that just a little strange?

**Taleb Noormohamed:** Mr. Speaker, do I find it strange? No, not when there is a leader of a party who has never had to live on anything but the taxpayer dollar. I think it is difficult for the Conservatives to understand how an economy works, let alone how balancing books works, so it is of no surprise to me the degree to which they would have made expenditures without considering how they were going to pay for them. It is entirely in line with the Conservative opposition, which has never thought about the fiscal prudence and fiscal direction of the country, but only about populace slogans and trying to win votes.

[*Translation*]

**Caroline Desrochers (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to take part in today's debate and to provide a few facts that are grounded in reality.

This debate is taking place at a time of unprecedented upheaval and readjustment in the global trading system, and it is irresponsible for an opposition political party to try to ignore this and bury its head in the sand.

We know that the world is changing. Accordingly, Canadians expect their government to react appropriately. The debate we are having today goes beyond the walls of this Parliament. It is happening all over Quebec and Canada, including in my riding, Trois-Rivières, in kitchens, living rooms, at Tim Hortons, in meeting rooms and at workplaces from coast to coast. Canadians and Quebeckers know exactly what is at stake here. Our government knows it too.

### *Business of Supply*

[*English*]

While the party opposite is focused on petty politics and simplistic slogans, our government is listening to Canadians. What is more, we are taking decisive action on what we have heard. In the face of this uncertainty, Canadians have called for serious plans to address this new economic landscape and its consequences, not a \$106-billion budget. They have asked for change that puts more money in their pockets, change that builds the strongest economy in the G7 and change that builds one Canadian economy instead of 13. Our new government is responding to this call for change, and that is what Canadians are expecting of us.

From a middle-class tax cut, which is saving money for 22 million Canadians, to the elimination of the GST for first-time homebuyers on new homes up to \$1 million, our government is putting more money in the pockets of Canadians. We removed the consumer carbon price as of April 1, helping to reduce fuel costs, including lower prices at the pump. Our middle-class tax cut alone will save two-income families up to \$840 in 2026, and going forward, it is expected to deliver over \$27 billion in tax savings to Canadians over the next five years.

What is more, the bulk of this tax relief will go to those who need it most, which is to say those with incomes in the two lowest tax brackets, with nearly half going to those in the lowest tax bracket, those earning \$57,000 or less, the same Canadians who stand to benefit from all the programs the party opposite voted against over the years, whether it is the dental care plan or day care. By eliminating the GST for first-time homebuyers on new homes at or under \$1 million, and reducing it for first-time homebuyers between \$1 million and \$1.5 million, we are saving first-time homebuyers up to \$50,000. Altogether, this means \$3.9 billion in tax savings for Canadians over five years, allowing more young Canadians to enter the housing market and spurring the construction of new homes across the country.

● (1325)

[*Translation*]

At the same time, we are seizing a generational opportunity to transform the Canadian economy through ambitious investments and a rigorous spending review, so we can spend less and invest more. We know that the global economy has changed, and Canada must change with it. We need to strengthen our economic power to provide Canadians with greater certainty, security and prosperity.

We need a new fiscal approach to get there. The cornerstone of our new approach is a capital formation budgeting framework that will make capital investment a national priority. This can be done by distinguishing between spending that stimulates capital investment in the public and private sectors and day-to-day spending, and by allowing the government to prioritize spending that stimulates capital investment in the public and private sectors. It is actually quite simple, but we are only deciding to do it now.

*Business of Supply*

This will result in more transparent decision-making and more taxpayer dollars allocated to investments that will grow our economy's potential. This new approach will put Canada in a better position to build the homes, infrastructure and industries our economy needs.

[English]

Our work on this front is already well under way. We recently, for example, launched Build Canada Homes, a new federal entity that will transform public-private collaboration and leverage modern methods of construction to catalyze the creation of an entirely new industry.

This represents a critical new tool to better harness the use of public land, while offering flexible financial incentives to attract private capital, facilitate the undertaking of large portfolio projects, and support modern innovative manufacturers as they build the homes Canadians need. However, it is not only the Canadian housing industry we are transforming. We are also streamlining the federal approval process to get major projects built faster. Working in close partnership with provinces, territories, indigenous peoples and private investors, we launched the Major Projects Office, which is going to work to fast-track nation-building projects by streamlining regulatory assessment and approval and to help structure financing.

Our government is moving with urgency and determination to advance this process, so Canada can build the infrastructure that will transform our economy to become the strongest in the G7. We are doing so because, for too long, the construction of major projects has been stalled by onerous and inefficient approval processes, which have stood in the way of investment. By removing these barriers and bringing new investments online, we will, in turn, create well-paying jobs for thousands of Canadians, supporting families and communities across the country.

What is more, we are undertaking these transformative changes to budgeting and investment on a solid fiscal footing, because the reality is Canada's deficit and net debt-to-GDP ratios are among the lowest among the advanced economies in the world. Let me just repeat that, because this is what I am talking about with facts versus slogans. Canada's deficit and net debt-to-GDP ratios are among the lowest among the advanced economies of the world. This is in sharp contrast with where we were in the nineties and the eighties. It is safe to say we all, maybe not all of us, but many of us, remember those dark days. We remember when stubborn deficits were leading to a rapid rise in Canada's net debt burden, eroding our fiscal advantage, increasing the cost of debt financing, and weighing in on our ability to invest in our people and our future. We can all take heart that those days are over.

In 2024, Canada's net debt-to-GDP ratio stood at just 11.9%, compared to the G7 average, excluding Canada, of 100.4%. In fact, Canada's net debt burden remains lower today than that of any G7 country prior to the pandemic. Canada is also expected to have had the smallest deficit in the G7 as a share of the economy this year. Canada is also one of only two G7 economies, along with Germany, to have an AAA credit rating. At least two of the three major global credit rating agencies are rating us AAA, and it is one that investors are expecting us to maintain. The result of this is Canada's

borrowing cost is as low as possible. Achieving these positive results was not easy, but we were able to do that because the world believes in Canada. I really hope the opposition party can start showing they also believe in Canada.

Our actions as a government will be guided by a new fiscal discipline. We will spend less and invest more. We are initiating a comprehensive expenditure review to ensure our programs and activities are efficient and aligned with our core mandate. We are also introducing a new budget cycle to ensure we are more closely aligned with construction season, providing increased certainty and predictability for businesses and investors, supporting more effective financial planning for federal departments and agencies.

Within this new fiscal framework, budget 2025 will set out our ambitious plan to build Canada strong, with a new industrial strategy that will transform our economy from one of reliance on specific trade partners to one that is more resilient to global shocks, built on the solid foundation of strong Canadian industries and bolstered by diverse international trade partners. We hope the opposition will stand with us.

• (1330)

**Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I have appreciated the opportunity to work with the member on the human resources committee, where we are studying the very serious issue of youth unemployment. As the member knows, the situation is quite bad with respect not just to youth unemployment but to unemployment in general. New job numbers are coming out tomorrow. Already we know that youth unemployment is at 14.5%. There was a 12% increase, in the last month alone, of working-age women applying for EI.

The government has made a lot of promises of things it is going to do, yet the indicators are bad: the second-highest unemployment and the fastest-shrinking economy in the G7. The best the member can offer are some indicators that are lower than the basement, such as saying that we still have not had a reduction in our credit rating.

When we will know if the Liberals' policies are working? What is the time horizon on which they are planning to demonstrate success? I would like to know, concretely, when we will be able know if they are succeeding?

**Caroline Desrochers:** Mr. Speaker, I am really happy to work with my colleague in the committee. Absolutely, youth unemployment is a really important issue, and I am glad we are able to work together on that.

I would like to bring back the issue of promises of what we are going to do. They are not promises; they are actions. We have launched the major projects office. We passed the one economy bill, and I thank the Conservatives for their support on that. We have launched Build Canada Homes, increased salaries for our armed forces and launched the defence procurement agency.

• (1335)

[*Translation*]

Day in and day out, we are delivering on our campaign commitments. We are six months into our mandate. We are delivering on our commitments. They are not promises.

**Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, perhaps my colleague from Trois-Rivières can respond to that.

In the last Parliament, the finance minister at the time, Ms. Freeland, did not want to table a budget with a projected deficit of nearly \$42 billion. She thought it was outrageous to propose—

**The Deputy Speaker:** I have to interrupt the hon. member. Members may not refer to other members by their first or last name in the House.

The hon. member for Drummond can start over.

**Martin Champoux:** Mr. Speaker, my apologies, I know that. I suppose I must have forgotten that this government is the same as the last. I apologize for my blunder. I withdraw the remark.

This former finance minister chose to resign rather than propose a budget with an outrageous \$42-billion deficit. We are about to see a budget tabled with a deficit of nearly \$100 billion.

How is it that the \$42 billion was so outrageous that it forced the then minister to step down, and now, \$100 billion is okay? The government is bragging and saying that everything is fine and dandy.

I would like the member for Trois-Rivières to comment on that.

**Caroline Desrochers:** Mr. Speaker, I believe that Canadians made a clear choice this spring on which party they trust the most to manage the real issues we are confronted with.

We were very clear during the campaign about our commitments. There is nothing in what we have proposed that comes as a surprise. We said that we would invest in infrastructure and that is what we are doing. We said that we would invest to build more housing and speed up the construction of housing to resolve the crisis and that is what we are doing. We said that we would invest in our armed forces and in our defence industry and that is what we are doing.

Now, our hope is that our colleagues will support us.

**Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my colleague spoke about investments that our government is making. These are investments that boost our economy.

Moreover, we have an ambitious plan in place in terms of housing construction. I am already seeing real impacts in my riding that are the result of federal investments in cities like Edmundston, Campbellton and Saint-Quentin.

### *Business of Supply*

Could my colleague tell us more about our ambitious housing plan, which will meet the needs of Canadians and boost our economy?

**Caroline Desrochers:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his excellent question.

Build Canada Homes was really set up to address the current housing crisis. Canadians and Quebecers need more housing, more affordable housing, housing that meets their needs and fits their budget.

We have committed to building up to 500,000 homes a year. We are making a \$13-billion capital investment in Build Canada Homes.

We are really addressing affordability by supporting the construction of all kinds of housing across the entire affordability spectrum, including social housing, co-operative housing and transitional housing.

[*English*]

**Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with my colleague, the hon. member for Huron—Bruce.

I am pleased to rise today on our opposition day motion that “the House call on the Liberal government to stop plagiarizing...Trudeau's failed policies and recognize that deficits drive investment and jobs down and the cost of living up.” I will start with a quote from Mr. Milton Friedman, who said, “Keep your eye on one thing and one thing only: how much government is spending, because that's the true tax...If you're not paying for it in the form of explicit taxes, you're paying for it indirectly in the form of inflation or in the form of borrowing.”

That is dead-on for what is happening right now, just as it was during the past 10 years with the same Liberal government. It is not a different Liberal government. It is not a new government; it is the same Liberal government, the same tax-and-spend Liberal government. In 2015, the former prime minister was well known for responding to a question about his cabinet make-up, saying it was “because it's 2015”. However, that is what the government seems to be saying right now about its continual spending and out-of-control deficits, that it is because it is 2025.

I say that because it is the same term and the same Liberal government. There is no new plan. It is the same tired cabinet with the same old finance minister, who will not answer what the deficit will be. Although the minister was asked repeatedly at committee what the deficit would be, we did not get a response, which Canadians deserve to hear. Instead, he told Canadians they “should rejoice” at our fiscal situation, yes, rejoice at rising unemployment, rejoice at the highest youth unemployment in decades, rejoice at the doubling of the deficits.

*Business of Supply*

The Minister of Finance is telling Canadians they should be happy with what is going on. They should rejoice at our fiscal situation, rejoice that the interest on the Liberal debt is going to be \$82 billion a year by 2030. Put in perspective, that is about \$3,000 out of their pockets for every taxpayer right off the bat, just for interest on the Liberal debt. They should rejoice at the fact that the last two years for GDP per capita, per person economic growth in Canada, shrunk by almost 3%.

“Canadians should rejoice” about being poorer, according to the Minister of Finance, and they should rejoice over the fact that the last five years, which coincide with the five years that the current Prime Minister was advising the Liberal government on economic policy, has been the worst five-year per capita GDP growth since the Great Depression. Think about that. It was worse than the five years covering the 2008-09 economic crash. Yes, we should rejoice, the same as the old finance minister who got demoted and is now off being a special envoy somewhere.

We should be happy. We have never had it so good. Every 30-year-old who is living in their mom's basement because they cannot afford to move out should make sure to rejoice and thank the Liberal government, as it says we should do. There are two million Canadians lining up every single month at food banks. One out of every 20 Canadians in the entire country is lining up at a food bank. They should take time, while they are lining up to rejoice, as the finance minister said.

Mortgage delinquencies have almost tripled in parts of the country in the last two years. As people are packing up their home because they cannot afford it anymore, moving their things into a moving van to maybe move into their parents' basement or out on the street, I hope they will take the time to do as the finance minister suggested and enjoy the good times, rejoice and be thankful for the great economic times the Liberals are delivering.

There are a lot of things I can agree with the government on, and I know I have voted on some items, but there is a lot I disagree with. That is fine; we can disagree. I just want the government to be truthful to Canadians. Government members should not have sat here in the House for years, defending the carbon tax and telling Conservatives that we are climate deniers or that we only want to see the world burn if we want to take our kids on a summer vacation.

• (1340)

They should not sit here and tell Canadians that their carbon tax is going to prevent forest fires or flooding. They should be honest with Canadians. We saw what the government did for years: It went after everyone who dared go after its dogma of the carbon tax. What happened the second it became unpopular? Liberals patted themselves on the back for cancelling the carbon tax.

A year ago, if someone was against the carbon tax, the old health minister, Mark Holland, would say that Canadians were going to burn the world down if they took their kids on a summer drive. The Liberals now say to thank them for getting rid of the carbon tax. The Liberals are now pretending they are pro-oil, pro-Alberta or pro-energy. They sit here and say that there are no proponents for new pipelines, but at the same time, they refuse to repeal Bill C-69, the “no new pipelines” bill. They refuse to repeal Bill C-48, which

bans tankers from taking Alberta oil up the B.C. coast but of course still allows U.S. tankers there.

They refuse to repeal the emissions and production cap that the Conference Board of Canada says will cost over 100,000 jobs in Canada. The Liberals should be honest; they should not sit here and say, “We love oil and gas. If only we had a proponent to build a pipeline.”

Liberals are all for oil as long as it stays politely in the ground, it seems. Their position regarding oil and gas is very much like saying that I will push a person down the stairs but also make sure someone pats me on the back for calling 911 to help that person afterward. That is what they seem to be doing with oil and gas: saying that we will be an energy superpower and that we will develop oil and gas but keep Bill C-69, Bill C-48 and the production cap, and that it will not be the Liberals' fault that no one steps up from the private sector.

The capital gains tax is another example. I just want the government to be honest. We heard the old finance minister say, basically, that Canadians are going to be living behind gated communities to keep out lower-income people who want to burn down their homes unless we have the capital gains tax. She stated, “[We] could finance [it] by taking on more debt. But that would place an unfair burden on our younger generations”, yet the Liberals are going to add \$60 billion of debt this year alone. She then urged Canadians to mark politicians who voted against the capital gains tax increase.

The current finance minister said that the “capital gains tax change [will] help Canadians” and that the Liberals “will fight for Canadians...will fight for the middle class.” He went on to ask whether members could believe that the Conservatives voted against the capital gains tax and tax fairness. The Liberals were going to increase investment in Canada, because their new capital gains tax would ask the wealthiest to pay a bit more to fund investments.

Move ahead a couple of months, and the finance minister, the same one who says we should rejoice at rising unemployment, that auto workers, I guess, should rejoice that we are going to have a permanent export tax on cars, permanent tariffs that are going to cause the industry to collapse, says that by tackling the capital gains tax, we are supporting builders, investment and entrepreneurs.

Is there any reason we doubt the Liberals when they say they are going to build the fastest-growing economy in the G7, while at the same time they bring in massive deficits that are going to drive out private sector investments? Their policies are causing massive, record increases to the use of food banks. Is there any reason no one trusts the Liberals? Everything was all-in on the carbon tax and the capital gains tax. All the borrowing they were going to do was going to drive investment into Canada, yet under the Liberals, half a trillion dollars in net investment has fled the country, with the Prime Minister's promising that another trillion dollars will flee Canada into the U.S. under their watch.

It is clear that we need a change. It is clear that the government has to end its Trudeau-era policies and get real with Canadians. It has to be honest with Canadians, be upfront and change its ways before it is too late.

• (1345)

**Hon. Kody Blois (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the member talked about some of the challenges that exist in the country. The government by no means suggests that it is perfect out there. The government is working within the realities, trying to meet Canadians where they are at and ensure that we have programs. That is why we have reduced taxes for 22 million Canadians. We have removed the GST for first-time homebuyers, for the 30-year-old who is trying to save up to be able to buy a home. We have actually introduced measures that the member is hopefully telling his own constituents about.

However, if someone is one of the seven million Canadian seniors who received old age security, the member voted against that. If someone is one of the 5.1 million Canadian children who are in receipt of the Canadian child benefit, the member voted against it. If someone is one of the more than one million Canadians who are now receiving dental support, the member voted against it.

What I find facetious about the entire debate is that the member ran on a platform of actually promising \$106 billion of new spending if a Conservative government was actually in the seats. How is he able to stand up and say these things with a straight face?

**Kelly McCauley:** Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to remind the member opposite that if the Liberals had not cratered our economy, they would not have to be providing so much in welfare-type services to Canadians.

The reality is that there can be good spending if it is for actual investments that produce productivity, goes toward reducing regulations or perhaps goes toward repealing Bill C-69, Bill C-48 and the emissions cap, which would be the greatest thing to unleash prosperity across the country. The government has done nothing but add on red tape, regulations and everything possible to destroy our economy, and the results show massive increases in unemployment, massive increases in youth unemployment and massive increases in debt.

• (1350)

[Translation]

**Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am a little concerned because I am watching the Liberals, and I see them cutting measures that could generate billions of dollars in revenue,

### *Business of Supply*

such as the digital services tax, which has been eliminated, as well as countertariffs, which we have not seen at all.

The same can be said of the Conservatives. When I asked the Leader of the Opposition earlier what he would do to put money back into the pockets of Quebeckers and Canadians, he again talked about reducing the size of government and making cuts.

I would like to ask my colleague what concrete measures will be taken to reinvest in the economy, to stimulate the economy and to encourage entrepreneurs to invest and grow. I do not hear any mention of this in the Conservatives' speeches today.

[English]

**Kelly McCauley:** Mr. Speaker, perhaps the member has not been listening.

We have been very clear. We can grow the economy by cutting red tape, cutting job-killing regulations that reduce investment, cutting taxes so we are competitive with international competitors, and having a business environment where people will invest and create jobs in this country. We could get rid of Bill C-48, the job-killing, pipeline-killing Bill C-69, and the cap on oil and gas production, which, by the way, produces the most wealth and is the main driver of equalization rates for the member's province.

**Harb Gill (Windsor West, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the world over shares or exports energy, even developing nations. How is it that we are not doing that?

Can the member walk us through how repealing Liberal anti-energy laws would help restore investment and job growth in regions like Windsor, Ontario and Alberta?

**Kelly McCauley:** Mr. Speaker, our energy industry is waiting to be unleashed. The International Energy Agency says that we are not going to see oil peak until 2050, unlike the former Liberal minister of resources, who said it was going to peak last year. We are going to see decades more growth and demand for oil.

Canada can be the country that delivers that oil in an environmental and ethical way, instead of giving money to dictators, as we are doing right now through the Liberal oil and gas cap. Canada can produce that oil for the free world. Canada can create that wealth here in the country, which can drive investment, and create wealth and jobs for Canadians.

**Ben Lobb (Huron—Bruce, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise here today.

What we are talking about today with this motion is ending the Justin Trudeau-style economic philosophy and the Justin Trudeau-style budgeting and getting back to the basics here. We are talking about investments today and different things.

*Business of Supply*

Before I get started, I should congratulate the Toronto Blue Jays on a great victory and a great series. It was excellent. We can all agree on that in the House. It is a bit of unity before we get the punching in. What did the Blue Jays do? We can give them credit for private investment. They spent \$750 million over the past few years updating the Rogers Centre, and they did not ask for any government money that I know of. They had a business case, they went about it and they did it. I think they did it on time and on budget. Now, they are into the next round of playoffs, and they are getting their return on investment.

That is really what we are talking about here today. We have to unleash the private business investment in this country. We have to become more attractive to foreign companies and our own domestic companies so they make a decision to invest in Canada. There is far too much red tape and obstruction to do that.

There was a Liberal MP who spoke about 20 minutes ago, and what she said was interesting. She said that the Liberals created a new program to deal with all the red tape and delay in the programs. Well, guess who created all that red tape and delay in the programs? The Liberal government has been around so long that it is trying to fix the devastation it created, but that is never going to happen, because the Liberals do not know how to fix it.

If we go back 10 years, Stephen Harper and Joe Oliver delivered a budget in the legacy of Jim Flaherty. It was a balanced budget. The government expenditures that year were \$289 billion for a balanced budget. The entire net debt for the country was \$610 billion, which is a lot. The debt-to-GDP ratio at that time was just over 31% and declining. We really were, after a number of years, becoming a destination for the world to do business.

Justin Trudeau came along and said, "Look, I'm just going to spend a bit more over the next three years. I'm going to have a balanced budget in 2020 and a little deficit in the medium term, or \$10 billion a year, so some investment can kick-start the economy." Now, that should have been deadpanned right from the beginning because, with a \$2-trillion economy, \$10 billion is really not going to get the job done. Right from the beginning, we knew it. Canadians should have known that, when a person comes in with that kind of philosophy, it is going to fail.

Fast-forward to today and the net debt is \$1.2 trillion to \$1.3 trillion, and the gross debt is way more. The debt-to-GDP ratio for just Canada, not for all the provinces combined, is 45%, I believe. The deficit this year, incredibly, will be higher than a Justin Trudeau deficit at approximately \$62.5 billion.

All the while, the Liberals have been telling Canadians that we just need to invest a little more to the point where, now, in 2024-25, I believe total government expenditure is at \$450 billion. In 10 years, we have increased the size of government by well over 50%, we have more than doubled Canada's debt permanently and we have added burden onto young Canadians that will last their lifetime and generations down the line, all because Justin Trudeau said 10 years ago that we were going to make a wee investment. He used the phrase "modest short-term deficit". He also used a phrase that came back to bite him pretty hard: "the budget will balance itself".

The other chief architect of this commentary is now the Prime Minister. He was Trudeau's adviser all the way along. When Canadians were looking at him in the winter and through the spring, they thought, "Boy, we've really broken away from this Trudeau guy." However, what they really did was elect Trudeau on steroids. Now, months later, people cannot believe what they got, and I know because I am out in my community all the time. It is not just in finance and business. It is in everything. It is universal disappointment.

• (1355)

We need to get back to the basics. We need to create an economic climate where we can invite people to do business in our country. We need transparency. We need to know exactly what the rules are. Think about how many times the rules have changed since the Liberals have been in government over the past 10 years. For big projects and little projects, everything is changing all the time.

He said one thing that might be the worst lie he could have told a Canadian, which was that the Liberals took on debt so Canadians would not have to. A lot of Canadians took that literally, five years ago. They are really being hit now, to the point where they are giving keys back to the bank and there are record lineups at food banks. It goes on and on.

Ten years ago, when Stephen Harper, Jim Flaherty and Joe Oliver were putting together budgets, a young family had a future. They could afford to buy a home. They could afford to save for their kids' education. They could put food on the table and not have to rely on government food programs to feed their children at lunchtime. People could afford to buy groceries and put it in their kids' lunch boxes. Canadians could afford to raise their kids, play sports and go on a vacation. They could do all these things. They may have had to work a bit of overtime and save from time to time, but it could be done.

Now that dream is way out in the distance. I talked to somebody the other day who was talking about all the boomerang kids who have come back to live with their families. We never—

**The Speaker:** Unfortunately, we have to stop there. The hon. member will have a little over three minutes left when the House resumes after question period.

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

● (1400)

[English]

### LEADER IN VETERINARY MEDICINE

**Sukh Dhaliwal (Surrey Newton, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Hakam Singh Bhullar and his new book *The Underdog*. In 1995, Dr. Bhullar became the first Indo-Canadian veterinarian to open a low-cost clinic in Vancouver, making quality animal care affordable for all. He worked with animal welfare groups, helped train many immigrant veterinarians and built a model of inclusion, but his success faced barriers and discrimination, leading to one of the longest human rights trials in Canadian history and a public apology from the College of Veterinarians of B.C.

*The Underdog* is a story of struggle, resilience and courage to fight for justice. I commend Dr. Bhullar for this important contribution to our community and to Canada.

\* \* \*

### CALGARY CANUCKS

**David McKenzie (Calgary Signal Hill, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise today to extend congratulations to the Calgary Canucks, a junior hockey club in the Alberta Junior Hockey League. Their determination, skill and community spirit brought home a momentous victory. On May 18, 2025, in Calgary at the Max Bell Centre, our team triumphed in the Centennial Cup with a commanding 7-2 win over the Melfort Mustangs, securing their first National Junior A Championship in 30 years.

On behalf of this House, and indeed all Albertans and all Canadians, I thank the Calgary Canucks for reigniting our pride and illustrating how sport can unite, inspire and give hope. With community support, collective effort, and determination, greatness is achievable.

Please join me in congratulating the 2025 Centennial Cup champions, the Calgary Canucks.

\* \* \*

### HUMAN RIGHTS IN IRAN

**Hon. Judy A. Sgro (Humber River—Black Creek, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, just weeks ago, thousands gathered outside the United Nations in New York to demand a free and democratic Iran. Led by the National Council of Resistance of Iran, the rally united international dignitaries, politicians and supporters of the Iranian resistance in rejecting dictatorship and calling for a future rooted in liberty, justice and democratic values.

A deeply troubling UN report released just days ago reveals an unprecedented execution spree in Iran, with over 1,000 people executed in just nine months. UN experts warn that Iran is carrying out executions at an industrial scale. The NCRI's 10-point plan rejects foreign intervention and appeasement and champions democratic change, led by the Iranian people.

Canada must continue to stand with all those fighting for human rights and democratic freedoms around the world.

## Statements by Members

### DIGITAL HEALTH CARE

**Matt Jeneroux (Edmonton Riverbend, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the eMental Health International Collaborative is bringing the world to Canada for the 10th Digital Mental Health Global Congress in Toronto. Under the leadership of Professor Anil Thapliyal, hundreds of experts from dozens of countries will gather to build the future of mental health care.

Worldwide, the need for mental health supports outstrips our ability to provide help the traditional way. Through the use of innovative digital tools, we can change just that. Digital tools offer the ability to bring health care to the patient in a timely manner and to cater to the individual needs of patients. Technology offers hope, it offers care and it offers a way to scale up that is not possible any other way. It offers the possibility of providing the same level of care no matter where someone lives.

I would like to welcome all the delegates and look forward to being a part of this important work.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### INTERNATIONAL DAY OF THE GIRL CHILD

**Bienvenu-Olivier Ntumba (Mont-Saint-Bruno—L'Acadie, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, October 11 marks International Day of the Girl Child, a day to celebrate the strength, intelligence and hopes of girls, here in Canada and elsewhere.

It is also a time to reflect on the challenges they still too often face: unequal access to education, violence, poverty and a lack of role models in decision-making positions. As parliamentarians, we have a duty to build an environment where every girl can flourish fully and without compromise.

As a father to three girls, this day is very important to me. Every day, I see their curiosity and their desire to contribute to a world that is more just. My three daughters, like so many other girls, inspire me to work for a future where their dreams face no obstacles.

Investing in them means contributing to a more inclusive and equitable society. I commend all the girls of Mont-Saint-Bruno—L'Acadie and elsewhere, who remind us, through their courage and commitment, that change begins now.

*Statements by Members*

● (1405)

[English]

**NIGEL WRIGHT**

**John Williamson (Saint John—St. Croix, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it was a terrible, awful shock to learn of Nigel Wright's sudden passing. Nigel was a good man, maybe the best among us. He had titles, success and stature, but he was humble. He demonstrated humility when he could have been filled with pride.

Nigel had a great commitment to charity. This too did not fully capture Nigel's goodness. His deepest devotion was to God. From that faith, everything followed.

Humility is rare in public life. We think it means being overlooked or even walked over. Saint Augustine asked, "Do you wish to rise? Begin by descending." He taught that humility is the foundation of all Christian virtues. It allows us to acknowledge our limitations.

Nigel lived a Christian life, a servant's life. I pray that Nigel is now in heaven with his God, his Saviour, our Lord Jesus Christ.

\* \* \*

**AUTONOMOUS SHUTTLE IN KANATA**

**Hon. Jenna Sudds (Kanata, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, today, I am excited to announce the launch of Canada's first all-season, medium-speed autonomous shuttle right here in Ottawa in my riding of Kanata in Canada's largest technology park.

Operating along a 4.5-kilometre route with eight stops, the shuttle connects employees, students and visitors throughout the park. It reduces emissions, improves accessibility and supports a more connected and inclusive community. The shuttle is equipped with advanced sensors, artificial intelligence and safety systems, allowing it to operate safely in all seasons and showcasing Canadian innovation in action.

This launch today positions Ottawa as a global leader in smart mobility and moves us closer to a future of cleaner, smarter and more sustainable transportation.

I congratulate all involved for making this happen.

\* \* \*

**PUBLIC SAFETY**

**Fred Davies (Niagara South, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the residents of Niagara were shocked over the brutal sexual assault of a three-year-old toddler by sexual predator Daniel Senecal. Nearly a year after the Liberal election promise to "act decisively to strengthen the Criminal Code" and protect victims by strengthening bail laws, the government has done nothing. The impact on my community is profound and has mobilized brave people, survivors and the entire region to demand changes to the Criminal Code.

I have talked to the first responders in my community. These men and women have children of their own. The chief of Welland's fire services told me that it is important that MPs and leaders from across Canada understand the devastating impact these crimes have on the brave people we depend on to protect us every single day.

We are done with the reckless Liberal hug-a-thug, weak-on-crime, catch-and-release justice system. Canadians do not feel safe in their neighbourhoods and their homes. It is time for the Liberals to step up or let Conservatives do it.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**WORLD EGG DAY**

**Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, October 10 is World Egg Day, so I would like to salute producers in Berthier—Maskinongé, across Quebec and around the world.

Let us all acknowledge the importance of this top-quality, healthy, nutritious food. Eggs are so versatile that it is almost impossible to imagine a recipe in which they cannot be used. Best of all, eggs are produced here.

Let us recognize our farmers' extraordinary contribution and acknowledge the place of the next generation in this industry. These farmers, their families and their communities all rely on our supply management system for ongoing prosperity and regional vitality. Let us continue to support them. Let us not allow headwinds and outside pressures to throw us off course, because food system resilience is priceless.

I wish everyone a happy World Egg Day.

\* \* \*

[English]

**OUTSTANDING ATHLETE IN PORT MOODY—COQUITLAM**

**Zoe Royer (Port Moody—Coquitlam, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as we mark Women's History Month, I rise to recognize an outstanding athlete from my riding of Port Moody—Coquitlam, Karen Lutz.

Karen competed with the first-ever team Canada Paralympics team at the dragon boat world championships in Thailand in 2023 and Germany in 2025. Her local senior C women's team earned silver at the Canadian nationals this August, qualifying them for the dragon boat world championships in Taiwan next year.

Karen's story reminds us that there is no age limit on achieving one's dreams. She is a role model for women and girls across Canada.

Karen Lutz embodies the very best of team Canada: strength, perseverance and pride. She has made Port Moody—Coquitlam and all of Canada proud. I congratulate Karen.

• (1410)

### WORLD MENTAL HEALTH DAY

**Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, on World Mental Health Day, let us remember that there is no health without mental health. Every day, 12 Canadians die by suicide and a further 200 attempt suicide. That is 73,000 Canadians per year, and thousands more struggle in silence.

Earlier this week, I received a message from the wife of a first responder who died by suicide. She asked me to remind my colleagues that the brave men and women behind the badge are someone's husband, father, daughter, brother, friend or colleague. They put their uniforms on every day to serve us and our families and keep us safe, and we are failing them. Whether it is our brave police officers, paramedics, firefighters, nurses, correctional officers or even the PPS officers here on Parliament Hill, they are all someone's loved one and they matter.

Those who are struggling are not alone. If they or their loved ones are in crisis, help is available 24-7. They can call or text 988. Remember that it is okay not to be okay. Our world is a better place with them in it.

\* \* \*

### CANADIAN EGG FARMERS

**Ernie Klassen (South Surrey—White Rock):** Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, egg farmers across Canada will celebrate World Egg Day, recognizing the critical role that eggs play for Canadian families and recognizing the contributions of egg farmers to Canada's resilient domestic food system.

More than 1,200 egg farmers support businesses and communities in this country on an ambitious growth agenda to increase production and consumption in alignment with the government's vision for sustainable growth. I know this, as I grew up on an egg farm collecting roughly 3,000 eggs daily as a child.

Egg farmers are proud partners in regional economies and food security. Egg farmers sustain thousands of local jobs, strengthen rural economies and provide Canadians with a reliable, high-quality source of protein.

I thank all parliamentarians for their support of our Canadian egg farmers and ask them to join me in wishing our farmers a happy World Egg Day.

\* \* \*

### LIBERAL PARTY OF CANADA

**Fraser Tolmie (Moose Jaw—Lake Centre—Lanigan, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I have witnessed the applause of the Liberals as they stood in the House cheering the loss of Canadian jobs. They cheer as Saskatchewan farmers have to deal with tariffs alone and pat themselves on the back making farmers pay longer loans. They cheer at the news that car manufacturing is shutting down in Canada and is heading south of the border. They cheer as they try to borrow their way out of debt and burden Canadians with more taxes.

### Statements by Members

They give standing ovations when we watch investment dollars go south of the border in trillion-dollar giveaways to Trump. The Prime Minister said it is okay that Canadian investments go south of the border because it's a free market there. It is a free market there, but not here. Who do the Liberals represent? Whose side are they on?

What would struggling Canadians be grateful for this Thanksgiving? It is a Prime Minister who stops breaking his promises to Canadian working families and a government that represents Canada.

\* \* \*

### GLOBAL DIGNITY

**Giovanna Mingarelli (Prescott—Russell—Cumberland, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this October marks the 20th anniversary of Global Dignity, a non-religious, non-political non-profit that celebrates the inherent dignity of every person.

[Translation]

Every year, more than one million young people in 80 countries participate in Global Dignity Day, reaching more than eight million people around the world every year. On October 15, young people across Canada will be celebrating this day by participating in workshops, projects and activities that promote kindness, respect and inclusion.

• (1415)

[English]

I would like to recognize Inuit artists and youth such as Tony Eetak, Krish Agrawal, Eva Suluk and Jamie Bell, with the Art Borups Corners collective, who will join with partners in Norway and the United States to share 20 dignity-themed short stories with the world.

[Translation]

I invite all members of the House to join me in congratulating Global Dignity on 20 years of tremendous impact.

[English]

Together, let us celebrate the voices of Canada's youth, who remind us that dignity is the foundation of a just and compassionate society.

*Oral Questions***TORONTO BLUE JAYS**

**John Brassard (Barrie South—Innisfil, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, how could we not love Vladdy and David Ortiz repeating after the game, “Da Yankees lose!”? Actually keeping their elbows up against the Yankees, the Toronto Blue Jays have punched their ticket to the American League championship, with a 5-2 victory last night. Credit goes to Ross Atkins, Mark Shapiro and manager John Schneider and his staff for building a culture where players play for each other, not for themselves. Along the way, they have allowed an entire nation to be part of this season. This is how championships are built.

From Vladdy to Bo, Ernie to Gaus, Daulton to Kirky, Canadians know this team by their first names and nicknames. We are all part of this ride now, and I think I speak for every Canadian when I say we want it all. We want them to win the ALCS and we want them to win the World Series. We want it all.

As the Blue Jays wait for their next opponent, start spreading the news. I wish I could say it like John Schneider said it. For the first time since 2016, the Blue Jays are going to the ALCS.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

**TRIBUTE TO A FATHER**

**Louis Villeneuve (Brome—Missisquoi, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, today I would like to honour my 93-year-old father, André, who is visiting Ottawa. His honesty, wisdom and humanity have made him a constant source of inspiration to me.

Through him, I want to recognize all the women and men who built the country that we have the good fortune to live in today. Our seniors are the living memory of our nation. They remind us that intergenerational solidarity is central to our identity. Honouring our elders means recognizing their contributions and carrying on their work by doing our part to build a just, welcoming and humane country.

I want to thank my father for the example he set and for everything his generation accomplished.

---

**ORAL QUESTIONS**

[*Translation*]

**INTERNATIONAL TRADE**

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, while the Americans are increasing their tariffs on our softwood lumber and automobiles, the Prime Minister has made a huge promise to the United States. He said that Canada had already invested half a billion dollars over the past five years and that \$1 trillion would likely be invested over the next five years if we get the agreement we expect.

The Prime Minister said this would be private money. Is he going to force investors to go to the United States or is he going to encourage them to invest here, in Canada?

[*English*]

**Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, today is a momentous day, and I am sure all parliamentarians would join me in recognizing the historic progress that has been made in the Middle East under President Trump's 20-point peace plan.

On behalf of the members, I would like to commend the leaders of Egypt, Qatar and Turkey and the architects of the plan, Mr. Kushner and Mr. Witkoff, and to underscore, as I did to the president and to Mr. Kushner, Canada's full support in ensuring that all parties implement all phases of this plan.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it is true that President Trump should be congratulated for his Middle East peace agreement.

However, I asked the Prime Minister a question in French about Canadian jobs. The Prime Minister should show a bit of respect for Quebec and for francophones who are losing their jobs right now and he should answer the question.

He promised that the agreement he will sign with the Americans will result in another \$1 trillion in investments being exported, which threatens the jobs of Canadians.

Did he get \$1 trillion from the U.S. in return?

• (1420)

**Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Canada currently has the best trade agreement with the United States in the world. That is the first point.

The second point is that we can improve that agreement and that is why the Minister responsible for Canada-U.S. Trade, Intergovernmental Affairs and One Canadian Economy is in Washington negotiating with the Americans. In that context, there will be more investment here in Canada.

[*English*]

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister came home empty-handed, with more tariffs on softwood and automobiles, but he made a massive promise of \$1 trillion of investment that would leave Canada to go to the United States. He said that this would be part of the agreement that he expects to get. Right in the agreement, he is going to commit to moving \$1 trillion out of Canada. Yesterday, he confirmed it would be private money.

How is he planning to do that? Is he going to pass a law forcing our pension funds to move their money south, or is he just going to continue with high-tax and antidevelopment policies that cause investment to flee?

*Oral Questions*

**Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I was there. I was there in the conversations with the president. I was there in the conversations in the Oval Office. I was there in the conversations afterwards.

The situation is this: We have the best deal in the world. We are in the process of making it better for the workers in the steel sector, for the workers in the aluminum sector, for our energy workers, for our auto workers, for our workers in forest products, for our workers across this great land because we believe in Canada. We will not rest until we have the best deal.

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, what we have is the fastest-shrinking economy in the G7, with the second-highest unemployment.

He was there, so he has a duty to tell Canadians, who are the owners of this \$1 trillion he wants to push out of our country, what is in this deal. He said it would actually be in the agreement that he is going to move \$1 trillion of private money south.

There are two ways to do that. Is he going to pass a law forcing investors to sell Canadian investments, putting people out of work here to invest in the south, or is he going to kill jobs with high taxes and antidevelopment policies that send money away?

**Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I know the hon. member was not here when this government cut income taxes, cut capital gains taxes and cut the carbon tax. I know the hon. member was not here when this government passed legislation for one Canadian economy and to build major projects across this great land, but the member opposite will be here when this government presents a generational investment budget on November 4, and we hope to have his support.

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, he must be on to something here, because Canada has invested a half-trillion dollars in the U.S. over the last five years alone and probably a trillion dollars in the next five years if we get the agreement we expect to get. This is what the Prime Minister said. This is after he has failed to get tariffs lifted on our auto workers and our lumber workers, after thousands have lost their jobs and after he created the second-highest unemployment and the worst growth in the entire G7.

Here is a very direct question: The Prime Minister is committing a trillion Canadian investment dollars to head south to the U.S. Has he secured an agreement that President Trump will send the same here?

**Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Canada has no tariffs on auto parts. Canada has the lowest tariffs on finished goods in the world. We are working towards an agreement that would increase investment in Canada and would increase investment in the United States. However, we will accept only the best agreement for Canada, and the private sector, if we remember that, will make those decisions.

\* \* \*

**NATURAL RESOURCES**

**Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister says he is going to put it right in the

agreement, so presumably he is going to enforce it somehow. It is another Liberal contradiction, another failure and broken promise by the Prime Minister.

Let us go to energy. Just days ago, the Prime Minister voted in favour of an energy cap that would make it impossible to fill another pipeline; then he woke up and discovered that President Trump has, for the last eight years, supported the Keystone XL pipeline. We know that as long as he blocks production in Alberta, we will not be able to fill that pipeline with oil, so what is he going to fill it with, maple syrup?

• (1425)

**Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I voted, as did a majority in the House, against a motion to get rid of something that does not actually exist. We are working with the private sector, we are working with the Province of Alberta and we are working with the Americans to unlock great Canadian energy to build this economy strong.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

**INTERNATIONAL TRADE**

**Yves-François Blanchet (Beloil—Chambly, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, we are making progress. I get a sense that, in a month or a month and a half, my colleague, the leader of the official opposition, will be ready to talk about Quebec's independence. We are making progress.

Meanwhile, medium- and heavy-duty trucks will be subject to a 25% tariff starting November 1. Lumber is subject to various types of tariffs at a rate of 45%. Aluminum and steel are tariffed at a rate of 50%. Automobile tariffs are in the range of 27.5%.

I would like the Prime Minister to explain to us when he will be speaking with businesses in the affected industries, their workers and subcontractors—

**The Speaker:** The right hon. Prime Minister.

**Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it was difficult to hear the last part of the question but here are some key points regarding where things stand.

First, we have the best agreement in the world with the United States. Second, we are in negotiations to ensure that steel and aluminum tariffs are reduced. Third, the tariffs on trucks and automobiles are the lowest in the world.

**Yves-François Blanchet (Beloil—Chambly, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I will take the Prime Minister at his word regarding what he said during the election campaign. He said that soon after the election, there would be no more tariffs, and that tariffs should not be used to retaliate against friends, allies and partners. He said that the tariffs would be eliminated quickly and that in the week following the election, he would go there and sign the free trade agreement.

He is the one who changed his mind. Not only did he change his mind, but he is also going to negotiate a pipeline to the United States. What will that do to diversify our economy?

*Oral Questions*

**Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, to diversify Canada's economy with reliable partners and partners like Asia and Indonesia, we just entered into a comprehensive agreement with Indonesia. We are in major negotiations with the European Union and all of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations countries. There will also be deals with South American countries.

**Yves-François Blanchet (Beloil—Chambly, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, we are well past the deadline the Prime Minister set for himself when he was campaigning. I guess the situation is understandable.

Now he is telling us that negotiations are under way to lower tariffs. It has been six months. They keep going up. The United States is adding new tariffs. This can hardly be called a great success right now.

Can he at least, in the meantime, roll out the programs he announced for aluminum and lumber? Those sectors have not yet seen a penny of what was promised.

**Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the member opposite will have the opportunity to support programs for the steel and aluminum industries and all sectors in Quebec and Canada in the upcoming budget on November 4.

\* \* \*

[English]

**EMPLOYMENT**

**Michael Barrett (Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands—Rideau Lakes, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, since the Prime Minister took office, nearly \$54 billion in investments has fled our country, yet the Prime Minister said that Canada will send the U.S., “\$1 trillion in the next five years—if we get the agreement we expect to get”. It is Thanksgiving, and I will tell members what Canadians expect. They expect a Prime Minister who will stand up for investment in this country and who will stand up for Canadian jobs.

When will the Prime Minister do that and finally stand up to the Americans, stand up to Donald Trump and stand up for Canadian workers?

• (1430)

**Hon. Anita Anand (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform my hon. colleague and the members of the House that we have provided billions of dollars of support for this economy, including \$5 billion in a strategic response fund. We are doing this while supporting our workers, supporting sectors, including the auto sector, and maintaining Canada's AAA credit rating and the lowest net debt-to-GDP ratio in the G7. We will get the best deal for Canada, and we will take the time we need in order to get this done.

**Michael Barrett (Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands—Rideau Lakes, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the minister that Canada has the fastest-shrinking economy in the G7. I would like to inform the minister that the Prime Minister has been all about concessions.

The Liberals have backed down on the DST, backed down on softwood lumber, backed down on auto, backed down on investments and backed down when our workers needed them to stand up

to Donald Trump, like the Prime Minister said he would. We have auto plant closures, steel plant closures and layoffs across the country.

Canadians want to know why the Prime Minister is sending \$1 trillion in investments to the Americans. When is he finally going to stand up for Canadian workers?

**Hon. Anita Anand (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House, we actually believe in the potential of this country. In fact, the statistics are bearing this out. We have the lowest net debt-to-GDP ratio in the G7. Inflation and wages are working in Canada's favour. We will continue to grow this economy by investing in workers and by investing in sectors, and we will do this while making sure that foreign direct investment flows to Canada, where we sit at the very top of countries as ranked in the G20.

**Rachael Thomas (Lethbridge, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, while in Washington, the Prime Minister bragged that the Liberal government has already driven half a trillion dollars of investment south of the border over the last five years, and then he proudly vowed that he would send another \$1 trillion south of the border if we get the agreement we expect to get. In other words, this is exactly what the Prime Minister wants to do. He wants to drive investment from Canada to the United States. So much for elbows up.

Here are the choices: Does the Prime Minister plan to order that Canadian pension funds be invested in the United States, or does he plan to continue his anti-development initiatives—

**The Speaker:** The hon. government House leader.

**Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we have this disturbing trend with the Leader of the Opposition making something up, and then members up and down the line add on new, and very intriguing, figures and facts. We do not really understand it. We cannot follow the logic.

Here is what I can say the government is doing: It is in negotiations with the United States. As we speak, the Minister responsible for Canada-U.S. Trade is there. We are going to negotiate a great deal for Canada, and we are going to continue to build Canada strong.

**Rachael Thomas (Lethbridge, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, here is what we know that cannot be refuted. We know that Canada has the fastest-shrinking economy in the G7. We know that the unemployment rate is the second highest. We know that Canadians are already struggling to put food on their tables and take care of their families. Now we know that the Prime Minister went to the United States of America and promised that he would drive another \$1 trillion of investment south of the border, therefore putting Canadian families at a disadvantage, because they will not have jobs.

What will the Prime Minister do to put his elbows up and stand up for them?

*Oral Questions*

**Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, once again, taking the opposition research bureau's stuff and just repeating it does not make it true. What we do know, and Statistics Canada would confirm this, is that Canada's economy is, in fact, growing. What does growth mean? It means we are adding value to our economy and adding opportunities for workers. Of course we are concerned about job losses, and of course we will continue to defend Canadian workers right across this land, but one thing is for sure, and that is that we will take our statistics from this side of the House.

**Jeremy Patzer (Swift Current—Grasslands—Kindersley, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, there is an old proverb that says that the road to hell is paved with good intentions. Canadian workers are getting sick and tired of the Prime Minister's good intentions. The best predictor of the future is the past, so let us take a look at the Prime Minister's record. His last act as the chair of Brookfield was to move the company headquarters out of Canada and into the United States, into the welcoming arms of President Trump.

I guess it is pretty clear that the Prime Minister will continue to sell out Canadian workers to the U.S. Is that not right?

• (1435)

[*Translation*]

**Carlos Leitão (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I will repeat what I announced in the House: Eighty-five per cent of our exports enter the United States tariff-free. What is more, the Canadian economy is an open economy. Capital moves across the border in both directions, and we will do everything we can to continue to attract capital to Canada so that we can invest and grow faster.

\* \* \*

**THE ECONOMY**

**Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister promised the U.S. President investments of “\$1 trillion in the next five years—if we get the agreement we expect to get”. Now we know why the Prime Minister recommended moving Brookfield's headquarters to New York when he was president of that company. Now the Prime Minister is asking Canadian businesses and investment funds to go invest \$1 trillion in the United States.

Why is the Prime Minister trying to improve the U.S. economy instead of Canada's?

**Carlos Leitão (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I must admit that I am surprised to see that our friends across the way do not understand the concept of capital flow. The Canadian economy is an open economy. Capital comes in and capital goes out. We have a great tradition of investing abroad and accepting foreign investment. That is what we will do and that is how we will grow the Canadian economy.

**Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, on the contrary, we understand quite well that the Prime Minister recommended moving Brookfield's headquarters to New York when he was the company's chair.

This year, the largest trucking company, TFI International, an outfit with 27 employees, announced that it would be moving its head office to the United States. It is no surprise that Canada's economy is shrinking faster than any other G7 nation's economy.

Does the Prime Minister know that he is working for Canadians, not Americans?

**Carlos Leitão (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the question that was asked on April 28, and Canadians overwhelmingly answered that this Prime Minister would be the one responsible for governing Canada and doing his best to ensure its rapid and diversified economic growth.

\* \* \*

**JUSTICE**

**Rhéal Éloi Fortin (Rivière-du-Nord, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the minister accused us of distorting his words. He is the one who referred to the Russian invasion of Ukraine when justifying his opposition to the notwithstanding clause, not me. He is the one who sent a factum to the Supreme Court in which he used slavery and summary executions as arguments, not me. He is the one who claims that the notwithstanding clause could be used to ban places of worship, abolish trade unions and shut down newspapers.

Frankly, who is distorting reality? Is it the minister or those who defend the notwithstanding clause?

**Hon. Sean Fraser (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that the federal government defend our charters, defend human rights and protect the Constitution.

This case is before the Supreme Court of Canada. It is the federal government's responsibility to intervene to defend the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and the Constitution. There are no circumstances under which the federal government would not intervene.

It is very important to protect the rights of Canadians now and into the future.

**Rhéal Éloi Fortin (Rivière-du-Nord, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, in the open letter from the five premiers, the signatories point out that the notwithstanding clause allowed for the patriation of the Constitution.

What the Liberals want to do is rewrite history and make Quebec and the provinces fully subject to the federal charter. In short, the Liberals want to erase the 1982 constitutional compromise. This government is using a power grab to weaken the National Assembly of Quebec and the provinces.

Will the minister listen to reason, uphold the notwithstanding clause and stop undermining the parliamentary sovereignty of Quebec and the provinces?

*Oral Questions*

● (1440)

**Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I strongly disagree with what my Bloc Québécois colleague just stated. Our intervention before the Supreme Court is intended to defend Canadians' rights and the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

No part of our intervention before the Supreme Court of Canada will prevent the provinces from continuing to use the notwithstanding clause if they so desire. However, when using the notwithstanding clause results in the violation of Canadians' rights, we want the courts to be able to adjudicate on that.

\* \* \*

[English]

**FORESTRY INDUSTRY**

**Ellis Ross (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Canada has the fastest-shrinking economy and the second-highest unemployment rate in the G7.

B.C. forestry workers have already been hard hit, but it is going to get worse. The Prime Minister promised to negotiate a win with the U.S.A, but softwood lumber tariffs have doubled since he took office. Instead of keeping his promise to Canadians, he is promising to invest \$1 trillion in the U.S. economy.

How many more B.C. lumber workers will lose their jobs because of the Prime Minister's failures?

**Corey Hogan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we have been very clear that the tariffs are unjustified. We are working at every level to address them.

We have created \$50 million in supports for workers. We have created \$700 million in liquidity support for companies and \$500 million for new markets and new innovations in this sector.

We are going to continue to work to support the forestry sector, and we hope that the Conservatives will get on board.

**Ellis Ross (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government cannot make up its mind. On one hand, it says it is unjust, and then it says it is the greatest deal in the world. It needs to make up its mind.

There are mills closing all across B.C., including Skeena Sawmills in Terrace and Canfor in Houston. West Fraser's shut-down left hundreds of my constituents out of work in an already weak economy. Our communities are hurting. Since the Prime Minister took office, softwood lumber tariffs have doubled, putting even more Canadian jobs and communities at risk.

When will the Prime Minister do what he promised and stand up for our forestry mills and for the communities and families who depend on these jobs?

**Corey Hogan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we will always stand with the workers and the affected communities, which is why we continue to invest and will do so in the future as well.

There are significant difficulties with the long-standing softwood lumber dispute, but those are difficulties we are addressing head on. We are working at every level to challenge them. We are doing that with the support of the whole Canadian economy. We are finding that we can leverage innovative new ways to make sure that we can get the best deal possible for our lumber sector.

**Gaétan Malette (Kapuskaing—Timmins—Mushkegowuk, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, people in northern Ontario and Canada urgently need the government to address the impact of U.S. lumber tariffs.

The Liberal government is failing sawmill workers, and the situation is only getting worse. The Prime Minister promised to negotiate a deal with the Americans, yet forestry and sawmill workers in Calstock, Hearst, Cochrane, Chapleau, Kirkland Lake and all across Canada are facing the real prospect of losing their jobs.

What is in place does not work. Why is the Prime Minister selling out our sawmill workers in northern Ontario and—

**The Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Jobs and Families.

**Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am no stranger to communities that struggle when industries are struck. I am from northern Ontario as well.

The difference between those in our government and the members opposite is that we step up for workers when they are struggling, whether it is through EI reforms, investment in companies so they could actually transition or work sharing to get a company through a tough time so that it can see a brighter future. This is some of the work we do on this side with companies every single day.

**Jim Bélanger (Sudbury East—Manitoulin—Nickel Belt, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Canada now has the fastest-shrinking economy in the G7 and the second-highest unemployment rate. It is looking worse for lumber and mill workers in northern Ontario. The Prime Minister promised to negotiate a win, but softwood lumber workers are being sold out with no deal.

Why is the Prime Minister breaking his promise and selling out Canadian mill workers?

*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, this is a great time for me to highlight the incredible work of FedNor, the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, which works with organizations across northern Ontario, and has for years, to make sure that as industries change, as times change and as products change, companies have what they need to grow and adapt.

We have invested millions of dollars in the softwood lumber industry and the lumber industry in general. We will be there for workers. We will be there for companies. Canadians know they can trust us, unlike those folks.

• (1445)

**Dan Albas (Okanagan Lake West—South Kelowna, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Canada is breaking records with the fastest-shrinking economy in the G7 and the second-highest unemployment. If failure was an Olympic sport, the government would own the podium.

The Prime Minister came to West Kelowna, held a press conference and promised to negotiate a win on softwood lumber. He even said Canada would “write our own story”. Well, his story so far is that tariffs have doubled, mills have closed, hundreds of people are out of work and their families have been sold out by the government in places like Grand Forks.

If this is the story the Prime Minister wanted to write, was the title he had in mind “How to Fail Big”?

**Corey Hogan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Canada does write its own story, and that is a story that includes buying Canadian and buying Canadian lumber to build Canadian homes. It is a story that includes \$50 million in income supports for workers. It is a story that includes \$700 million in liquidity support and \$500 million for innovation in the forestry sector.

This is a pretty good story, and I hope they will help us write it.

\* \* \*

**FOREIGN AFFAIRS**

**Amandeep Sodhi (Brampton Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Canada has long been renowned for its strong advocacy for multilateralism on the international stage. During Canada's historic presidency of the G7 at this turbulent time, our government has been committed to continuing this tradition.

Could the Minister of Foreign Affairs update the House on how Canada's diplomatic efforts are driving prosperity, creating good jobs and strengthening our position in the global economy?

**Hon. Anita Anand (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, every country with which I am speaking wants more of Canada. In fact, in the G20, Canada is ranked among the top two destinations for foreign direct investment. We are the only country in the world that has a free trade agreement with every other G7 country.

We are forging new relationships in the Indo-Pacific, in Europe and in Africa. We will not stop until we get the best deal for Canada, and all along the way, we will stand up for our—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Oshawa.

\* \* \*

**AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY**

**Rhonda Kirkland (Oshawa, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, in the G7, Canada has the fastest-shrinking economy and the second-highest unemployment, and it is only getting worse for auto workers, like the ones in my hometown, Oshawa. The Prime Minister promised to protect Canadian auto workers, yet one day after his trip to Washington, the Trump administration confirmed no relief on auto tariffs and a promised \$1 trillion for the U.S.

Why is the Prime Minister selling out auto workers and families in Oshawa?

**Yasir Naqvi (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade and to the Secretary of State (International Development), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am sure members opposite and all members of the House are well aware that we are in a major moment of transformation. The economy around the world is changing. This is why we are going to continue to work to get the best deal for Canadians, including Canadian auto workers, through the U.S. However, we are not stopping there. We are also working around the world to create new markets for Canadian auto workers to make sure we are signing new deals with countries in ASEAN and countries in Mercosur, because that is how we are going to make sure Canada remains strong and Canadian workers have good-paying jobs.

**Rhonda Kirkland (Oshawa, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the only auto workers these Liberals stand with are U.S. auto workers.

This is personal. These are good, livable jobs that help families find homes, raise kids and retire with dignity. They have done everything right, and now they are being told that their jobs do not matter.

These losses are the direct result of the Prime Minister's failure to stand up for Canada's auto workers even though he promised to do that. How can families in Oshawa and across Canada ever trust the Prime Minister again?

*Oral Questions*

**Yasir Naqvi (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade and to the Secretary of State (International Development), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this government will never let Canadian auto workers down. We will not let any workers down. We will work day and night to make sure that the Canadian auto industry remains one of the best success stories. That is why, as we speak, the Minister of Canada-U.S. relations is down in Washington working hard to negotiate a deal that is right for Canadian workers. That is why the Minister of International Trade is in Africa to make sure that we have opportunities in other parts of the world.

We will continue to do this work so that Canadian workers have good-paying jobs right here in Canada.

• (1450)

**Tony Baldinelli (Niagara Falls—Niagara-on-the-Lake, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Canada has the fastest-shrinking economy in the G7 and the second-highest unemployment levels. If we listen to the U.S. commerce secretary, it is only going to get worse for auto workers, including those at the local GM plant in St. Catharines.

In May, GM announced its largest investment ever in an engine plant just across the border from us in Tonawanda, New York. Meanwhile, it was crickets in St. Catharines.

Why is the Liberal Prime Minister so hell-bent on selling out our hard-working Canadian auto workers?

**Hon. Anita Anand (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we are making unprecedented investments in our auto sector, with a \$5-billion strategic response fund, for example, and all the while, we are making sure that workers are supported. The company NextStar has committed to hiring 2,500 workers and has just hired its 1,000th worker.

As an MP with the Ford Motor Company in their backyard, let me tell members that we are here for workers, we are here for the auto sector and we will get the best deal for our country.

**Tony Baldinelli (Niagara Falls—Niagara-on-the-Lake, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, General Motors has had a presence in St. Catharines since 1929, nearly 100 years. If the Liberal government does not act, it might not reach the century mark. As billions of dollars flee Canada for the U.S., Canadian auto workers are watching in dismay as their Prime Minister offers up their jobs to the Trump administration, and for what, a free lunch?

When will the Liberal Prime Minister stop selling out our Canadian auto workers, or has he already concluded that their jobs are motoring to the United States?

**Hon. Anita Anand (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, while we are on the topic of Canadian workers, first of all, let me thank Canadian workers, in particular unionized workers, for contributing to the growth of our economy every single day.

Our government has ensured that workers who are unionized will have 20 extra weeks of EI, which is expected to help thousands of workers. On top of that, we put in \$450 million for retraining and upskilling to help more than 50,000 workers.

The opposition does not like it, but it is true.

**Chris Lewis (Essex, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Canada has the fastest-shrinking economy in the G7 and the highest unemployment rate.

There are 150 workers at the Stellantis plant in Essex-Windsor who have lost paycheques, and now we learn that investments of \$10 billion are going to a U.S. battery plant. One day after the Prime Minister's trip to Washington, the Trump administration said that no auto deal is coming.

Why is the Prime Minister selling out Canadian auto workers in Essex, all the while fuelling the tank of the U.S. economy?

**Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, do members know why Canadians do not trust Conservatives? It is because they lie to them over and over again. They can themselves look up Canada's economy and see that it is actually—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**The Speaker:** Would the hon. member like to rewind a bit before that problematic word?

**Hon. Patty Hajdu:** There is a reason, Mr. Speaker, that Canadians do not trust the Conservatives. It is because they do not trust the words coming out of their mouths. Over and over, they hear misinformation.

In fact, Stats Canada shows that our economy grew in Q1 of 2025. Of course there are changes to our economy and of course we have sectors that are struggling, but do members know what Canadians know? They know we have their backs. While the Conservatives laugh at supports for workers who have lost their job, like the extra 20 weeks, my son and other people who are at—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Windsor West.

• (1455)

**Harb Gill (Windsor West, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Canada has the fastest-shrinking economy in the G7 and the second-highest unemployment rate. Contrary to what these guys believe, it is only getting worse for people in Windsor.

The Prime Minister is breaking his promise that he would protect Canadian jobs. A day after his trip to the U.S., we were told there is no deal coming.

Jobs in Canada are at risk, and the Prime Minister is pledging \$1 trillion to grow the U.S. economy, which is a slap in the face to our workers. He moved his own company, Brookfield, to the U.S., and now he is doing the same for Canadian jobs.

*Oral Questions*

Why is the Canadian Prime Minister helping the U.S. grow its economy—

**The Speaker:** The hon. government House leader.

**Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Canada's economy is, in fact, growing.

**Scot Davidson (New Tecumseth—Gwillimbury, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, auto workers at Honda Canada in Alliston are outraged. The Prime Minister sold them out again. He folded like a cheap suit in front of Donald Trump.

Canada already has the fastest-shrinking economy in the G7 and the second-highest unemployment rate. Now the Liberals have failed to secure a deal with the Americans. They are stripping the auto industry for parts and shipping those jobs straight to the U.S.

It is enough broken promises. Why are Canadian auto workers paying the price for the Prime Minister's failures?

**Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Canada has produced automobiles as part of an integrated North American industry for well over a century, and it will continue to produce automobiles for a century and more into the future.

The member knows well that we are standing up every day for union jobs in automaker plants right across this country and in southern Ontario. We are standing up for the auto-parts manufacturers. We are standing up for the entire supply chain. We have the support of the automakers on that position, and we will always stand with the auto industry in this country.

\* \* \*

**IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP**

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, after a decade of Liberal immigration failure, we need to restore order and fairness to the system. Today there are over three million temporary residents in Canada, an unprecedented 7.2% of Canada's population. There is no plan to get them to leave, and this is straining housing, health care and jobs. Now some temporary residents are exploiting Canada's outdated automatic citizenship rules to try to overstay their visas.

Will the minister align with most other countries in the world and require at least one parent to be a citizen or permanent resident to qualify for automatic citizenship?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Lena Metlege Diab (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Canadian law is clear: Since the end of the Second World War, anyone born in Canada is a Canadian citizen. Our government will continue to support a fair, constitutional and robust citizenship framework.

[*English*]

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the problem is that for the first time in Canadian history, we have over three million temporary residents in the country, and the Liberals are still issuing record levels of temporary resident permits. If we combine that with the Liberals' broken humanitarian

claim system, a protracted appeal system and their reluctance to deport, what is happening is that most temporary residents effectively stay here indefinitely.

Fairness must be restored. Will the minister update our outdated laws and require at least one parent to be a citizen or permanent resident to qualify for automatic citizenship?

**Hon. Lena Metlege Diab (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has her facts wrong. This country and this government will not create a two-tier system, and we will never penalize the children in this country who were born here.

[*Translation*]

**Natilien Joseph (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the courts have clearly stated that the first-generation limit on citizenship by descent is unconstitutional. It is our duty to respond to that finding and propose a framework for the citizenship system that is fair and consistent with the Constitution.

Can the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship tell us how Bill C-3 provides recourse to those who have been denied citizenship and how it ensures fair access to citizenship for future generations?

• (1500)

**Hon. Lena Metlege Diab (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question. Bill C-3 is our solution for lost Canadians. At the same time, we will ensure that children born or adopted abroad will be able to access citizenship if their Canadian parents, themselves born or adopted abroad, have a substantial connection to Canada.

That is how we strike a balance between fairness and protecting the tremendous value of Canadian citizenship.

\* \* \*

**FORESTRY INDUSTRY**

**Richard Martel (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Canada's economy is weakening at the fastest rate among G7 nations. The Prime Minister promised to negotiate a win with President Trump. Ultimately, after all the compromises that were made, workers in the softwood lumber industry are the biggest losers. The Prime Minister returned empty-handed from Washington. Even worse, softwood lumber was not even on his list of priorities.

The Prime Minister promised we would get an agreement that would remove all tariffs. Why has he not kept his promises once elected?

**Carlos Leitão (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, indeed, softwood lumber is an industry that is going through a challenging period, and not for the first time. This industry has regularly been under attack from our southern neighbour. That is why we must negotiate a comprehensive agreement that is in the interests of all Canadians.

### Oral Questions

The Prime Minister rightly pointed out that we would not be signing just any agreement. We will sign an agreement that will benefit Canada and all Canadian industries, including softwood lumber.

**Richard Martel (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, tariffs on Canadian softwood lumber have doubled since this Prime Minister took office. The Forest Products Association of Canada has sounded the alarm. It said, “With over 200,000 direct jobs at stake, sector calls on the Government of Canada to bring the same urgency to lumber as it has to steel, aluminum...”.

Why is the Prime Minister abandoning the 200,000 forestry sector workers and the families that rely on those jobs?

**Carlos Leitão (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we know the lumber industry very well. I know the lumber industry in Quebec very well. This is not our first go at this with our American neighbours. We will be able to negotiate an agreement with them.

That is why we are not going to sign just anything. We will make sure that the agreement we sign will benefit all Canadians and every sector.

\* \* \*

[English]

### AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

**Connie Cody (Cambridge, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, Canada already has the fastest-shrinking economy in the G7 and the second-highest unemployment. It is only going to get worse for Cambridge auto workers who work at Toyota, with jobs and investments fleeing south. Just after the Prime Minister's trip to Washington, the Trump administration said there will be no deal on autos, putting thousands of workers and their families at risk. To add insult to injury, the Prime Minister promised to send \$1 trillion to the U.S., spending money on American jobs while Canadians get pink slips.

Why is the Prime Minister so quick to invest in America's future while selling out the livelihood of Canadian auto workers?

**Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, of course Canada's economy is in fact growing. That is a statistical and objective fact.

I do not empathize particularly with the hon. member, who is reading the points that were sent in from a backroom, but I do very much empathize with the people of Cambridge and the anxiety that is felt throughout the auto sector. It is obvious that the President of the United States has put on the table tariffs that completely alter that sector and does not necessarily always respect the very good and very hard work that the sector does. We will defend those people.

\* \* \*

### BORDER SECURITY

**Chris Malette (Bay of Quinte, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday our government introduced Bill C-12 to secure and protect the integrity of Canada's immigration system, reinforce our border and curb the transnational flow of fentanyl.

Can the Minister of Public Safety inform the House why we need to move swiftly to pass Bill C-12?

**Hon. Gary Anandasangaree (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for Bay of Quinte for his very hard work.

The strengthening Canada's immigration system and borders act would strengthen our border and keep Canadians safe. It would ensure guns and fentanyl are off our streets, and it would assist law enforcement with the required tools to do its job properly.

I want to take this moment to thank the frontline RCMP, CBSA, CSC and CSIS staff, who work on the front lines each and every day. I want to wish them a happy Thanksgiving.

\* \* \*

● (1505)

[Translation]

### OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

**Jacques Gourde (Lévis—Lotbinière, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, we learned this morning that the Prime Minister delivers only 17% of his speeches in French. When I had the honour of being part of the previous Conservative government, all speeches began in French. Today, the Leader of the Opposition prioritizes French in his speeches.

This is not England. Is the Prime Minister aware that French is also a language of business in Canada and around the world?

**Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have a little news flash for my colleague across the aisle. We are the government that has done the most for official languages in Canada. We modernized the Official Languages Act and, as part of the process, made a historic \$4-billion investment in our official languages across the country.

For the first time in the country's history, we met our target of 4% for francophone immigration outside Quebec. We are at 7%. We are going to hit 8% and then get to 12%. This is historic. It is unprecedented. That is my little news flash for my colleague across the aisle.

[English]

### LABOUR

**Leah Gazan (Winnipeg Centre, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I often hear members of parties in the House say that they support workers. In fact, I have heard a lot about workers today, yet when I tabled my bill to protect the right to strike in collective bargaining, it was crickets from the Liberals and Conservatives. Words are one thing but action is another.

If the Liberal government really respects workers, will it protect their rights by supporting my bill to remove section 107 from the Canada Labour Code, yes or no?

**Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we have significantly strengthened the rights of organized labour in this country, which started in 2015, when the Liberal government repealed union-busting legislation that was presented and passed by the Conservatives, which was another untrustworthy move. We strengthened the Canada Labour Code, making scab labour illegal and investing in union-based training. We will continue to work with labour organizations and businesses to make sure the relationship remains balanced and productive.

\* \* \*

### INTERNATIONAL TRADE

**Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, we all know that Donald Trump is erratic and very difficult to deal with. However, the Prime Minister's growing list of concessions and appeasements is clearly not working. The latest sees him offering up the Keystone pipeline to the Americans and getting nothing in return. This is an uneconomic, environmentally damaging project that directly contradicts his pledge to reduce integration with the U.S. economy.

What happened to the Prime Minister who promised Canadians a strong approach to Trump's aggression?

**Hon. Anita Anand (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, businesses from all over the world are choosing Canada as a foreign direct investment opportunity. We rank among the top two countries in the G20 for foreign direct investment. In fact, contrary to the words on the other side of the aisle, we have inflation coming down and the Bank of Canada cutting the benchmark interest rate to 2.5%. We are in a free trade agreement with every other G7 country. These are more than just agreements; they are bridges to economic resilience, and we will keep going hard.

\* \* \*

• (1510)

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Hon. Andrew Scheer (Regina—Qu'Appelle, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it being Thursday, it is time for the Thursday question. I would like to use this opportunity to ask a few very specific questions.

First and foremost, we see that the embattled public safety minister has had to come, cap in hand, back to the House of Commons

### Business of the House

and restart his efforts with Bill C-2. It was literally the first piece of legislation the government introduced, and the government has had to do a complete do-over because it got it so wrong, infringing on Canadians' individual rights and liberties, completely violating charter principles of the right to privacy and due process. Now that the Liberals have tabled the do-over, mulligan piece of legislation, I would like to ask them when they might be calling that piece of legislation.

Second, I would like to ask the Liberals something very specific. The member for Similkameen—South Okanagan—West Kootenay has asked for an emergency take-note debate on softwood lumber. We note that yesterday the Prime Minister came home empty-handed; he did not get a deal on softwood lumber tariffs. Many mills have been closing across the country, and my colleague, who represents a lot of the forestry workers in British Columbia, has asked for an emergency take-note debate. I am wondering if the government will agree to that and schedule such a debate.

I would also like to seek the opportunity to help inform the Prime Minister. He said during question period that the Liberals voted against something that does not exist when it comes to the oil and gas production cap. I have here the actual regulations for the oil and gas production cap. Perhaps the Prime Minister has not had a chance to read that, but, if the House gives its consent, I will table that right now.

Maybe the government could also tell us what the business will be for the rest of this week and all of next week.

I have one more thing. Before we go, I would like to wish all Canadians a very happy Thanksgiving. I hope that all members of the House from both sides of the aisle, and all the support staff who work here and help this place place function, have a great, happy Thanksgiving with their friends and family.

**The Speaker:** The hon. member is asking for unanimous consent to table a document.

All those opposed to the hon. member's moving the motion will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Speaker:** The hon. government House leader has the floor.

[Translation]

**Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the only thing I will agree with my esteemed colleague on is wishing all Canadians a happy Thanksgiving.

*Business of Supply**[English]*

We have much to be thankful about in this country, and that includes a very healthy and vibrant democracy and exchanges like this one. We have a lot of blessings in this country, and I wish every Canadian a happy Thanksgiving.

The member referred to an emergency take-note debate, but Mr. Speaker, I would never presume to impede your judgment in these matters.

This afternoon, however, we will continue with debate on the opposition day motion brought forward by the Conservative party that, let us agree, always includes a bit of sketchy detail, despite what the hon. member tried to convince us of.

Tomorrow we will resume consideration and second reading of Bill C-11, the military justice system modernization act.

*[Translation]*

When we return on Monday, October 20, we will begin debate at second reading stage of Bill C-12, an act respecting certain measures relating to the security of Canada's borders and the integrity of the Canadian immigration system and respecting other related security measures, introduced yesterday by the Minister of Public Safety. We will continue that debate on Tuesday.

On Wednesday, we will resume consideration of Bill C-10, an act respecting the commissioner for modern treaty implementation.

I will end where I began, by wishing everyone a happy Thanksgiving.

*[English]*

**Hon. Andrew Scheer:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of clarification, the request was for a take-note debate on an emergency basis. It is within the government's purview to grant take-note debates. Am I to take it that the request has been refused?

**Hon. Steven MacKinnon:** Mr. Speaker, I think the member should take it that the request is under consideration with a little dose of skepticism. It cannot be much of an emergency if we did not have an opposition motion on that very matter today.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1515)

*[English]***BUSINESS OF SUPPLY**

## OPPOSITION MOTION

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

**Ben Lobb (Huron—Bruce, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I really think question period today highlighted the fracture in philosophies on the best way forward for the Canadian economy. What we heard in question period today from the Liberals, time and again, was that if we keep spoon-feeding and force-feeding the failed policies of the last 10 years, it might work, instead of letting free enterprise and the capital market move forward with the ability to invest on its own.

In question period today, the Liberals were talking about direct foreign investment into Canada. The reality is that it is almost zero when there are no government dollars attached to that investment. We have seen those investments in Ontario and in different places. However, they would have never happened under the current economic climate unless there were taxpayer dollars involved.

If we go back in time, that was not the case. Large corporations could examine the Canadian market, take a look at the investment climate, the labour pools and all the different services that went into it. I am talking about before 2015. They could make their own decisions, and they did not need Canadian taxpayer dollars to make the investments; they would just come here.

It has not been great in the last 10 years. In fact for Canadian companies, unfortunately, the majority of the time when they have a chance to make an investment in Canada, they definitely are not doing so. They are choosing somewhere else. Unfortunately we see that in the news every day.

Another one is AI. It is a buzz word on the news, in business and everywhere else. At the beginning of the year, the United States announced there would be a \$500-million investment into the broader AI sector. None of that was government dollars; it was all private dollars. There has actually been a lot more since that, NVIDIA being the greatest example. It is allocating \$100 million out of its own free cash into AI, ChatGPT, in the United States.

It is pretty quiet up here in Canada. The only investment we really see is from the Government of Canada. Why is that? It is because the climate, not the weather climate but the investment climate, is not great. The other thing is that there is no extra electrical capacity in this country, partially because of all the red tape in seeking approval to start projects.

There is a lot I would like to continue on with. Of course unemployment, unfortunately and amazingly, under the current Prime Minister, and it is almost unbelievable I am saying this, is higher than when Justin Trudeau was the prime minister. I do not think the current Prime Minister ever thought that would happen. As well, there have been 86,000 job losses since he was elected. I do not think he ever thought that would happen, but it did.

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, first off, I think it is important that we do not necessarily recognize the Conservatives as throwing the AI industry in Canada under the bus, when in fact the AI industry in Canada is doing exceptionally well. The potential to grow is there. It is very real and tangible.

The Conservatives consistently try to give a false impression with respect to Canada's debt situation and deficit. When we look at the G7 countries, which include countries like the United States, Germany, and the United Kingdom, we see that we are actually doing better than they are with respect to debt-to-GDP.

My question for the member is this: Does he believe that all those other countries around the world are in fact broken too?

*Business of Supply*

**Ben Lobb:** Mr. Speaker, first of all, nobody is putting down AI. Simply put, I am saying that when given the choice where to invest, investors are picking the United States. That is all I am saying on that.

When it comes to the debt-to-GDP ratio in the G7, I do not know why the Liberals even bring it up anymore. Once we get to 100% debt-to-GDP ratio, it is over. No country has ever recovered from that. Basically we are comparing ourselves to countries that are terminal financially. Without a great debt jubilee, it is over for them, like Japan, the United States, etc.

Why do we want to be the best of the worst? Why do we not just want to be the best?

• (1520)

**Tako Van Popta (Langley Township—Fraser Heights, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, my colleague's speech was very inspiring. He talked about the importance of private investment dollars. I agree with him.

I wonder if he could comment on how free enterprise private investment dollars have a unique ability to find the most productive place in the economy compared to politicians' poor track record of distinguishing between winners and losers.

**Ben Lobb:** Mr. Speaker, that is a great question. I can give an example. Over 20 years ago in my riding, where I used to work, the owner of Westcast Industries at the time made a decision to make a huge investment in Wingham, Ontario to build a new foundry where exhaust manifolds would be built and sold around the world. It was the largest manufacturer of them in the world. There were 2,000 employees in Ontario at Westcast Industries during the period of 2003 to 2004. Do members know how many there are today? There are zero.

That is the tale across many communities in Ontario and in Canada. I know that the softwood lumber industry is feeling it now. Those jobs do not come back. The dollars to build the foundry at that time were from private investment, not government grants.

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, I could not believe what the member said. I said that Canada was the best in terms of GDP-to-deficit ratio in the G7. The member came back and asked why we would take any sort of happiness in the fact that we are the best of the worst.

If the United States, Germany, France and the United Kingdom are the worst in the world, we are in a lot of trouble, a lot more than one could possibly imagine.

I am wondering whether the member would apologize for making such a bizarre statement. Is he trying to say that the United States and the G7 countries are on a downward trend, which would mean that the whole world is broken?

**Ben Lobb:** Mr. Speaker, the member had better ask his Prime Minister, because I am sure he will give him a lesson on macroeconomics.

We can take just one simple measure: the price of gold. That is where stability is found for countries. When the Liberal government was elected in 2015, the price of gold was \$1,200. The price of gold today is \$4,000, and that is not because the government has

been doing a great job; it is because everybody else around the world knows that the economy is broken.

**Hon. Mark Gerretsen:** Now we are responsible for the price of gold?

**Ben Lobb:** Mr. Speaker, if the member from Kingston and the member from Winnipeg do not get it, I am sorry but you guys are the ones who are sitting at the cabinet table and are saying that the ship is going great. It is not going great; it is going badly.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Before we resume debate, I want to remind members that comments must be directed through the Chair. The Chair is not responsible for the price of gold.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Bourassa.

[*Translation*]

**Abdelhaq Sari (Bourassa, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying that I will be sharing my time with the member for Madawaska—Restigouche.

Before I begin my speech, I would like to wish all my colleagues here in the House a happy Thanksgiving. I hope they have a good time with their families and enjoy this time in their ridings.

Once again, we find ourselves debating a Conservative Party motion that is long on slogans but short on substance. Canadians deserve a serious government that is capable of having serious conversations about how to grow our economy.

While the Conservatives continue to trash-talk Canada, our government is working to build a stronger, more resilient Canadian economy, the strongest in the G7. To achieve that, we are investing in Canadians, in Canadian innovation and in the industries that will define the next generation of growth.

Our government is well aware that many Canadians are struggling to make ends meet. They have a lot of bills to pay, housing is expensive and buying food to feed a family costs a lot. We understand this reality, and that is why Canadians gave this government a mandate to take concrete action that would make life more affordable. Canadians did not put their trust in the Conservatives for one very simple reason: They did not offer Canadians a plan for the economy, they offered them tired slogans and hollow rhetoric.

Let us recall the facts: Canada has the lowest net debt-to-GDP ratio and the lowest deficit in the G7. We have a AAA credit rating from all the major agencies, making us one of only two G7 countries that can claim that distinction. Our inflation rate has remained within the Bank of Canada's target range for over a year and a half, and our policy interest rates are lower than policy interest rates in the United States or the United Kingdom. These are not slogans; these are facts. These are results that people can count on.

*Business of Supply*

Canada's new government is focused on implementing a plan to overcome the cost of living challenges affecting Canadians across the country. On November 4, the Minister of Finance and National Revenue will table our government's first budget, which will lay out our plan to build a stronger and more resilient economy. It will include investments in housing and infrastructure that will encourage significant private sector investment and help build new reliable partnerships.

Since forming government, we have taken several steps to help Canadians and to put more money in their pockets. I will provide some examples. One of the very first measures we took as the new government was to give a tax break to the middle class to help hard-working Canadians keep more money in their pockets. Nearly 22 million Canadians are already benefiting from our middle-class tax cut.

This tax cut will help double income families save up to \$840 in 2026. In the future, it should help Canadians save more than \$27 billion in taxes over the next five years. This reduction in the income tax threshold will benefit Canadians across the country, and most of the tax cut for the middle class will go to people in the two lowest tax brackets, with nearly half going to those in the first bracket, which is \$57,375 and below in 2025.

Thanks to this tax cut for the middle class, the lowest marginal tax rate has been reduced from 15% to 14% effective July 1, 2025. This tax cut is helping hard-working Canadians to keep more of their paycheque to spend where it matters most.

Our government is also fully aware that Canada is in the midst of a housing crisis. Although improvements have been noted recently in many cities, too many Canadians, particularly young people, are having a hard time finding affordable housing. That is why our government is implementing a new and ambitious approach to increase the housing supply in Canada.

• (1525)

For example, our government will remove the GST for first-time buyers of new homes priced at \$1 million or less and reduce the GST for first-time buyers of new homes priced between \$1 million and \$1.5 million. This is significant relief, as first-time homebuyers can save up to \$50,000 in total. This tax cut is expected to save Canadians \$3.9 million over five years. With this GST relief, we are ensuring that first-time homebuyers, especially young people, have lower upfront costs and more money in their pockets for related expenses.

I am pleased to see that this tax cut will also have a dynamic effect on increasing supply by stimulating the construction of new homes across the country. Our commitment to help build more homes from coast to coast does not stop there. We also recently launched Build Canada Homes, a brand new federal agency tasked with building affordable housing on a large scale. Build Canada Homes will rapidly build affordable prefabricated housing on federal lands.

The agency will also help tackle homelessness by building transitional and supportive housing in collaboration with provinces, territories, municipalities and indigenous communities.

It will help keep community housing very affordable for low-income households. It will speed up housing construction, create jobs and give private builders the certainty they need — and I do mean certainty — to build even more. Build Canada Homes aims to transform private-public sector collaboration by using modern construction methods and by fostering an all new Canadian housing industry.

Through all of these measures, our government is reducing taxes, lowering costs and giving money back to Canadians. However, while ongoing support for Canadians is important, we also understand the vital need for continued prudent management of Canada's finances.

We are guided by a new fiscal discipline. We will spend less and invest more. We will balance government operating expenses and revenues over the next three years by cutting waste, capping the public service, ending duplication and deploying technology to improve public sector productivity.

The Minister of Finance and National Revenue will present the details of the new budget plan to the House on November 4.

Our government has also eliminated the consumer carbon tax to refocus carbon pricing on large emitters.

With all these measures, our government is lowering taxes, bringing down costs and putting money back in the pockets of Canadians.

The federal budget will be comprehensive, effective, ambitious and prudent. It will focus on growth, productivity and long-term prosperity. It will meet this moment, build the strongest economy in the G7 and build a strong and free Canada.

Meanwhile, the Conservative Party's plan, if one can call it that, changes from week to week. One day, they promise all kinds of cuts; the next, they pretend to support investment. They talk about helping Canadians, but they vote against measures that make life more affordable. They voted against dental care, pharmacare, the national school food program, affordable housing and clean energy projects in their own ridings.

They claim to stand up for workers, but they oppose investment liberalization in pensions to boost productivity and support good jobs here at home. They say they care about competitiveness, but they oppose investment tax credits that attract new industries to Canada.

Canadians are not falling for it. When it is time to act, the Conservatives have no plan, only political stunts. They say that they balanced the budget, but it was a sleight of hand. They just fudged the numbers. They were able to balance the budget not by strengthening the Canadian economy, but by cutting frontline services, selling off assets and cutting corners on the backs of Canadians.

They were able to do it—

• (1530)

**The Deputy Speaker:** We will move on to questions and comments.

The hon. member for Kitchener South—Hespeler.

[English]

**Matt Strauss (Kitchener South—Hespeler, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I am totally confused. The member opposite said the Conservative government did not strengthen the economy. Would the member acknowledge that GDP per capita in Canada has not gone up but has flatlined over the last 10 years that the Liberals have been in government?

[Translation]

**Abdelhaq Sari:** Mr. Speaker, I can outline what the Conservatives did, quite simply. I would like to finish what I started. They were able to do it by reducing frontline services. They sold off assets. They cut spending at the expense of services to Canadians.

Is that really what increasing the GDP means to you—

**The Deputy Speaker:** I must interrupt the hon. member. When he says “you”, he is referring to the other member. However, during debates in the House, members must address other members through the Chair. The Chair was not the one who made the comments raised by the member who asked the question.

I will allow the hon. member for Bourassa to finish his response.

**Abdelhaq Sari:** Mr. Speaker, although some may think that this balanced the budget, in fact, the opposite was true. The Conservatives merely fudged the numbers. Canadians cannot accept this. The Conservatives cannot claim to have balanced the budget when all they did was reduce services to Canadians.

**Patrick Bonin (Repentigny, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois has a solution for tackling the deficit.

At present, the government is still subsidizing the oil and gas industry, despite the fact that, in 2023, it announced a minor measure to phase out subsidies to that industry. In 2024, it was supposed to introduce a new measure to further phase out the subsidies, yet in 2024, the oil and gas industry received \$28.5 billion in subsidies.

Will my hon. colleague's government agree to simply get rid of these subsidies to the oil and gas industry?

• (1535)

**Abdelhaq Sari:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to shift the focus back to the government's actions. Our government's measure was a strategic adjustment, not an ideological reversal. We shifted to carbon pricing for the big polluters, the ones actually causing the emissions. Canadians should not have to pay for pollution that really

### *Business of Supply*

comes from the big polluters. That is why we are focusing on the big polluters in large industries.

**Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in his speech, my colleague mentioned that the Conservative motion before us today lacks substance and contains several inaccuracies about our economic situation.

I would like to know if my colleague could help us set the record straight.

**Abdelhaq Sari:** Mr. Speaker, that is an excellent question.

What we want to do is to spend smart. We want to invest in Canadians, not make them poorer. There is a difference between spending to survive and investing to grow.

Our government wants a growing Canada, a freer Canada, a stronger Canada and, above all, a Canada that is independent from its neighbour to the south.

[English]

**Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I find the member for Bourassa's analysis of our motion today to be rather crude.

In addition to that, the Liberals have caused the increase in crime in our country, the out-of-control immigration in this country, our housing crisis, the inflation, the rampant food cost increases across the country and the unemployment across the country. For them to say that they are now the solution to all these problems is rather disingenuous.

Would the member not agree that they are attempting to spend less? Why are they attempting to spend less?

[Translation]

**Abdelhaq Sari:** Mr. Speaker, first, I would like to know what the Conservatives built in 10 years. The answer is next to nothing.

Unlike them, we want to spend smarter. We want to reduce current operational spending. We want to invest in a freer country. We want to invest in our economy. We want to build Canada strong. We want Build Canada Homes to build for future generations and especially for young people.

[English]

**Arnold Viersen:** Mr. Speaker, the member opposite did not answer my question on why he thinks they need to reduce spending. This is something I have heard over and over today, that the Liberals are going to spend less.

I am asking the member why they have to spend less. Conservatives think they should spend less to balance the budget so that we can bring down inflation. Why?

[Translation]

**Abdelhaq Sari:** Mr. Speaker, we simply need to distinguish between operational spending and investing. That is another thing my colleagues across the way need to understand. However, it would take a long time to explain it to them. They really need a class, not just a speech in the House.

*Business of Supply*

Simply put, growth is very important. Canada is experiencing positive growth, has the lowest debt in the G7 and is keeping inflation under control.

**Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the motion before us today talks about the importance of investments, the cost of living and the economy. This is timely because Canadians gave our new government a strong mandate in the spring. They trusted us to build a strong economy that works for everyone. When we talk about an economy that works for everyone, we are talking about having measures in place to help Canadians deal with the cost of living.

On this side of the House, when we say that affordability is an important issue, we follow up with concrete action. One of the first things we did when we came back to Parliament in the spring was pass a tax cut for over 22 million Canadians that will give them more purchasing power. It is a concrete measure that shows we are serious. When we say we are going to help people, we take action.

If we look at the Liberal record over the past few years, we see several examples of measures that were introduced to help the public, but which our Conservative colleagues opposed. I am thinking in particular of the Canadian dental care plan. During the election campaign, people told me that they needed dental care but could not afford it. The expansion announced last spring allows people who did not have access to these basic services to access them at an affordable cost. This is a real change for the public. Last week, the Minister of Health announced that more than five million people are now enrolled in this program.

The Canada child benefit is a flagship measure that transfers money directly into parents' pockets to help them provide for their children. Since 2016, this measure has lifted more than 600,000 children out of poverty. In my region alone, more than \$40 million a year is transferred to parents in my riding of Madawaska—Restigouche to help them provide for their children.

Since 2021, more than 900,000 children have secured affordable child care spaces through our program. We understand that if we want to build a strong economy and a strong Canada, we need strong families. We need to enable parents, especially women, to be fully active in the workforce, and that means providing access to child care spaces. The opposition voted against this program, which is not surprising. When we look at the record of the leader of the official opposition, he has been against funding child care spaces for 20 years. If we delve into the House of Commons archives, we will see that one of his first speeches in 2005 was to oppose federal funding for a national child care program.

I am also thinking of the national school food program, which my official opposition colleagues also opposed. This program ensures that children go to school with full bellies. Some 400,000 children across the country are better off because of this program. We will be investing \$11 million over the next three years to make this program available to more than 57,000 children in my province, New Brunswick. That is a big deal. We know the cost of living can be high sometimes, but children should never have to go to school on an empty stomach. That is why we are there for Canadians, there for children and there to provide them with healthy meals.

If we want to hang onto measures like these that make a big difference in people's lives, we need a strong economy. Our position is already strong according to economic statistics. Canada is the only G7 country other than Germany with a AAA credit rating. We have the lowest net debt-to-GDP ratio of any G7 country.

In addition, the government is working to further strengthen the Canadian economy. I am thinking in particular of last June, when we passed the One Canadian Economy Act. This act removes federal barriers to interprovincial trade. We really want to unleash the potential of our domestic market and work to build one Canadian economy out of 13. This act also established the Major Projects Office. In fact, a whole list of projects was announced recently, and more are on the way. When these projects meet our stringent criteria, the question is not whether we will build, but how. We want to stimulate investment in the country because we know that when we stimulate investment, we create jobs and help Canadian businesses.

Then there is the important work being done by the Treasury Board. It is conducting a red tape review that has identified more than 500 superfluous regulations that are no longer needed and that actually hinder productivity and limit economic growth. We are going to get rid of those regulations. The review will continue because we want to demonstrate that Canada is a place where people can invest. That is another way we are stimulating the economy.

● (1540)

Our new buy Canadian policy also comes to mind. The Government of Canada is the largest purchaser of goods and services in the country. We have immense purchasing power, and we want to use it to support Canadian businesses. We will be providing the details of this policy in the coming months, but the idea is to prioritize Canadian goods and services wherever possible. It is about spending money here in Canada to stimulate our economy.

We are also here for workers across Canada. We recognize that the economic situation may be difficult for some people right now. That is why we have announced various measures related to the employment insurance program. For example, we waived the one-week waiting period for claiming EI benefits. People who need benefits will no longer have to wait a week before they can receive them. We also announced that we will allow people to keep their severance pay without affecting the amount of their benefits. For people who want to retrain, we have also announced various measures to support retraining for people who unfortunately lose their jobs and want to change sectors. Once again, these are concrete measures to help Canadian workers.

I would say that the motion before us today lacks substance. It seems less like the product of rigorous work and more like something designed to get clicks on social media. While the official opposition wastes time on an unserious motion, we are over here working away.

The Minister of Finance and National Revenue is working on an ambitious budget that will be tabled in the House on November 4. With this budget, we will seize a generational opportunity to transform the Canadian economy through ambitious investments and careful management of our public finances.

When I say ambitious investments, I am thinking of housing in particular. We announced the new Build Canada Homes agency, and we plan to invest in housing at a rate never before seen in Canada. We understand that people really need this. During the last election campaign, when I talked to people in my riding, they often told me that housing construction was a priority. When I sit down with the mayors in my riding of Madawaska—Restigouche, they tell me that we need to build housing more quickly in the communities.

Millions of dollars in federal funding has already been invested back home in places like Edmundston, Campbellton, Saint-Quentin, the Madawaska Maliseet First Nation and the Eel River Bar First Nation.

The federal government has invested millions of dollars in building housing. Some housing has already been built, and there are people in my riding living in housing that was funded with federal money. More sites are under construction. I will be visiting some of them next week. This is just the beginning. With the investments in the budget, we are going to increase the pace of residential construction. We are going to incentivize public-private partnerships in the housing sector. We are going to support the construction of affordable housing across the country because we know that it is a priority for Canadians, and they expect us to deliver.

At the same time, these investments will allow us to stimulate the economy by prioritizing the use of Canadian products, like softwood lumber and steel.

We have also announced historic investments in defence. Starting this year, will meet our 2% of GDP target to honour our commitments to NATO. With these historic investments in defence, we are also going to stimulate our economy. We are going to identify Canadian companies that can help us procure defence-related goods and services.

### *Business of Supply*

In conclusion, if my official opposition colleagues truly care about affordability and building a strong economy that benefits everyone, I hope they will support our efforts to pass the budget that will be tabled on November 4. As I said, this will be a generational opportunity to transform our Canadian economy. I sincerely hope that our opposition colleagues will work with us to achieve that.

● (1545)

**G rard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent—Akiawenhrahk, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague and congratulate him on his speech.

Clearly, we have our differences, but we also have some common ground. For example, we are the ones who proposed the tax cut. For years and years, we said that it had to be done, and the Liberals finally did it. I am glad they are using some of our ideas. Our leader actually reiterated that commitment. He said the Conservative Party is fine with the government taking its ideas.

However, one thing on which we differ is debt. Anyone who lives beyond their means and runs a deficit will accumulate debt. Who has to pay that debt? Our children, our grandchildren and our great-grandchildren will have to pay for it because we are living beyond our means right now.

Does the member realize that the deficit has doubled in the time since he was elected to Parliament and the Prime Minister became the head of this country?

**Guillaume Desch nes-Th riault:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind my colleagues that Canada is in an enviable position. We have the lowest debt-to-GDP ratio in the G7. We have a government that is focused on building an even stronger economy through strategic investments that will benefit Canadians for generations to come.

Our investments in housing, defence and critical infrastructure, along with our plan to catalyze major projects of national interest, will produce real benefits for generations of Canadian grandchildren yet to come.

● (1550)

**Andr anne Larouche (Shefford, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for his speech, in which he promised us a budget that will revolutionize the Canadian economy. Among other things, he spoke about the idea of establishing one economy, which was proposed by the Prime Minister.

I would like to know whether the hon. member is aware that a unanimous motion was tabled in the National Assembly of Quebec on April 1, 2025. I will read it:

That the Assembly oppose the Canadian Prime Minister's desire to create "one Canadian economy, not thirteen";

*Business of Supply*

That it affirm that Québec's economic interests cannot be sacrificed for the sake of other provinces or territories on the basis of the concept that there is only one Canadian economy, rather than thirteen;

That it reiterate Québec's right to look after its own economic, cultural, linguistic and other interests, according to its priorities and distinct social values, while working to reduce barriers to interprovincial trade.

What does my colleague have to add to that?

**Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault:** Mr. Speaker, as I said, Bill C-5, which we passed last June, removed federal barriers to internal trade.

As a member from New Brunswick, I have regular discussions with my colleagues in the Legislative Assembly of New Brunswick, including a number of provincial ministers who are in my riding.

We talk about how the work we do here in Ottawa can have a positive impact on New Brunswick's economy.

**Angelo Iacono (Alfred-Pellan, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for my esteemed colleague.

Does he agree with the Conservative Party that policies mandating investment in Canadian workers and industries are failures?

**Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault:** Mr. Speaker, no, I do not agree. Our record shows that we are there for Canadian workers. We have put in place measures to help with the cost of living. I am thinking of the Canada child benefit, the Canadian dental care plan and the programs to create child care spaces. We have also adjusted the employment insurance system to help people who sadly lose their jobs.

On this side of the House, we are here for Canadians. We walk the talk, unlike our opposition colleagues, who say that the cost of living is important to them but then vote against every measure we propose to help Canadians with the cost of living.

[*English*]

**Matt Strauss (Kitchener South—Hespeler, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to hear the member opposite, who is a very gifted speaker.

I always hear the Liberals say they are working hard and that they understand there is an affordability crisis, but I never hear any analysis of why this affordability crisis developed during their time in power. Over the last 10 years, in Kitchener and Waterloo, food bank usage has quintupled. The Liberals like to talk about programs that are band-aid solutions, but they do not want to talk about the sectoral damage caused to our economy.

Why are the Liberals working hard but it is not working?

[*Translation*]

**Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault:** Mr. Speaker, inflation and a high cost of living are global issues. Canada is not the only country facing them; all of the western nations are. In Canada, we are coming out of it in an enviable position, with the lowest debt-to-GDP ratio and a AAA credit rating.

We understand that if we want help Canadians with the cost of living, we need to present concrete measures, such as the school

food program and all the other measures that we have put in place and that our opposition colleagues opposed.

[*English*]

**Rachael Thomas (Lethbridge, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the hon. member for Barrie South—Innisfil.

When the Liberals first took office in 2015, they told Canadians that a bit of red ink would buy prosperity, that deficits would fuel growth and investment and that Canada would be better off. After nearly a decade of the record showing the opposite, we have to wonder if we should still keep going in this direction. We have had record borrowing and record spending, with record debt and hardship among Canadians. Investment per worker has fallen by more than 10%; economic growth per capita is the worst in the G7, and the current Prime Minister has caused 86,000 jobs to be lost, resulting in the second-highest unemployment rate in the G7. The new Prime Minister is just like the old one: more spending, more borrowing and more pain for hard-working Canadians.

Behind every number is a person, a story deserving to be known. A few weeks ago, I spoke with Joy, a woman from my community who uses a wheelchair and lives on a fixed income. She called to tell me how desperate she has been in trying to find accessible housing. She has done everything she can. She is responsible, organized, determined and working hard, but as rents climb and the cost of living rises, every apartment she looks at is out of her reach. She told me she just wants a place where she can live with dignity. Is this not what most people want? These are the very basic necessities of life, and she just wants a place where she can live with dignity. My question for the government is what it would like me to tell her. What do I tell someone like Joy, who is doing all she possibly can but is not able to afford a basic roof over her head?

Then there is Susie. Susie is a senior in my riding who reached out to me. She has worked hard her entire life, raised her family and contributed to the community. She pays her taxes faithfully. Now, in retirement, she finds herself unable to afford groceries and rent. She has to choose between the basic necessities of affording her rent or putting proper groceries in her fridge. Of course, the roof over her head is most important in her view, so she pays the rent, but she has turned to skipping meals in order to make it.

This is Canada, one of the richest nations in the world, yet our seniors are being forced to choose between food and rent. There is nothing else to point to other than government policy. It is not the sign of a healthy economy. It is the consequence of years of reckless fiscal policy that has driven up inflation, raised interest rates and punished those who have worked hard their whole lives. This is happening not just to seniors or those with a disability but to working families too.

*Business of Supply*

A couple who would prefer not to be named sat down with me and shared that both of them are working full time. They have three kids and are doing their best, but, at the end of the day, they are not able to afford the things they require as a family. These people have chosen to start skipping meals in order to make sure that their kids have enough to eat and that they can continue to put a roof over their head and function as a family unit. I could go on and on. There are dozens of these stories that come into my office almost monthly, and it keeps getting worse as time goes on. Folks have done everything right, but, for some reason, cannot get ahead.

This is what happens when a government spends beyond its means. Inflation is not an abstract concept; it is a thief, and it is the result of the government. It erodes purchasing power, punishes responsibility, makes the poor poorer and shrinks the middle class, yet the Liberal government continues to insist that deficits somehow make life more affordable and somehow Canadians are going to get ahead.

They are not. The truth is the opposite. Every dollar the government borrows today is a dollar that people like Joy, Susie or the hard-working couple have to pay back. It is on their backs. It becomes their responsibility because of the government's irresponsibility.

• (1555)

Just the other day, I overheard my office manager in the constituency talking to my intern. She was explaining to my intern that when people call or come into the office, sometimes they sound upset or maybe even a bit angry; sometimes, that can be a bit uncomfortable. However, my office manager put it into perspective. She offered an explanation and said that when they come in, they are not trying to be mean and they are not trying to be rude; they are desperate because of fear. They are afraid because they cannot afford rent. They are afraid because they cannot afford food. They are afraid because they cannot pay their bills, and they are desperate for help. They are afraid of what the future holds, because they do not see hope in it.

This insight reminded me of what is really at stake here. Behind policy debates and behind the economic charts and forecasts are millions of Canadians who are afraid. They are afraid they will lose their jobs, afraid they will be without a home and afraid they will never get ahead or be able to step into that opportunity that they so long for. These are the people I visit with each and every day when I am in my constituency. These are the people who share their stories with me, and they just want a fair shot at life. They need Canada to be as it once was, a place where opportunity is great and where the chance to get ahead is normal.

The Liberals told Canadians that their deficits would grow the economy from the heart out. How is that working? It is not. Instead, they have grown debt; they have grown dependence, and they have grown despair. That is what is on the current government's record. Since 2015, business investment in Canada has fallen off a cliff by about half a trillion dollars. It has gone south of the border. Companies do not want to invest here because they see a government that is hostile to them, a government that actually wants those jobs to go south, as the Prime Minister has promised. He wants to send not

just half a trillion dollars but a trillion dollars; that is his latest promise.

The Liberals have been trying to convince Canadians that more spending is the solution to every problem that their spending has already created. If we would just take a second to consider that, it is like pouring gasoline on a fire to put it out. That is what the government is offering. That is what we can expect in the November 4 budget from the government: more spending to put out the fire that its inflationary spending has already caused. It is ludicrous.

The truth is simple. Government does not create wealth; it takes it from those who do, which means it is incumbent upon governments to be wise stewards. Every dollar government spends is taken from a taxpayer. It is taken from Joy, Susie and the hard-working couple I referenced earlier.

I want to be clear: The motion we are discussing today is not just about numbers; it is about people. It is about Joy, it is about Susie, and it is about that couple in my riding. Canadians are strong. They are resilient and hopeful, but they are losing faith in the current government, in the leaders of the day. Who can blame them? After nearly a decade of Liberal promises, Canadians are worse off than ever before. They need a government that respects their money, that lives within its means and that restores common sense to our economic decisions.

Conservatives are calling on the current Liberal government to stop its wasteful spending, which fuels inflation; to bring investment back to our country rather than sending it south of the border; and to make life affordable for hard-working Canadians again. I urge every member in the House to listen to the stories in their communities, to hear the pain and the anxiety behind the statistics and to recognize that the Liberal government's decisions are failing Canadians. Let us stop repeating Justin Trudeau's and the current Prime Minister's policies, and let us stop mortgaging our children's future. Instead, let us start building a Canada where every person, regardless of income or circumstance, has the opportunity to thrive. It is time to put those people, Canadians, first. It is time to rein in spending and be responsible.

• (1600)

**Hon. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, if government spending is inflationary and just contributes to inflation, does that mean that the budget the member ran on, of spending an additional \$106 billion, would have contributed to inflation as well?

**Rachael Thomas:** Mr. Speaker, we will recall that in 2015, Justin Trudeau was the prime minister. He came in and said that just a little red ink would help Canadians.

We then fast-forward to 10 years later. There is still a Liberal government in place, and Canadians are worse off than they have ever been in terms of being able to afford the necessities of life.

Food bank lines are longer than they have ever been before. It is because the government decided that its policy would be to take on debt after debt by going into deficit spending. It is wrong.

*Business of Supply*

• (1605)

[*Translation*]

**Alexis Deschênes (Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Lis-tuguj, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her speech, which is firmly rooted in the reality of her constituents. I want her opinion because we in the Bloc Québécois also think that this government is mismanaging public finances and that—

**The Deputy Speaker:** There is a problem with interpretation. I will let the member start his question or comment over again to give the member for Lethbridge the chance to hear the whole thing.

**Alexis Deschênes:** Mr. Speaker, I was congratulating my colleague on her speech, firmly rooted in the reality of her constituents. I would like her opinion. We in the Bloc Québécois think that the government is mismanaging public finances and that our deficit is much too high and is the result of several bad moves. One of those bad moves made by Mr. Carney's government was to cancel the carbon tax—

**The Deputy Speaker:** I must interrupt the hon. member. The Prime Minister's name should not be mentioned.

**Alexis Deschênes:** We will get there, Mr. Speaker. This government's decision to repeal the carbon tax outside Quebec in the middle of an election campaign meant that nearly \$4 billion was re-funded to people who had not even paid it.

I understand that my colleague from the Conservative Party was probably opposed to carbon pricing, but does she agree with me that giving away nearly \$4 billion in election handouts in the middle of an election campaign, when that money had never been paid, was bad public policy?

[*English*]

**Rachael Thomas:** Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member points to a greater problem at play here, which is a government that is very much out seeking votes. At that point in time, it was conveniently during an election that this money was reimbursed. Of course, as he mentioned, it went to folks who did not even pay into the pot of money to begin with.

Why did the Liberal government make that decision? Why did it give this extra \$4 billion to these folks who had never even paid into the carbon tax to begin with?

I have no other explanation than to suggest that perhaps the Liberals were simply seeking votes. It is wrong. It is a misuse of Canadian dollars.

**Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Lethbridge has been around this place for a fairly long time. I have been here about six years now.

We have heard these wonderful slogans. One was during COVID, that we were going to go into debt so that Canadians would not have to, which was said by Justin Trudeau.

Another one was that we were going to “build back better”.

Another wonderful slogan from Justin Trudeau was, “the budget will balance itself”.

We are now hearing that the new line is, “we are going to spend less to invest more.”

Does she think that this will be as successful as the other bumper sticker slogans?

**Rachael Thomas:** Mr. Speaker, there are these catchphrases that are used by the Liberals, such as how we are going to go into debt so that Canadians do not have to. That debt gets put on the backs of Canadians. It is our children and our grandchildren who are going to pay that debt.

What kind of sloppy statement is that? The government is going to go into debt so that Canadians do not have to? Where the heck is the government going to get that money from?

There is no money for government without taxpayers. That is exactly where that money is going to come from.

[*Translation*]

**Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my colleague spoke about the cost of living. I would like to know why she voted against affordable child care, a concrete measure that allows parents to participate fully in the labour market. What do the people of Lethbridge think about their MP opposing affordable child care?

[*English*]

**Rachael Thomas:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to tell this member exactly what those in Lethbridge think about their plan.

The members in my riding hate this Liberal plan with regard to day care because it has taken away quality, spaces and put them in a place of desperation. They have fewer dollars in their bank account than they have ever had before, and now they do not have proper access to day care for their kids.

• (1610)

**John Brassard (Barrie South—Innisfil, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, we are here debating a motion at a point in this nation's history when Liberal delusion is meeting the fiscal reality of Canadians and Canadian businesses.

The delusion is that Canadians have never had it as good as they have it today. The reality is that Canadian families and single moms are worried about putting food on the table and keeping a roof over their heads. Canadian businesses are not investing. In fact, we are seeing a lot of investment leaving this country because of doubt and uncertainty and because of the tax regime of this country. Yesterday, I met with the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, and it is quite concerned about the tax regime in this country.

Delusion is actually meeting reality, and just this week, we learned of what that reality may look like. MNP financial issued a note on a survey it did. The reality of the headline, I think, speaks volumes as to where we are at today as a nation: “Canadians face ‘heat or eat’ decisions as financial strain deepens”. That is the headline this week. MNP financial did a survey of Canadians. Would members like to know what it found? Again, Liberal delusion is meeting the reality of Canadians:

*Business of Supply*

Canadians' financial vulnerability is worsening, with the MNP Consumer Debt Index sliding two points to 86—its lowest September reading since 2023. Growing numbers report making painful trade-offs: 29% [of Canadians] have reduced utility consumption [which is up five points, year over year] and 24% say they are eating less to save money [which is down four points, year over year]. Nearly half [of Canadians] (48%) are within \$200 of insolvency each month [which is up six points, quarter over quarter], and the average cushion after bills has fallen to \$744 (from \$916). Fewer than half (46%) have six months of emergency savings, leaving many households exposed as winter heating costs approach.

Where are they cutting back? Again, it is Liberal delusion meeting with Canadian reality: “Beyond heat and food, Canadians are changing daily habits to cope. 51% are grocery shopping more strategically (meal plans, bulk buying, coupons, price matching). 45% are avoiding impulse purchases and 41% have stopped dining out or ordering takeout.”

When we listen to the Liberals, and we have heard them today, Canadians do not care about debt-to-GDP ratios, despite the fact that the Liberals are wrong. We have the second-highest unemployment rate in the G7. These are all the realities that Canadians are facing right now.

Insanity is doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results. What today's motion says is that enough is enough. What the Liberals are doing is not working. The reality of Canadians is that they are suffering.

Four million Canadians are using food banks. We have seen it increase in Barrie sixfold since 2020. Just a couple weeks ago, I was at the Barrie Food Bank. It is serving 7,600 families a month right now, and 44% of the people it is serving are children and seniors. Those who used to donate to the food banks are now users of food banks in Barrie. This is cascading across the country. Four million people are using food banks every month in this country. It should not be that way.

In the last government, we saw increased debt and deficit, which caused inflationary pressures that have caused many Canadians to feel the price increases at the stores for groceries, and for other items, including heat and hydro. They cannot afford to live anymore, based on the fiscal policies of the last 10 years.

• (1615)

The government has trumpeted the fact that it is a new government since the April election. The reality is that it is the same government since 70% of the people who are in that cabinet today were in cabinet in the Justin Trudeau government, and they are responsible for 80% of the spending occurring in the government today. It is not a new government. It is the same government employing and deploying the same tactics and the same strategy of debt and deficit that is causing so much hardship to Canadians.

After the last election, we have a Prime Minister right now, who is not so much a PM, but more a portfolio manager, who promised the world to Canadians and that he was going to be different. He is anything but, because we are now seeing that the deficit is projected to be \$60 billion. I suggest it is going to be a lot more than that. There are a lot of people who are much smarter than me who are suggesting it is going to be a lot more than that. We are also seeing debt increase.

There is a budget coming November 4, which is basically a bait and switch. We know the Liberals are going to try to cover up as much as they can in terms of the actual amount of the debt and deficit through this new budget regime. They are not going to be fooling anybody. All eyes will be on the government to see just how much of a bait and switch this new budgetary regime it is announcing is going to cause.

I say to people all the time that it is naive to think that the Prime Minister left a multi-billion dollar company making multiple millions of dollars for some virtuous reason to make \$400,000 as the Prime Minister because he wanted to come back to save the nation. I have said this before in the House, but he came back to keep the kleptocracy alive, to allow those in the inside circle of the Liberal elite party, and all of those who are well-connected insiders and lobbyists, at the trough to maintain access to the Treasury.

Every single problem we have in this country, such as the inflation, the debt, the deficits, the housing crisis, the health care crisis and the immigration crisis, everything, all started before Donald Trump became the President of the United States. Everything did, yet the Liberals continue to use Trump as an excuse.

What we are saying with this motion today is that enough is enough. The Liberals cannot keep doing the things they are doing and expect different results.

Lastly, I want to focus on the issue of resources and building our resources out. Canada has the best innovation, labour and human rights standards in the world. We have the third-largest and fifth-largest reserves in the world. As long as legislation like Bill C-69, Bill C-48 and the emissions cap exist, it will continue to limit and impede our ability to create the revenue we need to pay for the debt and deficit the government has not only accumulated over the last 10 years but also continues to accumulate going forward.

We cannot keep attacking our energy sector. We have what the world needs. We have clean Canadian energy that we can feed the world. The problem we have right now, as long as these pieces of legislation exist, and as long as we continue with our emissions cap and an ideological attack on our energy sector, Canada is falling behind to a point where we are not going to supply the world, but we are actually going to enter into a supplementary mode.

We can supply the world with clean Canadian energy, create billions and billions of dollars in revenue and great-paying jobs for our fellow Canadians, including indigenous Canadians, right across the country, yet this ideological attack continues and limits our ability to create these revenues. This will keep happening as long as we keep doing these things. This motion is calling for us to stop doing what we are doing, because it is not working. Canadians are paying the price every single day the government continues on the path it is on.

*Business of Supply*

• (1620)

**John-Paul Danko (Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the members opposite for finally getting a motion before the House that has Justin Trudeau right in it. There is a strange Conservative obsession with the former prime minister. I think Conservatives are going to go to Spirit Halloween and get an animatronic of Justin Trudeau to jump out of the bushes to scare children.

As we head into Thanksgiving, we have our new government and the newly elected member for Carleton, who is just right here. I would like to wish him and his constituents a very happy Thanksgiving. They have something to be thankful for because they finally exercised the ghoul living in the basement.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The last couple of words the member said were, I hope, not in reference to a current member of the House. In the spirit of Thanksgiving this week, I want to wish all members a happy Thanksgiving, but we should be careful with how we define other members of the House.

The member for Barrie South—Innisfil.

**John Brassard:** Mr. Speaker, I know you said “I hope”, but I believe the comment was directed at a member currently sitting in the House, which goes to show the indifference the Liberal government is showing toward the plight of Canadians right now.

The Liberals think everything is a big joke. It is not a joke for a single mom who cannot afford to put food on her table or a roof over her head. It is not a joke for a business owner, their family and their employees, who are counting on that business to continue to function, as long as the government keeps attacking people through increased taxation and regulation.

We are not talking about a joke here today. The Liberal members may see it that way, but there are millions of Canadians who are suffering each and every day in this country. They are making ends meet just to get by, and enough is enough.

[*Translation*]

**Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, today's motion contains some things that we agree on, and some things that we agree on less. What we most agree on is our impression that there is no one at the controls, that the government has lost control of public finances.

I am going to cite a few figures about the deficit since last December. It all started a long time ago, but I am going to talk about events over this brief period of time. The finance minister resigned in December 2024 because she was about to present an economic statement that included a \$42-billion deficit. The Liberal Party's platform in the last election mentioned a \$62-billion deficit. The Parliamentary Budget Officer talked about a \$68-billion deficit. Right now, according to the C.D. Howe Institute, we are headed for a \$100-billion deficit.

How can we continue to forfeit revenues with such alarming figures to contend with?

[*English*]

**John Brassard:** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased the hon. member for Shefford brought up this point. I am very thankful she is as

concerned as I and my family are for the state of finances in this country.

There seem to be no guardrails, and the member is quite right. I remember the fiasco the day the former finance minister resigned. I remember the former House leader coming in and dropping the fall economic statement on the table. There was really no opportunity to discuss it.

We have not had a budget in this country in 18 months. We have no idea what the government's revenues or expenditures are, except what is being signalled by the Parliamentary Budget Officer and others. With Halloween coming up, it is scary for all Canadians.

**Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, this debate is very much like the crime debate. The comments just made by my colleague from Barrie South—Innisfil were interesting. We also heard the member for Kingston and the Islands across the way say the Liberals have not dropped a budget in 18 months and they still won the election.

**Hon. Mark Gerretsen:** I didn't say that.

**Warren Steinley:** Mr. Speaker, we always know what a Liberal is going to do. The Liberals are going to do the best thing for the Liberal Party of Canada, and when Canadians get hurt, it does not matter. We have seen it with their crime bills. They will support the criminals and support the Liberal Party, and try to protect their record, but not care about Canadians. We will see it in this motion too because we want Canadians to have food on their tables, and the Liberals do not care.

• (1625)

**John Brassard:** Mr. Speaker, I said it during my speech. I think the Prime Minister has come back to keep the kleptocracy alive. Those well-connected insiders, those advocates, those—

**John-Paul Danko:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, you admonished me for my comments, and now we have a member demeaning a member of—

**The Deputy Speaker:** I will remind the member that once a Speaker makes a ruling in the chamber, Standing Order 10 is very clear that we cannot go back and revisit that Speaker's ruling.

Members have a lot of space for debate, and what I have heard so far is debate.

The chief government whip, on a different point of order.

**Hon. Mark Gerretsen:** Mr. Speaker, I believe the member was trying to reference a previous point of order in order to make the point he was making.

I think it is incumbent upon you and it is your duty, Mr. Speaker, as I am sure you would agree, to at least listen to his point of order before interjecting, unless you believe you have heard enough.

**The Deputy Speaker:** I thank the chief government whip for that reminder, but I had heard enough.

*Business of Supply*

The hon. member for Barrie South—Innisfil.

**John Brassard:** Mr. Speaker, they do not like the truth. That is all I have to say.

[*Translation*]

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order. It is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 38 to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands, International Development; the hon. member for Vancouver Kingsway, Employment; the hon. member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, Employment.

[*English*]

**Hon. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding that the comments made by the member for Regina—Lewvan a few moments ago about what I said are completely inaccurate, I would like to inform the House that I will be sharing my time with the member for Whitby. I am very much looking forward to listening to his speech.

I have spent quite a bit of time in the chamber today, so I have had the opportunity to listen to what has been said. I must say that some of the stuff I have been hearing from the Conservatives is quite alarming and hypocritical and, quite frankly, does not make a lot of sense when we look at their actions.

I will start with what we heard recently from the member for Lethbridge, the member for Barrie South—Innisfil and the member for Huron—Bruce earlier. They all talked about inflationary spending. They suggested the government created the inflationary problem that the whole world has seen. The Government of Canada spent money and then the whole world saw inflation. That is what Conservatives would like us to believe.

What I find most ironic about that comment is that I am sure the member for Regina—Lewvan, who was talking about me a few moments ago, and all members who have made comments are aware that they ran on a platform that had 106 billion dollars' worth of new spending in it. Are they now trying to say, indirectly, that their own platform was inflationary and was contributing to inflation? If I listen to what they are saying now, that is exactly what I am hearing.

It is more than that. I have been in this House long enough to have heard countless speeches, as I am sure the member for Whitby has, from Conservatives who get up and say the carbon tax has contributed to inflation and the carbon tax is the reason food prices are higher right now. Over and over again, we have heard that. Let us just throw out the fact that Ukraine produces a third of the world's wheat and is in the middle of a war and that extracting all of that wheat from the global supply has a massive impact on inflation. Let us forget about all of that. It was the carbon tax. The Conservatives said that all we had to do was get rid of the carbon tax, and then suddenly inflation would disappear.

Well, guess what. The carbon tax is gone. Have all the prices the Conservatives said would drop instantly dropped? No, they have not, because it was not contributing to inflation. This is the exact same logic they are trying to apply now.

Earlier, I got a real kick out of the member for Calgary Crowfoot talking about how the Conservatives are great fiscal stewards of the economy and the finances of the government and had left the new Liberal government in 2015 with an incredible surplus. It is as if he was trying to suggest that Conservatives know something about bringing in balanced budgets. They know absolutely nothing about it.

Let us go back. I will just talk about the preceding two Conservative governments. Brian Mulroney had 10 budgets, and he balanced zero. There were zero balanced budgets by Brian Mulroney. I understand that probably very few members of the Conservative Party were here when Brian Mulroney was here. There is at least one currently in the House right now, and that is great, but I will make this a little more relevant for some of the newer members who may have been here when Stephen Harper was here.

It is true that Stephen Harper had three surpluses out of the nine budgets he introduced in this House. Let us look at those budgets. The first two budgets were at the beginning of Stephen Harper's term, when he was first elected. He had a \$13-billion surplus, but what is interesting is that the year before that, Paul Martin also had a \$13-billion surplus. Stephen Harper actually inherited, from Paul Martin, a \$13-billion surplus.

Then in year two of Harper's government, he had a \$9-billion surplus. It was on its way down. Then it vanished, and he was in a deficit position all the way through, right up until the last year when the Canadian Taxpayers Federation or some right-wing association told him it was absolutely imperative that he balance the budget. What did Stephen Harper do? He set out to balance the budget.

● (1630)

How did he do that? He did it by selling shares of GM at bargain prices. He slashed veterans' offices. For the first time in recorded Canadian history, our percentage of GDP invested in the military dropped below 1%. It has only ever existed below 1% for one year. That was in the year 2015, when it was at 0.96% of GDP. That is the legacy. That is the surplus. When the member for Calgary Crowfoot comes in here and says that the Conservatives left a surplus, I guess they did, but they did it on the backs of Canadians.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**Hon. Mark Gerretsen:** Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe that. I just said they did it on the backs of Canadians, and at least four or five Conservatives started cheering and clapping. That just happened moments ago as I was standing here.

I have heard a lot of other misinformation in the time I have been sitting in the House today and listening to the debate. I heard a really interesting exchange. One thing the public does not get to see is the heckling that goes on back and forth. During a speech being given by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, the member for Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek, when the parliamentary secretary was talking about the Canada child benefit, yelled out that the Conservatives started it, that it was their program. Nothing could be further from the truth. What the Conservatives had under Stephen Harper was the universal child care benefit.

*Business of Supply*

What was the universal child care benefit? I am sure my Conservative colleagues here today are still extremely proud of that. They can go ahead and clap if they want, although I did not hear any claps there, which is interesting since I put them on the spot and offered them the floor to applaud. It gave the exact same amount of money for every child to every parent. That meant a millionaire got the exact same amount of money, because of course, the Conservatives would never want to miss an opportunity to send a cheque to a millionaire.

What we did, which was truly transformative, was put in the Canada child care benefit so that millionaires and people who were extremely well off, those who did not need the cheque, did not receive the cheque. It gave us the ability to provide more to those who really needed it. I am bringing this up and spending time on it because there is a fundamental difference between government intervention by a Liberal and government intervention by a Conservative. Liberals believe in giving people opportunities so they can have the best shot.

We talked about the national school food program. When there was an exchange going on, I heard the member for Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek say that it was not working. She was heckling that. I can say that the Food Sharing Project in Kingston delivers food to schools throughout my entire riding and neighbouring ridings. As a matter of fact, a lot of the schools in the jurisdictions of the member for Lanark—Frontenac and the member to the east of me, the member for Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands—Rideau Lakes, receive food through its programs as well. I visited the Food Sharing Project and have seen exactly what it is and the impact that it has. This is not some imaginary bureaucracy; this is real.

I will leave it at that. Once again, I have been subjected to a day of listening to the misinformation of the Conservatives, who are proclaiming that certain things exist and the reasons they exist, which are quite frankly not true. I hope I have contributed a bit of clarity today.

• (1635)

**Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend's flair for the dramatic, and he said something that was really on point, which does not happen a lot in his speeches. He said the Harper government balanced three budgets and the Justin Trudeau government balanced zero budgets. That is the truth. I would agree with him.

Harper went through a recession, a financial meltdown, in 2008. Trudeau went through COVID. Harper's government came back with a balanced budget after a few years. The Prime Minister is not on pace to balancing the budget ever given his unsustainable spending. The Trudeau government added more debt to the country than all other prime ministers combined. That is not rhetoric; that is fact.

**Hon. Mark Gerretsen:** Mr. Speaker, if the member listened only to the one sentence, then he has done himself a huge disservice, because what I said is that Stephen Harper's two so-called surpluses were on the heels of Paul Martin. They were Paul Martin's surpluses. The surplus he had just in time for the election in 2015 was done on the backs of veterans. It was done on the backs of the military, of dropping our military to 0.6% of GDP. Is that something the member is proud of? It sounds like it to me.

[*Translation*]

**Alexis Deschênes (Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Lis-tuguj, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, sound management of public finances is a concern for us in the Bloc Québécois.

I would like to know what my colleague thinks about his government's recent decision to drop the digital services tax. We know that we will be facing a huge deficit. We are still waiting for the numbers on November 4.

With a 3% tax on the activities of multinational web companies in Canada, the digital services tax would have brought in \$7.2 billion over five years. Why did this government decide to forgo this revenue?

[*English*]

**Hon. Mark Gerretsen:** Mr. Speaker, the member would have to ask the Prime Minister about the digital services tax, but I will say that he is absolutely right; it is the job of the government to manage the finances and to introduce a budget.

The questions Canadians have is this: Do we take the word of and look to an individual who has been the governor of two central banks and who, by the way, Stephen Harper himself said was responsible for getting us through the 2008 financial crisis, or do we take the word of the Leader of the Opposition, who has been here since he was 24 years old and has had no experience outside this place? I will leave it to the Canadian public to decide.

**Kristina Tesser Derksen (Milton East—Halton Hills South, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the chief government whip mentioned the opposition's habit of revising history a little bit. We are given revisionist histories and things taken out of context. It contributes to misinformation and disinformation among the public.

Could my colleague please comment on the damage that does to political discourse?

**Hon. Mark Gerretsen:** Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition dumbs down issues and tries to suggest that the global financial crisis was the sole responsibility of Justin Trudeau. What we have when individuals do that, and when they use the narrative and the language to support that, is a misinformed public. We want the public to be informed so they can make proper decisions. It begs the question, why do the Conservatives not want the public to be informed so they can make the best decision on the questions they have to face?

• (1640)

**Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, there was a point of misinformation from the other side of the floor. Every opportunity the Liberals get, they discuss the shutting down of veterans offices. The truth of the matter on that is that those offices were not shut down; they were moved—

**An hon. member:** Oh, oh!

**Cathay Wagantall:** Quiet.

*Business of Supply*

Mr. Speaker, they were moved so they could serve veterans without the overhead of the offices. The call to have those offices removed came from the bureaucrats who responded across the government to the fact that we needed to remove some funding—

**The Deputy Speaker:** I have to give time for the chief government whip to respond.

**Hon. Mark Gerretsen:** Mr. Speaker, leave it to the Conservatives to blame something on the bureaucrats: “Oh, the bureaucrats did it. They were the ones who moved things around and closed them.” I think I will just leave it at that.

**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, it gives me great pleasure to follow what was a very good and entertaining, but obviously factual, speech from the member for Kingston and the Islands. It is great to be here to debate this afternoon.

I understand that the members opposite are very eager to see our plan for growing the Canadian economy, so let me reassure them. On November 4, the government will table a historic budget that will both catalyze growth and outline our ambitious plan to refocus day-to-day spending and invest in the Canadian economy. Budget 2025 will build on our ongoing work that is focused on building a stronger economy and delivering for all Canadians.

I would like to take a moment to highlight some of the important ways we are making life more affordable here at home, while ensuring that we are working to build an economy that will benefit Canadians for decades to come.

As we all know, the global economy is undergoing a seismic shift, and there is no doubt that Canada must change with it. Canadians all across the country recognize this, which is why this past April they provided our government with a clear mandate to build a resilient and modern Canadian economy, the strongest in the G7.

Bill C-4 was one of the first bills introduced in the House, very soon after the House resumed. It was introduced by the Minister of Finance and National Revenue in the spring. Bill C-4 received unanimous consent from the House. I recently said in the House that common sense seems to be lacking. It is not so common in the Conservative Party today, but common sense was provided at that moment, when Conservative members actually supported our tax cut bill, which is good news for all Canadians.

I am a proud member of the finance committee. We are studying Bill C-4 right now, and we look forward to the bill's getting speedy passage back to the House and receiving royal assent.

From a middle-class tax cut that is saving money for 22 million Canadians to eliminating the GST for first-time buyers on new homes up to \$1 million and reducing the GST for first-time homebuyers on new homes between \$1 million and \$1.5 million, the legislation will put more money in Canadians' pockets. Canadians need that right now of course. These measures complement a whole package of other measures that were Liberal initiatives in the past Parliament, all of which were voted against by the Conservative Party, including dental care; child care; the Canada child benefit,

which is indexed to inflation, by the way; the national school food program and many more.

There have also been other supports that our government has put in place under previous leadership in the past Parliament that reduced mortgage insurance, moved to 30-year mortgages and, again, offered tax-free savings accounts for first-time homebuyers. These measures, taken in context, complement a whole series of affordability measures that our government has put in place.

What is new is that the Conservatives actually supported Bill C-4 and voted to get it through to committee. I hope that they will vote it through the House when it comes back from committee, hopefully soon. The other piece of Bill C-4 is to essentially remove from federal law the consumer fuel charge, which would essentially allow us to focus carbon pricing on large emitters.

Additionally, we continue to work diligently to address the housing crisis by focusing on driving down costs and making housing more affordable and accessible for Canadians. To this end, we recently launched Build Canada Homes, a new federal entity that will transform public-private collaboration and deploy modern methods of construction as it catalyzes the creation of entirely new Canadian housing industries from prefab to modular, to mass timber and to any other innovative method. I visited a group at York University that is 3-D printing three-storey homes, which was just incredible to see.

Canada's innovation will lead the way. Build Canada Homes is part of our stepping up to support that industry. This critical tool will leverage public lands. It will offer flexible financial incentives to attract private capital, facilitate large portfolio projects and support modern manufacturers to build the homes that Canadians need.

● (1645)

It is not only the Canadian housing industry that we are transforming; we are also streamlining the federal approval process to get major projects built faster. For too long, the construction of major projects has been stalled by arduous and inefficient approval processes, leaving enormous investment on the table. The newly launched Major Projects Office will fast-track nation-building projects by streamlining regulatory assessment and approvals and will help to structure financing, all in close partnership with provinces, territories, indigenous peoples and private sector partners and investors. This in turn will create good-paying jobs for thousands of Canadians across this country.

*Business of Supply*

I remember when the Prime Minister first announced the launch of five major projects. What struck me that day was what the Conservative leader said. He called those five major projects “pathetic”. He called tens of thousands of good-paying jobs for Canadians pathetic. He called 60 billion dollars' worth of economic activity in our economy pathetic. Members do not want to know what I think is pathetic.

Our government is moving with urgency and determination to build the strongest economy in the G7, but that urgency demands new ways of budget planning. That is exactly what we are doing. The finance minister outlined recently a new way of budgeting, the cornerstone of which is a new capital budgeting framework that distinguishes and prioritizes spending that stimulates public sector and private sector capital investment versus day-to-day operational spending. This will mean more transparency in decision-making and more opportunity for stringency and scrutiny of taxpayer dollars allocated to investments that will grow Canada's economic potential. This follows many G7 countries.

Going forward, the government will also adopt a fall budget cycle starting with budget 2025. The fall timing, which is before the main estimates, will facilitate the oversight and study of public expenditure for parliamentarians, inherently making the process more transparent. It will also support effective financial planning for federal departments and agencies and for provinces and territories, as well as for Canadian businesses, allowing for more informed decision-making on where public funds will have the most impact.

The updated budget cycle will also closely align with the construction season and provide increased certainty and predictability for businesses and investors, giving builders and investors a real head start. The new fall budget will be followed by a spring economic fiscal update as the new fiscal year begins, as well as pre-budget consultations over the course of the summer, allowing for ample time to build a budget that fully reflects the current needs of Canadians.

Before I conclude, I would like to take a minute to highlight Canada's fiscal advantage and how we stack up against G7 countries. In 2024, Canada's net debt-to-GDP ratio stood at just 11.9%, compared to the G7 average, excluding Canada, at 100.4%. That is 11% compared to 100%. In fact, Canada's net debt burden remains lower today than that of any G7 country prior to the pandemic. Canada is also expected to have had the smallest deficit in the G7 as a share of the economy this year.

Canada's fiscal position also stands out among a broader set of 30 advanced economies, posting deficit and net debt-to-GDP ratios among the lowest in the group. This marks a sharp contrast with Canada's fiscal situation in the 1980s and early 1990s, when sustained deficits led to a rapid rise in the net debt burden and an erosion of Canada's fiscal advantage relative to its peers.

Canada is also one of only two G7 economies, along with Germany, to have a AAA rating from at least two of the three major global credit rating agencies. Our AAA credit rating helps maintain investors' confidence and keeps Canada's borrowing costs as low as possible. Canada has a lower interest rate on debt than the United States has, which I would say is noteworthy.

Budget 2025 will highlight how all our actions are guided by a new fiscal discipline. We will spend less to invest more. I know that is hard for Conservatives to understand, but spending less on government operations allows us fiscal room to invest more and to attract private capital, playing the catalytic role in our economy that the Prime Minister has talked about over and over again.

That is how to produce and create a virtuous cycle between investment and growth in the economy, which will increase tax revenues in the future and allow us to sustain many of the social programs and gains we have made under previous Liberal governments that we will need in order to have the fiscal room to continue to support. This is why we have initiated a comprehensive expenditure review to ensure that we get the most out of every Canadian dollar.

• (1650)

**Corey Tochor (Saskatoon—University, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it is frustrating to hear these words out of this member. We know that there are 86,000 people out of work. There are now four million visits to the food bank, and one in four people in Toronto rely on the food bank for food.

The Liberals are talking about these major projects that are going to get fast-tracked. A major project near this member's riding in Darlington is the GE Hitachi SMR. Construction started over a year ago, and I just got an update that the project is progressing. Where are the jobs that the Liberals are claiming are going to be protected by this project that has already started?

**Ryan Turnbull:** Mr. Speaker, it is one of the best opportunities I have ever had in the House to talk about the Darlington nuclear project, the SMR project, which is going to create 1,600 jobs in my region of Durham. I am very proud of that project being listed as a major project, and it is moving forward quickly. That is how we build the economy in Canada. That is how we create more jobs. I am very proud of that project making the major projects list and being expedited through the approval process.

Members opposite do not understand Bill C-5. I suggest they go back and read it. If I am not mistaken, I think they voted in favour of it. It is surprising that they never read the bill, but that does not surprise me much.

Let us get back to the facts. Canada has the lowest tariff rate of any U.S. trade partner. Canada has the lowest net debt-to-GDP ratio in the G7, and Canada has an AAA credit rating, one of only two countries in the G7.

[*Translation*]

**Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am fascinated by the discussions and debates in the House today. I really feel like I am witnessing Harry Potter-like budget magic, or highly creative budgeting. Numbers can be made to say a lot of things. That is exactly what my colleague is showing us.

*Business of Supply*

On the other hand, I am trying to see how we can properly control public finances when we are forgoing revenue like the carbon tax. The Conservatives are going to have to explain that to me at some point. The Liberals say they are heading for a deficit, but in these difficult economic times, they are completely unwilling to provide targeted assistance for people who really need it.

This morning, I asked a question about increasing OAS benefits for seniors aged 65 to 74. I would now like to hear my colleague's thoughts on employment insurance and the support measures needed in these difficult times—

**The Deputy Speaker:** I must interrupt the member to give the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance and National Revenue the chance to respond.

[*English*]

**Ryan Turnbull:** Mr. Speaker, I have been making the argument that Canada is in a strong fiscal position. I know members opposite do not quite seem to understand the fact that we do have fiscal room to continue investing in the Canadian economy. If we do not do that, the economy will shrink. We need the economy to continue to grow. We need to build a strong economy. We need to diversify our trade.

The current Governor of the Bank of Canada came out about a week and a half ago saying that it is exactly the right strategy. What the Liberal government is doing, which is to diversify trade and invest in the infrastructure that we need in order to get our goods to other markets, is exactly how to increase productivity and wages in Canada. It is exactly the way to make life more affordable for Canadians.

• (1655)

**Hon. Arielle Kayabaga (London West, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for his very good speech, which updated the House on the economic stance of Canada. He just mentioned that the opposition is perhaps not understanding. Is it that they are not understanding, or is it that they want to continue to mislead Canadians?

The motion before us includes the former prime minister. Is it that they miss him? Do they really care about what Canadians voted for in this election? Maybe the member can tell us why the Conservatives' rhetoric remains the same.

**Ryan Turnbull:** Mr. Speaker, it is an unhealthy obsession that the opposition members have with our former prime minister. They were really tethered to our former prime minister and bashed him at every moment. It seems like they developed a kind of dependence on that. Now that we have a new Prime Minister, who has a far superior understanding of economics and investment, they do not seem to know what to do any more but misinform people, which they do daily in the House. It seems they do not have an understanding of economics.

**Eric Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—Glengarry, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to rise in the House to speak on behalf of the good people of Stormont—Dundas—Glengarry. I am also proud to be sharing my time today with the great new member we have in our caucus, the member for Edmonton Northwest.

As the official opposition, our role is to hold the Liberals to account on what they promise and what they deliver, and we have, in many cases, with the new Prime Minister but same old Liberal government. They talk a big game. They have these photo ops and make flashy announcements, but the follow-up leaves something to be desired.

The Prime Minister said, when he was sworn in with the cabinet, that he wanted to be judged by the prices Canadians pay at the grocery store. I am happy to do that, but unfortunately, it is not the best of news when it comes to the situation we face in my part of eastern Ontario in the city of Cornwall with the Agapè Centre.

The Agapè Centre has Lisa Duprau, her staff and the many volunteers who make the place what it is. It is an incredible organization that runs a food bank, a store and a kitchen and helps thousands of local residents each year. It held its AGM last month, and I wanted to advise the House of some pretty alarming statistics when it comes to affordability and the state of our economy here in Canada, and specifically in the microcosm of Cornwall.

There were 40,000 visits made to the Agapè food bank in Cornwall last year. That is a city of 47,000 people. Visits were up 193% in the last four years, and children using the food bank is up 257%. Between the kitchen and the food bank, the Agapè Centre processed a million pounds of food for those in need, with a value of \$3.6 million. It is affected by the increased usage and increased cost of food because that is a 10% increase from the previous year.

I want to quote the executive director, Lisa Duprau, who said, “The urgency of the situation cannot be overstated. People are skipping meals, taking on unsustainable debt, and stepping further away from a life of dignity.” That is the record of the Liberal government over the course of the last 10 years. When we look at the last six months with the Prime Minister, the situation is only getting worse. Food inflation is 70% above where the target inflation rate should be, and Canadians are going to be spending an extra \$800 on groceries as a family this year. That is the expected average, with no relief in sight.

One of the things we know and have been saying for years, which continues to be shown with higher food inflation, higher housing prices and higher deficits, is that those higher deficits and money printing lead to inflation and lead to that pressure. It is not sustainable, what we have seen for the last number of years under the Liberals, and we are seeing that live in living colour through the sad reality of one food bank in Cornwall alone.

A key part of any government in order to be successful, to grow the economy and to have a sustainable future is getting investment in this country. From what we have seen, the numbers speak for themselves. Since the Prime Minister came into office, we have seen \$54 billion in investment leave this country for the United States. Over the course of the last five years, that number has been half a trillion dollars. Why?

*Business of Supply*

It is the lack of good management from the Liberals to create an economic environment through good taxes, good opportunities for jobs, and an atmosphere so that businesses want to bring direct foreign investment from around the world into Canada. We have seen half a billion dollars leave Canada for the United States because that is where they prefer to do business.

• (1700)

As if that rate continuing for the next five years was not bad enough, this week when the Prime Minister visited Washington, there was another major concession with no deal. He has already conceded on countertariffs and the digital services tax, and then he said in his comments in the Oval Office of the White House that he would pledge, as some sort of deal they are working on, \$1 trillion of Canadian investment money to go to the United States in the next five years. That is double the rate we have already lost. That is absolutely ridiculous. It is an absolute betrayal of Canadians and Canadian workers.

What does that mean? That is \$1 trillion the Prime Minister put on the table with nothing in return, except for those dollars being used in the United States. Just imagine if those one trillion Canadian dollars were invested in Canada in the next five years instead, but no.

We are going to see a factory either closed in Ontario or, if a brand-new one will be built, it will not be built in Ontario but rather in the state of Michigan or Ohio. With the red tape of regulations, it takes 25 years in many cases to get a permit for a mine in northern Ontario, B.C. or other parts of this country. As opposed to seeing that investment and jobs created in British Columbia, as an example, or northern Ontario, it will be going to West Virginia or Washington. For someone with dollars in Canada, as opposed to opening up a new business in, say, Nova Scotia, they will open up in the state of Maine instead. This will happen at a time when we can least afford it.

As the official opposition, we have a responsibility to hold the government to account. The Prime Minister said that he was going to create new jobs in Canada. Since he became Prime Minister, 86,000 jobs have been lost, including in the city of Cornwall, with Ridgewood Industries closing and 300 jobs gone in our community just in the last couple of months. This is not sustainable, but over and over again, we see the Liberal government repeating the same failed approaches.

We are now seeing the Prime Minister going out and openly advocating and creating deals with the United States, with nothing in return, that are going to see \$1 trillion in Canadian investment money leave our country and flow down south.

The Prime Minister knows that very well, because he did that just before he became Prime Minister, when he was the chair of Brookfield. Brookfield is part of that \$500 billion of Canadian money I mentioned that moved to the United States in the last five years. The Prime Minister's own company, Brookfield, was one of those. It moved its headquarters to New York City, leading by example in completely the wrong way.

We need to see some fiscal responsibility from the government after 10 years. We thought Justin Trudeau was expensive. The Prime Minister is making him look like a penny-pincher.

**An hon. member:** Hold my beer.

**Eric Duncan:** Mr. Speaker, hold my beer, as the expression goes, absolutely.

We have seen the independent Parliamentary Budget Officer predict the deficits of the new Prime Minister, with the same old Liberal government and same old Liberal team adapting the same old failed approach of endless deficits, never-ending deficits with no plan to balance the budget. The deficits are at least double what Justin Trudeau's deficits were going to be, according to the Parliamentary Budget Officer.

Every dollar government spends comes from the pockets of Canadians. It adds to higher taxes, higher food costs, a higher cost of living and higher costs for housing. We are not seeing a good return on investment on the tax dollars the Liberals are spending.

As we have in our opposition day motion, every dollar that leaves our country and flees in investment is fewer jobs and lower wages. On this side of the aisle, we are going to stand up for Canadian workers and for Canadian investments for a brighter Canadian future.

• (1705)

**Hon. Arielle Kayabaga (London West, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is clear that Prime Minister Trudeau is still part of their economic plan and their plan to government, even though it did not work in the last election.

Perhaps the member opposite can tell us why he thinks that the child tax benefit is a waste of money? This is a tax credit that has lifted over 400,000 children out of poverty. Why does he think that investing in child care across this nation, an economic policy, is a waste of money?

Also, what is the obsession with talking down on Canadians and Canada? Today in question period, we heard, in almost every question, the Conservatives talk down Canada. What do they have to actually offer Canadians?

**Eric Duncan:** Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be Canadian. I am proud to stand up for Canada. What I am ashamed of and what I am criticizing is the Liberal government. That is what we are talking about here. Members will notice that the Liberals are doing everything they possibly can today to talk down their own former prime minister. They do not want us talking about Justin Trudeau anymore.

The reality of the situation is that Justin Trudeau may be gone, but the new Prime Minister is making the situation even worse financially, with larger deficits and more spending. Our immigration system is in chaos, and there is no end to the housing crisis. We need to build more houses. We are actually seeing things slow down. There is example after example of these things. The Prime Minister did not just make any promise; he made the promise that he would get a deal with the United States, and he has broken that promise. He is leading us toward the same disastrous financial record Justin Trudeau had. It is not a new government; it is the same tired Liberal Party.

[Translation]

**Alexis Deschênes (Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Lis-tuguj, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague for his passionate speech. One of the problems we have when we talk about public finances is that there is no transparency right now. We still do not have a budget.

I would like to discuss something with my colleague. When the votes were tabled in June, we noticed certain things. First, transfers to individuals will hardly increase at all, and federal bureaucratic operating expenses appear set to skyrocket by 16%. Spending on consulting firms would explode by 26% and equipment purchases would increase by 300%, not counting military procurement.

What does my colleague think of this preliminary overview we have of public finances?

**Eric Duncan:** Mr. Speaker, there is a major problem with transparency on the part of this Liberal government when it comes to the country's budget and finances.

[English]

There is a major problem with transparency when it comes to the Liberal government. I can speak longer than the 30 seconds I have to elaborate on that, but I will agree that we are seeing spending on consultants going up significantly. This was after the Prime Minister said that he was going to cap spending at 2%. The first bill he tabled increased spending by 8%, with billions of dollars more on consultants.

Now it is \$742 million on a gun confiscation program that the Liberals' own Minister of Public Safety said will not be effective. There are many examples of waste that have come from the government; if that money were back in the pockets of Canadians, maybe they could afford food.

• (1710)

**Anna Roberts (King—Vaughan, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, we have a serious situation in this country, with 86,000 people out of work. Earlier today, during question period, the Minister of Foreign Affairs stated that they are going to support the Canadian population with EI. The people in my community do not want EI; they want jobs. They want to work. How would the member address that?

**Eric Duncan:** Mr. Speaker, I could not agree more on just how tone-deaf the Minister of Foreign Affairs was today when we were talking about the importance of the auto sector and supporting auto workers and mill workers right across this country. Her answer was not to worry, because the government was going to give them extra weeks of EI. This is absolutely out of touch.

### *Business of Supply*

I could not have said it any better than the member did. Workers want a job. They want good pay, good benefits, a good pension, a reasonable home to live in and the ability to afford food to feed their families. It is sad that after 10 years under the Liberals, continuing with the new Prime Minister, it is the same old Liberal Party, and Canadians are struggling over and over again to get basic necessities. It is shameful that this is the country the Liberals have created after 10 years.

**Billy Morin (Edmonton Northwest, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise in the House. I thank my colleague for sharing his time with me.

For 10 years now, the Liberal government has made our country weaker with overspending and deficit after deficit. Through the Liberal government, the promotion of government dependency in regard to economic development has become the staple and the identity of Canada, especially in indigenous economic development.

The current projection for the Liberal government deficit, for this year alone, is anywhere from \$60 billion to \$100 billion. Indigenous peoples and Canadians have questions. Why is it that the government, year after year, gets to spend recklessly and go billions and billions over budget, with little to no plan when, through the Indian Act and Indigenous Services Canada, it enforces financial and management penalties if first nations go over budget?

Why is it that first nations have default and third party management enforced on them for one challenging fiscal year, but the Liberal government gets to put Canada in debt to the tune of trillions of dollars and have billions of dollars in annual deficits? Maybe the government, led by the supposedly brilliant banker, should be subject to the same penalties it enforces upon first nations.

It seems to be rules for thee, not for me, when it comes to the government.

The deficits have cost 86,000 net job losses alone in our country. Indigenous unemployment and youth unemployment have combined to exclude an entire generation of young indigenous workers from contributing to Canada's economy. Deficits hurt community workers, frontline workers, teachers and health aides.

First nations communities see their pay stagnate while living costs soar. Just as the rest of rural Canada does, we already struggle to recruit teachers, social workers, health care workers and other frontline staff needed in our communities.

Ottawa's reckless spending does not lift up indigenous workers. It pushes them out of the workforce through affordability pressures and housing shortages.

### *Business of Supply*

Indigenous Canadian unemployment is exacerbated by the Liberal mismanagement of immigration and temporary foreign workers. For years, we have had workers in the indigenous communities wanting their chance to contribute to local economies in rural Canada and urban centres, but they feel left out and forgotten because of Liberal mismanagement.

It is time to put Canada first. Canadians are scared; they are scared about job losses and how they are going to put food on the table and pay the bills. Food inflation above the Bank of Canada's target is not abstract. It means \$15 milk in northern community stores, families choosing between gas and groceries and higher costs for traditional foods and supplies.

People accessing rural grocery stores were hit hard with both rising food costs and the cost of fuel to get them to and from their reserve communities. Rising fuel and transportation costs erode band budgets, forcing leaders to cut community programs or delay infrastructure maintenance. Rising costs force chiefs and councils to choose between health care and social supports. This has exacerbated housing shortages and lack of access to clean drinking water, as well as increasing maintenance costs for public service vehicles and preventable costs for indigenous communities, which Canadians continue to pay for later.

Increased costs of living hit indigenous post-secondary students hard, with increased costs to study and increased costs for housing, for travel and to meet cultural and family obligations.

Indigenous students are a part of the record line-ups at food banks. The treaty right to education funding has been watered down under the Liberal government. These are our future leaders, but they are falling behind the rest of Canada.

Indigenous communities continue to struggle in the Liberal deficit environment to create and sustain their own-source revenue initiatives today. When the dollar weakens and borrowing costs rise, first nations own-source revenues and trust funds lose value. Inflation cancels out indigenous progress. Every gain from new businesses, trading programs and economic partnerships is swallowed by higher costs.

Local indigenous entrepreneurs are priced out of equipment loans and procurement opportunities. Youth training programs face cost overruns with no adjustment in funding, and \$53.9 billion leaving Canada for the United States means fewer partnerships for indigenous-led projects.

Energy, food security, natural resources, mines, operations and tourism ventures struggle to attract investors.

- (1715)

Real reconciliation requires capital staying in Canada to grow indigenous economies, not capital fleeing and the government trying to play hero by making federal tax dollars the focus for economic development in our communities. Indigenous nations want the government to get out of the way so that we can create our own economies alongside the rest of Canadians.

Ottawa's deficits raise interest rates, which raise borrowing costs for first nations and indigenous development corporations, making self-financing more challenging or near impossible. The promise of

reconciliation through economic inclusion rings hollow when inflation eats away at every grant dollar and makes indigenous infrastructure 30% to 40% more expensive to build. What indigenous prosperity needs instead is fiscal discipline that makes every dollar count; targeted investments, not blanket deficits; stable inflation, so indigenous nations can plan multi-year infrastructure builds without surprise cost escalations; true partnerships in which indigenous communities direct investment to local priorities and not to Ottawa's vote-buying announcements; and economic reconciliation grounded in accountability, stability and productivity, not recycled Liberal talking points.

The traditions of first nations people often centre on not taking more than what one needs, not wasting one part of the buffalo or the moose that we hunt to sustain us. That is sustainability. This aligns with the principle of balancing our budget and eliminating our deficits. This aligns with our values as indigenous people.

When I became chief of my nation, oil prices were down, which affected our local economy. We projected an \$8-million deficit, or 10% overspending, for my first nation alone. We had overdependence on band office jobs. We had very little in terms of external investment confidence in our Enoch Cree Nation. We knew we had to make tough fiscal decisions and really do the work to restore investor confidence and our membership confidence to have good governance in our first nation and have a real plan to grow and diversify our economy.

Therefore, we created our first financial law, which holds our Enoch government accountable for how it spends. We made ourselves investable again, which resulted in hundreds of millions of dollars in economic development on and off our reserve for our members and for Albertans. We invested in our natural resource sector and partnered to build the first greenfield large-scale natural gas power plant in a generation in Alberta. We grew business and entrepreneurship; we focused less on government-dependent jobs, and we became stronger. We readily partner with other first nations and indigenous communities to make everybody else stronger as well.

The government talks about “Canada strong”, but I think the Liberals really need to reflect on the fact that deficits make Canada weaker. We think in terms of seven generations in our indigenous communities. The current government seems to be adding seven generations' worth of debt and burden to all Canadians in the future.

**Bruce Fanjoy (Carleton, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, does the member see a role in the federal government's making targeted investments to improve the economic prospects and the future of indigenous Canadians?

• (1720)

**Billy Morin:** Mr. Speaker, the member implicated the government in needing to make targeted investments in first nations and indigenous economies. I thank him for that question, but I would rephrase that. What we need is for the government to get out of the way. We have always known how to run our own economies. We have always known how to stand on our own two feet, and we need the government to get out of the way so that we can get rid of red tape, we can get rid of the Indian Act and we can get rid of these different policies that are still being upheld by the Liberal government today. Then we can actually build Canada and put Canada first so that we can have this economy back on track.

[*Translation*]

**Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my colleague spoke at length about the importance of nation-to-nation relationships and supporting projects designed and led by and for indigenous peoples. Last year, I met with a group that came to talk to me about the Yānonhchia' project. I hope I am pronouncing that correctly.

This project, which needed \$150 million in funding, aimed to facilitate access to affordable capital for indigenous communities to support a housing renewal model. These truly were projects that had to be designed and led by and for these communities.

I would like to hear my colleague's comments on this project and on the importance of funding this type of initiative.

[*English*]

**Billy Morin:** Mr. Speaker, government certainly has a role in investing in housing for first nations communities. Federal jurisdiction dictates that first nations in particular have to work directly with the government and not necessarily provincial government or municipalities first.

Again, I highlight that we have the resources. Many of our communities are rural, right next to the biggest forests in Canada. In B.C., we have first nations ready to invest in softwood lumber and to build homes in first nations communities.

However, in terms of the bigger picture, I am really disappointed in the government and how it is downplaying and harming these larger industries and not allowing first nations to step forward in those partnerships to build homes on reserve.

**Ellis Ross (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for an incredible speech regarding deficits. I think the Liberals missed the point of what he said.

### *Business of Supply*

I was in the situation of remedial management and third party management, and it was very humiliating. It was for one year of unmanageable deficits. It was very humiliating, and that is why I went after an economic base.

What is third party management, and what would happen if Canada was subject to the same rules that many first nations chiefs and councillors are subject to?

**Billy Morin:** Mr. Speaker, third party management is an ISC policy and stipulation. If the government cannot spend its dollars right, it needs oversight, and rightly so. It is humiliating for first nations, and sometimes humility is part of what we are as first nations.

If this applied to Canada, we would not have 10 years of deficits and would not have trillions going to other countries, externally. If Canada was held accountable to the same degree that first nations are held accountable, this country would be in a better situation. Sovereignty would not be harmed, and we would be on the path to prosperity.

[*Translation*]

**Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, last month, I had an excellent meeting with representatives of the Eel River Bar indigenous community in my riding. We talked about housing.

This is a major issue in that community. Since 2023, the federal government has invested more than \$10 million in the community through the rapid housing initiative. We have also invested over \$375,000 through the affordable housing fund.

Would my colleague agree that this is excellent news that meets real needs in communities?

[*English*]

**Billy Morin:** Mr. Speaker, since first nations and indigenous communities are so far behind, investments in housing are always good.

Again, I would implore the government to think bigger, not just about subsidies and social housing. Those are good things that will be needed in indigenous communities and all Canadian communities for the rest of time, but there is also a market for housing, and first nations could get rid of the Indian Act stipulations that go against mortgages on reserve. That is something else we need to focus on to create the space for them to build their own housing.

**Juanita Nathan (Pickering—Brooklin, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am thankful for the opportunity to participate in today's opposition motion debate. I will be sharing my time with the member for London West.

*Business of Supply*

The global economy has changed, and Canada must change too. We need to build more housing and infrastructure and support industries that are essential to our economic growth. This spring, Canadians called for a serious and ambitious plan, and we are working hard to prepare and implement that plan.

First, our colleague the Minister of Finance has already announced that our new government will table the 2025 budget on November 4. Second, as he outlined this week, the budget will be based on a new capital investment budgeting framework. This framework will distinguish between current operating expenditure and capital investments, which will help the government prioritize investments that will deliver long-term benefits for Canada and Canadians.

The operating expenditure will be balanced by 2028-29. The 2025 budget will rise to the occasion. It will be a budget to build the strongest economy in the G7 and a budget to build a strong and free Canada.

The 2025 budget will do something else that is very concrete. It will make life more affordable for Canadians. We understand that the cost of living remains a constant concern for Canadians. We have already announced several measures to help them.

We know that one of the challenges is the cost of housing. We are facing a housing crisis, which is why we are implementing an ambitious new approach to increase the supply of housing in Canada. For example, the Prime Minister recently launched a new federal agency responsible for building affordable housing on a large scale, which is called Build Canada Homes. With Build Canada Homes, we will combat homelessness by building supervised and transitional housing in collaboration with provinces, territories, municipalities and indigenous communities. This agency will build community-based, highly affordable housing for low-income households and will partner with private developers to build affordable housing for the country's middle class.

To help Canadians buy homes, we proposed eliminating the GST for first-time buyers of new homes valued at \$1 million or less and reducing the GST for first-time buyers of new homes valued between \$1 million and \$1.5 million. Furthermore, as Canadians demanded, we put money back in the pockets of all Canadians by cutting taxes. Since July 1, all Canadians have benefited from a tax cut that will save a dual-income family up to \$840 per year starting in 2026. I am proud to note that 22 million Canadians will benefit from this tax relief. They can now keep more of their paycheques and use them according to their priorities, as they wish.

In these times of trade tension with the United States, we understand the importance of continuing to support Canadians affected by this dispute. Since the beginning of the trade dispute, we have put in place a robust Canadian system of economic support programs to help businesses and workers directly affected by U.S. tariffs. For example, we have temporarily suspended the one-week waiting period for employment insurance benefits, and we have temporarily suspended the rules surrounding the processing of severance pay to prevent workers from having to exhaust their severance pay before receiving the employment insurance benefit. We have made it easier to access employment insurance by increasing the unemployment rate applied to regions for a period of six

months. We have also made it easier for employers and workers affected by tariffs to access the work-sharing program. Employers experiencing a decline in business activity due to the threat or potential implementation of tariffs may be eligible for special measures under the work-sharing program.

Our new government has also announced a series of targeted measures to support Canada's steel, aluminum and softwood lumber industries. For example, our government will invest \$70 million in labour market development agreements with provinces and territories to provide training and income support measures to nearly 10,000 affected steelworkers.

• (1725)

We are also implementing new measures to help the lumber industry transform and compete. We are providing up to \$700 million in loan guarantees to alleviate the current pressure on the lumber sector, and we are building with a focus on using Canadian materials in construction. We have changed the federal contracting processes to require companies that contract with the federal government to source Canadian lumber. In this way, our government is ensuring that Canadian workers benefit from our investments during these challenging times.

The 2025 budget will be a generational investment in our future, and with it, we will build a Canada of the 21st century. This budget will set out a clear plan to build the strongest economy in the G7, based on generational investments in housing and infrastructure, while reducing the cost of living for Canadians. It will stimulate private investments here in Canada and strengthen our ties with trusted trading partners and allies, moving our economy from reliant to resilient. At the same time, the government will exercise new fiscal discipline in its day-to-day operations to make services more efficient and reliable, while focusing resources on long-term growth to ensure Canada's prosperity today and for decades to come.

• (1730)

**Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):** Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the hon. member that I am going to ask a question that was not raised in her speech, but earlier by members of her party who put things before the House that I would like to challenge a bit. The Darlington project is being touted as proof that the government is bringing economic benefit to Canada, but that project, to build an SMR, a so-called small modular reactor, if completed, will be the first one in North America. They are not operating anywhere. Well, they operate in China and Russia, but commercially, not in North America. At a \$21-billion price tag, much of the consortium private sector builders are not Canadian. GE Hitachi is U.S.- and Japan-owned, and Kiewit Engineering is U.S.-owned.

*Business of Supply*

Do we really want to be shipping that many billions of dollars to U.S. firms on an untested technology?

**Juanita Nathan:** Mr. Speaker, as the member said, this is a new technology and it is the first time they are trying it. Anything that would give Canadians work is worth trying.

**Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I want the member to respond to something her colleague from Whitby said. He said the government will spend less so it can invest more, and he referred to the operating budget, which means it will have to lower expenditures on the operations side to have the funds to spend on more development.

Would she know what the cuts will be to the public service and programs the government will introduce so that it is spending less?

**Juanita Nathan:** Mr. Speaker, the operating budget cuts will be for services or programs that are not relevant and are not maintained by the framework of the federal government. Each department is scrutinizing its budget and carefully making these cuts so that essential services and programs are not affected by them.

[*Translation*]

**Patrick Bonin (Repentigny, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, if we want to do something about high food prices, we need to tackle the real causes of rising prices. Climate change impacts are directly related to significantly higher food prices.

We need to step up the fight against climate change, accelerate greenhouse gas emissions reduction and develop well-funded strategies. We need strategies to address crop loss due to unpredictable weather, the droughts we are currently experiencing in Quebec, water shortages and flooding, which is also problematic. The government is backing down from the fight against climate change.

Does my hon. colleague agree that his government is backing down from the fight against climate change? Can she tell us when we are going to see positive action, not just backtracking?

[*English*]

**Juanita Nathan:** Mr. Speaker, climate change is an important topic, and the Liberal government is very serious about it. Budget 2025 will seize the generational opportunity to transform our economy through ambitious investment and rigorous discipline, ensuring that every dollar goes further to help build the strongest economy in the G7.

• (1735)

**John-Paul Danko (Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member served at the municipal level, as have I. We have seen the impact that provincial governments have on affordability by downloading costs to municipalities and downloading costs to residents.

What role does the member see the provincial governments across Canada having in addressing affordability, and what more positive partnerships might be possible?

**Juanita Nathan:** Mr. Speaker, it is true that programs and services are the responsibility of the provincial government, and at this time, if they are able to do what they are supposed to do, they will

be able to put programs in for everyday Canadians who are going to be affected by the tariffs.

I urge the provincial governments to look deep and to serve Canadians well.

**Hon. Arielle Kayabaga (London West, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for Pickering—Brooklin for sharing her time with me. I am very happy to rise on this motion.

First of all, let us address the elephant in the room. The Conservative Party has brought forward a motion that is, once again, heavy on slogans and light on substance. Canadians are tired of the noise. It is unfortunate to see that, with the few opposition days they have, this is how they are choosing to spend them, by lying to Canadians.

We know what Canadians want—

**Matt Strauss:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I think you would agree with me that it is terribly unparliamentary to accuse the party opposite of lying to Canadians. That is not the case.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater):** There are certain words that are very clearly unparliamentary, and I will ask the member to quickly withdraw it and carry on.

**Hon. Arielle Kayabaga:** Mr. Speaker, I do withdraw that word and would replace it with “misleading”, as they are misleading Canadians through the many comments we have heard in the House.

We know that Canadians want results. They want leadership that builds and not one that just continues to blame consistently. While Conservatives spend their time talking down Canada and Canadians, our government will continue to focus on building with discipline, direction and delivery.

We are strengthening an economy that is already the most stable in the G7 and positioning it for the next generation of growth. We are investing in Canadians. We are investing in their ideas. We are investing in their skills and in the industries that will carry this country forward. We are investing in clean energy, electric vehicles, advanced manufacturing, and the copper and critical minerals that power the world. These are not abstract plans. They are the backbone of Canada's economy.

[*Translation*]

While the Conservatives keep criticizing, we keep building a strong economy. We are going to deliver results for families, workers and communities across the country. We are preparing ourselves and preparing our nation for the future with the same ambition as the generations that built Canada.

*Business of Supply**[English]*

We know that times are tough right now. Canadians have told us that. Bills are high, housing is tight and groceries are costly. This is when Canadians need leadership. It means that we have to show up with solutions and not slogans. It means that we have to serve Canadians. We have to pass bills in the House and not just talk down to Canadians. That is exactly what this side of the House is doing.

Let us take a look at the facts. Canada has the lowest net debt-to-GDP ratio in the G7. We have a AAA credit rating from every major agency. Inflation has stayed within target for over a year. These are not just talking points, these are real measures and real results.

I am sure Conservatives will talk about inflation, but what they forget to tell Canadians, every single time they bring it up in the House, is that inflation is something that has plagued the whole world in the last number of years.

We have good news. On November 4, the Minister of Finance and National Revenue will table a budget, a plan to grow the economy, to boost productivity and to restore long-term prosperity. It will focus on the fundamentals, which are housing, infrastructure and skills. It will build partnerships that attract private investments across every region of Canada.

Since the new government took place, we have been putting money back into Canadians' pockets. We know that the middle class tax cut is helping 22 million Canadians keep more of what they earn. For a two-income family, that is up to \$840 next year. It is real help and not political fodder.

We are also tackling housing head on through Build Canada Homes. We are fast tracking affordable prefabricated homes on federal lands. This will help young families get into the market and create skilled trade jobs, unlocking a whole new generation of Canadian builders. By removing the GST on new homes for first-time homebuyers, we are saving families up to \$50,000 and making ownership a reality for many young people.

● (1740)

*[Translation]*

Every house built will be a dream come true, a job created and a community growing ever stronger. That is what building Canada is all about.

*[English]*

Our plan is rooted in fiscal discipline and economic realism. We are spending less and investing smarter. We are capping the size of government, cutting duplication and using technology to deliver better services. Every single dollar must deliver value. That is called fiscal discipline with purpose.

Meanwhile, the Conservatives cannot pick a lane. One week they promise cuts everywhere; the next they say they will invest. They voted against the dental care plan, pharmacare, affordable housing, clean energy projects and families and children in this country, even in their own ridings. When they say they stand with workers but oppose pension reforms that would fund new industries right here at home, they are misleading Canadians. That is not leadership.

That is politics for politics' sake. Canadians can see the difference and made their choice in April. This is the moment that the Conservatives can come together and support the government to rebuild Canada's economic strength for the long haul.

Budget 2025 will set the foundation for a new industrial strategy, one that secures our energy future, rebuilds our supply chains and attracts the kind of investment that turns local opportunity into national growth. That is what the Conservatives are being given an opportunity to do, and I really hope they will take the opportunity to invest in Canadians and support budget 2025.

We are moving forward with short-term fixes to long-term building, from dependence on a single market to resilience in global trade, from uncertainty to steady growth.

*[Translation]*

We are going to build an economy that works for everyone, an economy based on discipline, innovation and Canadian pride. In fact, Canada's real strength is its people, its ambition and its ability to deliver results.

*[English]*

This is about building a strong nation. It is about building the future for young people. It is about imagining what Canada could look like when we invest in children, young people and seniors, and when we work together, the government and opposition parties. When Canadians voted on April 28, they sent us here to do exactly that, and we have to meet the moment.

While Conservatives continue to chase headlines, this government will continue to focus on real results. We will continue to build an economy that works for all Canadians, an economy powered by Canadian talent, industry and ambition. We are building a Canada that simply works for the middle class, the next generation and every region across this nation. That is leadership and what leadership looks like.

**Matt Strauss (Kitchener South—Hespeler, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the Liberals continually say they are going to build Canada strong and build a great economy. They have had 10 years to do it, and it has not happened. Canada's GDP per capita growth over the last 10 years was the lowest in the G7. I am begging the hon. member opposite merely to acknowledge that economic fact and, upon acknowledging it, reflect on what about the Liberals' plan did not work for the last 10 years and how the new plan is different.

**Hon. Arielle Kayabaga:** Mr. Speaker, as I said in my comments, we acknowledge that inflation has hit Canadians. I acknowledged that housing costs and food costs have gone up, but that is not just in Canada.

*Business of Supply*

I know the Conservatives love to talk down Canada. Today, in question period, they used the same script. Maybe the same person writes the script. Perhaps they need to change that person, because they were given misleading information to mislead Canadians and said that Canada is not growing. That is simply not true.

[*Translation*]

**Alexis Deschênes (Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Lis-tuguj, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I noticed that my colleague used the word “discipline” in her speech and that she spoke on the importance of being disciplined and diligent when managing public finances.

I would like to hear what she has to say about the action taken by her government immediately before the election, when it eliminated the carbon tax and refunded Canadians outside Quebec and British Columbia nearly \$4 billion, even though the carbon tax had not been paid.

How does that show discipline or diligence?

● (1745)

**Hon. Arielle Kayabaga:** Mr. Speaker, my colleague knows perfectly well that the carbon tax did not apply in Quebec. For those who paid it, unfortunately, we had to return that money and remove the carbon tax for Canadians, because the issue became polarized thanks to the Conservatives, and they are still doing it today.

They started with the carbon tax. Everything they touch becomes polarized. Now they want to polarize Canada with slogans saying that Canada is broken, when that is not the reality.

I hope my colleague across the aisle will continue to work with us to be more disciplined, especially in the language we use to communicate with Canadians.

**Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from London West for her excellent speech.

Last April, Canadians gave us a strong mandate. I believe this is because they realized that our party was the only one with a real plan to defend our workers, our industries and our economy.

In my colleague's opinion, how is the budget, which will be presented on November 4, an essential step in strengthening our economy and making it the best-performing economy in the G7?

**Hon. Arielle Kayabaga:** Mr. Speaker, I greatly appreciate my colleague's question. I also want to congratulate him on all the work he does for francophones outside Quebec. As a francophone outside Quebec, I greatly appreciate all of his work on that front.

As I mentioned, on November 4, we will have very good news for Canadians. The Minister of Finance and National Revenue will bring down a generational budget, a disciplined budget that aims to help Canadians in several sectors, but especially the energy sector and the sectors affected by the tariffs. It will be a budget unlike any we have seen in a very long time.

I know that my colleague will vote in favour of the budget, but I also hope he will use his parliamentary influence to convince our colleagues and his friends to vote in favour of the budget.

[*English*]

**Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, the member's colleague, the member for Whitby, stood up and said the government would be spending less to invest more and referred to the operating budget.

Could she share with the House and Canadians what the cuts will be to the public service?

**Hon. Arielle Kayabaga:** Mr. Speaker, we believe in our public sector. As we said, this budget is going to spend less and invest more in Canada and invest more in Canadians. That means we have to review everything. We have to review our operations, everything that we do. I trust that the public sector is doing that work right now to review and to make sure we have the ability to invest in Canadians.

I would think the member would support that.

**Michael Ma (Markham—Unionville, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the hon. member for Swift Current—Grasslands—Kindersley.

I am honoured to be representing the people of Markham—Unionville.

If capital can be considered water, then Canada is a leaky bucket. Our foreign direct investment, FDI, is the directional flow of this water. FDI coming in is the total inflow of capital from the world to Canada, and FDI going out is the total outflow of capital to the world from Canada. If we subtract the inflow from the outflow, we get our net FDI, or the level of water in our bucket.

The Canadian bucket has been leaking every year from 2015 to 2024 under the Liberal government. Rounding solely to the nearest billion, these are the quick stats for the net outflow each year, all negative: 2015 was \$30 billion, 2016 was \$44 billion, 2017 was \$69 billion, 2018 was \$26 billion, 2019 was \$36 billion, 2020 was \$24 billion, 2021 was \$56 billion, 2022 was \$50 billion, 2023 was \$63 billion and 2024 was \$40 billion. From 2015 to 2024, this equates to negative \$437 billion.

Do we even have a bucket here, or is this a pipeline of our capital being pumped directly to other countries under a decade of Liberal loss? Let us discuss the cause of these leaks. When the outflow FDI from Canada consistently exceeds the inflow, it means that Canadian capital is finding better opportunities abroad than foreign capital is finding in Canada. This means we need more domestic projects with streamlined regulations to retain our leaky capital.

*Business of Supply*

Our domestic market is small, with only about 40 million people dispersed across a land mass that is second only to Russia in size. This already means that our firms cannot completely rely on domestic consumption. It already means that the only way we compete internationally is through exports. It already means that the only decision in the mind of our firms is whether they can build in Canada and ship to external markets or whether they set up production internationally to sell internationally.

We need incentivizing structures to make it easier to launch massive projects in Canada around energy, infrastructure and manufacturing. These projects would give our economic actors reasons to keep their capital within our borders. However, the Liberals want to make it hard to build in Canada. Our reputation is ruined for investors with multiple failed projects like northern gateway or energy east.

The Liberals want carbon pricing. The Liberals want environmental, social and governance, ESG, reporting requirements on everything. The Liberals want impact assessments over and over again, barriers upon barriers. The Liberals do not want us to build. They do not want us to be industrialized. The Liberals want to drive us back to the Stone Age, where we can frolic in fields, beset by poverty.

We only need to look at current stats to see the road to poverty that is being paved for us by Liberal intentions. Since the Prime Minister was sworn in, in March, 86,000 Canadians have lost their job, Canada has the second-highest unemployment rate in the G7 and food inflation is double the Bank of Canada's target rate.

I came across an interesting definition of the west: western, educated, industrialized, rich and democratic. When we take away our industrialization, we lose what makes us rich and what enables us to be educated. We often find in cities that universities emerge only after the city has undergone an industrial and commercial build-out. There is no true mass democracy without a mass society fostered through the foundation of industrial wealth.

● (1750)

When too much capital leaves Canada because of anti-growth Liberal policies, will Canada still be a western nation? The Conservatives want to stop these capital leaks. The overarching vision is very simple: Retain more of our domestic capital and attract more foreign capital. Another way to look at this is when we have more water than our bucket can contain. Imagine that our bucket is no longer leaking, but that it is very small. This small bucket could not contain the \$437 billion of outflow that exited our bucket over the last 10 years under the Liberal government. Building a bigger, capital-retaining bucket means having cities where we can deposit our capital for an expected return.

As I mentioned before, let us focus on energy, infrastructure and manufacturing. If we cannot create a policy environment where it is easy for major projects to be set up in Canada, these major projects will be set up outside of our borders. Along with these out-going projects will be the jobs that should have existed for Canadians. There is no other way for us to make meaningful moves within the parliamentary cycle.

I have one additional point that relates to manufacturing, and I will relate it through an analogy. All things being equal, do we want to be grape sellers or wine sellers? Speaking broadly, Canada is very used to being a seller of grapes throughout our distinguished history. However, if we want to retain more capital within our borders, we need to do more of the venture-added processing work, which would behoove us to have a stronger domestic production build out. From an industrial policy standpoint, this means selling less of our resources raw, investing in more production capacity for the resources that we have in abundance and ensuring that we have end markets for our value-added products, otherwise this export strategy all falls apart.

Let us recall that, first, if we do not do this ourselves within our borders, it means that our capital will find itself investing in production facilities within the end market destinations. Second, our roughly 40-million person market across a vast land mass is not enough to serve our total pool of capital. Finally, an export-oriented strategy built upon the foundation of energy, infrastructure and manufacturing projects may be one of the few ways to reserve our flows of capital from a federal policy standpoint under the consideration of a parliamentary cycle.

Absent our capacity to retain our capital through policy levers at the federal level, we risk becoming a nation of fields to frolic in, beset by poverty in a post-industrial wasteland that the Rust Belt knows only too well. Perhaps we will then come to rely solely on tourism to our green society, and guess where our tourists will come from? They will come from industrialized societies producing wealthy citizens, uninhibited by carbon pricing, ESG reporting requirements and impact assessments.

Every dollar that leaves the country means lower wages and lost jobs for workers. We Conservatives call on the Liberals to stop driving investment and jobs down and the cost of living up.

● (1755)

**Kristina Tesser Derksen (Milton East—Halton Hills South, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I noted some interesting comments the member made about the government wanting to send Canadians back to the Stone Age and frolic in fields. I am sure the member has heard about our government's revolutionary nation-building projects, which will bring billions of capital and build up innovative industries.

How does the member resolve his outlandish comments with our innovative nation-building project program?

**Michael Ma:** Mr. Speaker, what we saw in the Prime Minister's announcement of projects was that they were all old projects. They were existing projects or ones that are being completed.

*Business of Supply*

What progress have we made since this government came into power? Compared to the last 10 years, we have made no progress.

[*Translation*]

**Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, there is one aspect that has not been discussed much today. In this difficult economic climate, there are some very active groups that are considering ways to develop the economy in the regions. Yesterday in Granby, there was an event that focused on economics. It brought together representatives from the chambers of commerce across the Eastern Townships.

I would have liked to have been at that conference. There were workshops to discuss how to develop the regional economy. I was here in Ottawa, but I commend those who helped organize it. I know that one of their concerns is about temporary foreign workers, who are essential to the regional economy. I am sure that came up in the discussions yesterday.

What does my colleague think about that?

[*English*]

**Michael Ma:** Mr. Speaker, the economics of Canada, as we have seen, is that we have been dragged down by a lot of temporary foreign workers, thereby youth unemployment is up and the available jobs for youth and other citizens have gone down. The unemployment rate is high. We need to protect the Canadians who are here. Their lives depend on our economy and the job market we have in Canada.

• (1800)

**Tako Van Popta (Langley Township—Fraser Heights, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his speech, which highlighted some macroeconomic issues in Canada's economy.

All day today we have been hearing from the Liberals saying our debt-to-GDP ratio is pretty good, but there are two factors they ignore. The first is subnational debt, so that we are really comparing apples to apples with other nations. The second is the economy's ability to service debt. The best measure of that is productivity, which also is lagging substantially behind our trading partners.

I wonder if my colleague could comment on those.

**Michael Ma:** Mr. Speaker, we all know the deficit will drive up costs for all Canadians because, as the hon. member mentioned, we have to finance those debts. They do not come cheap or at zero cost. What that means is that a lot of the tax dollars we receive will have to go to service those debts. That takes away from the available budgets for programs like hospitals, education and, most importantly, developing our economy. That is very critical when we are expecting this new budget coming up to be even worse than that of the last Liberal government. This would be an alarm bell for all Canadians.

[*Translation*]

**Linda Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, does my hon. colleague believe that changing trade relations with the United States and broader changes in the rules-based international trading system pose an economic threat to Canadian businesses and workers?

[*English*]

**Michael Ma:** Mr. Speaker, we always believe that if there are risks, there are also opportunities. It is up to the Prime Minister to negotiate and turn those risks into opportunities for Canadians.

**Jeremy Patzer (Swift Current—Grasslands—Kindersley, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, it is always an honour and a privilege to rise in the House of Commons to speak on behalf of the great people of southwest and west central Saskatchewan. Before I begin, I would like to give a quick happy birthday shout-out to the member for Cariboo—Prince George, a wonderful member of this House. There are lots of family ties between people in southwest Saskatchewan and people in his part of B.C. I know there is a flow of people that way. Happy birthday to him. He is a great member.

Before I get into the substance of my speech, it is really important, whenever we talk about anything that has to deal with the state of the economy in Canada, that we point out the total number of debt in Canada. Right now, Canada's federal debt is \$1,276,208,890,000. Now it is \$891,000, \$892,000, \$893,000. I cannot even read the hundreds and the cents because it is going up way too fast.

The share of federal debt for each and every person in the House and every single Canadian is \$30,457. The growth in Canada's debt per day, without the government introducing any new spending, is \$109,863,013.70. That is every single day without the government doing anything. When the Liberals start pouring more inflationary spending on the fire, imagine how that number will be impacted and how it will change.

Those are the numbers that every single member of this House should be paying more attention to. If they did, they would understand them, particularly those on the government side. On this side, we pay attention to those numbers a lot. The government needs to pay attention to them, because then it would finally start to understand why we talk so much about the negative impact on the economy of the way the Liberals have been steering things.

I want to give people a bit of a history lesson. I am from Saskatchewan, born and raised. I grew up on a farm outside of a small town. The prairie economy back in the day was based on a couple of things. The most common thing was the rail line. When we look at where all the different communities across southwest and west central Saskatchewan are, they are generally in relation to either the current national rail line or the many offshoot rail lines. Some rail lines are no longer in existence and have been removed, but we can see the communities that used to exist along those rail lines. Some of those communities, unfortunately, have vanished or are vanishing because of the state of the economy.

*Business of Supply*

The reason I bring this is up is that there used to be, out in the Prairies in particular, very individual, localized economies. If we look at the jobs numbers, 86,000 jobs were lost in Canada recently under the Prime Minister. These small local economies used to provide a lot of jobs. In just about every single small town along the rail line, farming was obviously the driver of the local economy, but within the local, siloed economy, there were farmers, a blacksmith, sometimes two or three equipment dealers selling farm implements and a couple of different auto dealers selling cars and trucks. They also had schools and hospitals. They had a heavy focus on the local economy, so there were always lots of jobs for folks in these small towns.

If we fast-forward, our rural communities have been decimated. We can look on Google Maps and zoom in and look at the roads. This is true for many members in the House, from Saskatchewan, from Alberta and from all across the country. In my riding in particular, I have well over 100 communities, and several of them are small in size for sure, but they are just as important as any of the larger communities, like the city of Swift Current, and, when we look nationally, some of the large cities, like Toronto, Vancouver and Montreal. These small towns are extremely important. Why is that? For starters, agriculture represents one in eight jobs in the national economy, and we can break that down into the various portions of agriculture. The canola industry, for example, impacts GDP and the Canadian economy more than the auto industry does. That is how big and important the agriculture sector, even just the canola industry, let alone the entire agriculture sector, is to the prairie economy. I want people to know that off the top.

● (1805)

That gets to some of the current Liberal policies that are driving the cost of living crisis and chasing jobs out of Canada. We have things like the industrial carbon tax, the incoming Liberal fuel standard that is a second carbon tax and the emissions cap, and everybody knows about the failed Impact Assessment Act and the tanker ban. These are all largely detrimental policies for rural Canada, but they have a trickle impact into urban Canada because everything that exists in urban Canada originated from rural Canada, first and foremost. Whether it is food, building materials or the energy used to heat and cool homes, it all originated in rural Canada. It is important for people in the House to know and understand that.

I do not think that western Canada, particularly my riding, when we look at the way it was settled, would have developed the way it did if the Liberals of the day had had the same types of laws we see today, with the industrial carbon tax and things like that, which I listed earlier.

I want to share a quick story. Before we came back from summer break, I met with some seniors. He is 90 and she is 80. He is a retired farmer, and she worked in the service industry most of her life. One would never know it by looking at them; they do not look a day over 60. It is quite remarkable. People who work hard live long and prosperous lives. However, they have gotten to a point in their lives where they are not able to find work. No one is going to hire them, but when someone is 90 or 80, they should not be thinking about how they are going to work to put food on the table. They have a fixed income, and they are at a point in their lives where

they have had to take a mortgage out on the house they have, just to be able to afford the basic necessities of life.

When I went and met with them, they had not run their air conditioning all summer, they did not have any lights on in their house and they told me they are not going to turn the furnace on until they absolutely have to. They had not eaten beef or even knew how long it had been since they had been able to go out and buy a roast, some steaks or things like that. They talked to me about how the food that they are eating is perilous, that their diet is going down the drain. It is actually leading to bad health outcomes for them because, again, they are 90 and 80.

She is doing everything she can to make home-cooked meals with the limited resources she has. When we look at the cost of groceries, it has gotten out of hand to the point that they are not even able to afford a roast anymore. She is really struggling to make things go. When I was there, she had loaves of bread set out that she had made because someone had given her the raw products needed to mill her own homemade bread, so that is a staple in their diet. It is homemade, so that is good. In the same breath, when they go out with \$100 to the grocery store, for two people, that should be able to get them through a week and into a second week with no problem, but it does not. It barely gets people through a couple of days. Their budget only goes so far.

At the age they are at, they have medications that they have to buy. They still have a vehicle, but they do not drive it because they cannot afford to put gas in it. They cannot do the things that most people do when they retire with their grandkids. For example, they cannot take them on trips, to the hockey rink or for supper. It is hard for them to be able to do any of those because, quite frankly, they literally cannot afford it.

This is a farmer who has worked hard his entire life. He is a very proud man. This lady worked in the service industry helping people, including seniors, and also worked with adults with disabilities, one of the most noble things a person can do. Now they can hardly even afford to feed themselves.

That is why we have this motion in front of us here today: to get the government to focus on Canadians. We heard the Prime Minister today talk about \$1 trillion being invested, if he gets the right deal, in the United States, and he is saying that it is private money. That is the whole point. Private companies should be investing in Canada, and the Prime Minister's goal should be to get that investment in Canada to fix our economy and create jobs so that the cost of living will not impact people like this family has been impacted.

It is embarrassing and the government needs to reverse course. It should adopt our motion.

• (1810)

[*Translation*]

**Linda Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is my turn to offer my best wishes to one of our colleagues. I am talking about the member for Labrador. I wish him a happy birthday. This is a great place to celebrate a birthday. There are at least two people sharing the same birthday.

I also want to take this opportunity to wish everyone a happy Thanksgiving.

I listened carefully to my colleague's speech. It pains me to see that things are becoming difficult for seniors. The member was talking about a farmer who has always been there. Fortunately, at least they have access to dental care now. That helps them.

Here is my question for my colleague. Does he believe that the evolution of trade relations with the United States and broader changes to the rules-based international trading system pose an economic threat to Canadian businesses and workers?

[*English*]

**Jeremy Patzer:** Mr. Speaker, it absolutely is creating an emergency for Canadian workers, because we lost 86,000 jobs over the last little while.

The Prime Minister, again, was openly bragging about sending \$1 trillion into the United States if he gets the deal he expects. That investment needs to be in Canada. We are not hearing if it has been reciprocating into Canada. We need that investment in Canada, not the U.S.

**Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, we heard the member for Swift Current—Grasslands—Kindersley talk about his constituents. The deputy House leader talked about how they want to protect the Liberal government. When we talk about failed policies, we talk about the failed Liberal policies. The Liberals are not Canada. Does the member agree with that?

**Jeremy Patzer:** Mr. Speaker, yes, he is absolutely right. The Liberals are not the entire representation of Canada. When we bring up these stories, the Liberals need to listen to us and understand the pain people are feeling because of their bad policies, and have the humility to do what is right.

• (1815)

[*Translation*]

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater):** Order. It being 6:15 p.m., it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forth with every question necessary to dispose of the business of supply.

The question is as follows.

[*English*]

Shall I dispense?

**Some hon. members:** No.

[*Chair read text of motion to House*]

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater):** 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 per-

### *Adjournment Proceedings*

son wishes to request a recorded division, I would invite them and indicate it to the Chair.

**David Bexte:** Mr. Speaker, we request a recorded division.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater):** Pursuant to Standing Order 45, the division stands deferred until Monday, October 20, at the expiry of the time provided for Oral Questions.

**Hon. Kevin Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, I suspect that, if you were to canvass the House, you would find unanimous consent to call it 6:30 p.m. so we could get to the late show.

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater):** Is it agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

---

## ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

[*English*]

### INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

**Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):** Mr. Speaker, I want to pursue a question that I first asked on June 17 of this year. Looking at the reality that we have not had a budget yet, but will see soon, we have been told that we are going to see massive increases in military spending.

The point of my question was to ask if we were not aware that geopolitical security does not necessarily come from arming ourselves to the teeth but to prepare to wage peace, to be prepared to hold peace in areas that have been conflict zones and, even more importantly, perhaps long term, to ensure we address the climate crisis and that we are prepared to increase our humanitarian spending in the world.

The reason I raised this, and raise it again tonight, is due to the answer I received, of course. It revealed a lot about the new government's commitment to international development. Had I asked this question before the election, there would have been a minister responsible for international development who could have responded, but in this new cabinet, there is no minister responsible for international development. There is the member of Parliament for Surrey Centre, who is the Secretary of State for International Development. Certainly that is a responsibility, but he does not have the same degree of clout around the cabinet table because he is not seated there.

The reality of our current situation globally is that the world is in what the Prime Minister calls a "hinge moment". It is certainly in crisis. The old order of things that we once thought we could take for granted has certainly been upended by the actions of the U.S. president. He is erratic, unpredictable and withdrawing from multilateralism. He is even withdrawing from the kind of multilateralism of international trade deals respecting the general agreement on tariffs and trade, the GATT from post Second World War. He has withdrawn from numerous global organizations.

*Adjournment Proceedings*

That not only cuts into humanitarian assistance but also reorders the world in ways that can be quite dangerous as, for instance, when the United States withdraws from UN agencies, it opens up space for the People's Republic of China to move in. The People's Republic of China already owns much of Africa. When we look at the global south, we want the influence of democratic nations that hold human rights and free speech dear, recognizing that we cannot allow women and girls around the world to go uneducated and expect to have a stable world.

The United States has withdrawn from the World Health Organization. That clearly means the world is going to see more millions of people at risk of tuberculosis, of malaria and of HIV/AIDS. The U.S. has cancelled its entire USAID program. Where is Canada? Can we step up and fill the gap?

I mentioned that we do not have a minister for international development right now. It was Lester B. Pearson who, after he was prime minister, headed up a UN agency and said that we were going to target 0.7% of our GNI all around the world to international development assistance. That target, known as the Pearson target, has been more than met by quite a number of our European allies who have hit more than 1% of their GNI going to overseas development assistance.

Where is Canada? How close are we to our 0.7% target? We are just about halfway. We are at 0.34%. We are laggards in the world of international development assistance. We rate 15th, but that is a better record than where we rate for donating and helping peacekeeping operations.

• (1820)

**Yasir Naqvi (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade and the Secretary of State (International Development), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is always an honour to rise in the House to debate and discuss some important issues of our time.

I really appreciate the concern raised by the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands, whom I respect tremendously, regarding Canada's commitment to international development assistance. This is an important issue that speaks directly to Canada's role in the global community.

First, let me emphasize that our government recognizes that peace is achieved in a multi-faceted way, through a combination of development, diplomacy and defence. We know that poverty, failed states and fragile governance are root causes of conflict and terrorism.

Canadian development assistance helps address these issues and is an essential component of promoting global security and keeping Canadians safe. It is a key pillar of our foreign policy.

[*Translation*]

At a time when democracy and human rights are under threat around the world and our partners are looking to build prosperous economies by fighting climate change, our government remains committed to international aid.

We continue to promote development, support vulnerable communities and contribute to democratic governance. These commitments are critical to fostering peace and prosperity.

[*English*]

At the same time, we face a complex and evolving global landscape that demands a thoughtful and nuanced approach to strengthening Canada's security. Meeting the NATO defence spending target is not just a commitment; it is a necessity at this time. In an era marked by shifting global dynamics, as the member alluded to herself, and renewed threats to our sovereignty, the challenges we face are urgent.

It is vital to ensure that Canada is prepared to defend our people, our values and our sovereignty and to protect our partners worldwide. This does not negate in any way our commitment to international development assistance and poverty reduction. In fact, this commitment is essential to peace and prosperity both here at home and around the world. International development assistance helps partner countries respond to global threats and strengthen their economies to contribute to a more secure and prosperous world for all.

Official development assistance and our defence spending are not mutually exclusive. Our government remains responsive to global needs and continues to invest in programs that address the root causes of conflict and instability. This includes support for areas like humanitarian assistance, gender equality, good governance, climate action, education, global health and, of course, economic growth.

We also work to ensure the transparency and accountability of international assistance to deliver measurable, optimized results. By prioritizing effectiveness and measurable results, as well as our partners' own priorities, we continue to focus on having a real and lasting impact in the places we work.

Finally, our government is actively pursuing innovative partnerships and mechanisms with other countries, international organizations and the private sector to make the most of our resources. The moment we live in demands that kind of multi-faceted approach, and that is exactly what Canada is pursuing.

• (1825)

**Elizabeth May:** Mr. Speaker, the proof will be in the pudding on November 4. Will the budget include serious increases to our overseas development assistance? It is not going to be enough to say we are holding steady, because we have been laggards for too long. It is not enough to say we will hold steady on what we do on peacekeeping, because we have not done enough for a very long time, even though peacekeeping originated with Lester B. Pearson.

Will the parliamentary secretary please take the message to caucus and to the Prime Minister that in this moment, Canada is needed in the world, as never before, to stand up for democratic values, human rights and the humanitarian assistance and contributions to making a more peaceful world that will be far more able to defend our security than arming ourselves to the teeth would be.

**Yasir Naqvi:** Mr. Speaker, at a time when other countries are stepping back, our government remains committed to international development. We are being deliberate in where and how we invest, focusing on security and economic partnerships that advance mutual interests, deliver benefits for both partners and Canadians and ensure that everyone in this world is prosperous. We understand that poverty, inequality and instability breed violence and that Canada's development assistance is an investment in global stability and in Canadians' own security and prosperity.

As we strengthen our defence capabilities, we remain resolute in our commitment to international assistance. I will take the member's message to caucus as well.

#### EMPLOYMENT

**Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, working families across Canada are struggling. Half of all Canadians are living paycheque to paycheque. The cost of essentials is climbing, and our economy is on the verge of recession. Unemployment is at its highest level in a decade, with young people hit hardest. One in six youth is out of work, with many more underemployed.

At the same time, Donald Trump's trade war continues to hurt Canadian workers and undermine our economic stability. Instead of putting forward real solutions, the Liberal government is planning an austerity budget. The Liberals want to cut services Canadians rely on and the good jobs that go with them, all to meet an arbitrary 15% target that puts neo-liberal ideology over common sense. They want to vastly increase military spending on things like Donald Trump's golden dome and expand fossil fuel infrastructure to the U.S. instead of investing in the productive and sustainable sectors that Canada needs for a prosperous future.

We think that is the wrong approach. New Democrats believe that now is the time for investment, in our communities, in our businesses, in our workforce and in our infrastructure. We believe that Canadians need bold action to strengthen our economy, create good jobs, build affordable homes and improve our public health care system. That means supporting technology and research, getting more value from our raw resources, developing sustainable industries and building infrastructure that improves people's lives, with Canadian labour, Canadian materials and Canadian companies.

Canada has an infrastructure deficit approaching \$300 billion. There is no shortage of excellent projects that we can all agree are much-needed, things like modern and clean electricity grids, efficient public transit systems, community health care clinics and quality long-term care centres. Let us join together and start to construct these nation-building projects.

We are painfully aware that Canada has a severe housing crisis. Rents have more than doubled since 2015. Home ownership is out of the question for far too many Canadians. This crisis stems from decades of policy failure. It is clear that the private market cannot

#### *Adjournment Proceedings*

adequately meet the needs of low- and middle-income earners, yet only 3.5% of Canada's housing stock is non-market, far below the OECD average of 7%.

A secure, affordable home is the foundation of every Canadian's ability to function well in our society. New Democrats believe that the federal government has a critical role to play in ensuring that everyone has a decent place to call home. That is why it must take the lead in dramatically scaling up the construction of non-market housing of all types, including co-op, student, senior and supportive housing. It needs to start now, in the upcoming budget.

Canadians are also acutely aware that our public health care system is under serious strain. Millions of folks do not have a family doctor, wait times are growing and health care workers are burning out. Public health care is more than a service. It is a nation-building project. It is the heart of our national identity because it reflects our shared commitment to care for one another.

This is more than just a moral imperative. It is also an economic one. A healthy economy needs healthy workers. It is time to strengthen and expand our public health care system, not maintain the status quo. That means improving access to care, delivering universal public pharmacare and supporting our Canadian dental care plan.

Will the Liberals deliver a budget that invests in people, or will they choose austerity, service cuts and job losses instead?

• (1830)

[*Translation*]

**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, I thank the hon. member for Vancouver Kingsway for his question and for his continued interest in young Canadians and the challenges they face in finding employment.

[*English*]

I want to assure the hon. member and all colleagues that we share his concern, and I will point to the plan we have and the array of programs we put together to build a skilled workforce for the future.

[*Translation*]

That is why we are working hard with employers, service providers and trade unions to ensure that our young people have the skills and job opportunities they need to enter the labour market.

*Adjournment Proceedings**[English]*

Many Canadians share the priorities that the member opposite raised about investing in communities and infrastructure, about investing in people and in our workforce, and certainly about investing in and protecting public health care.

I want to pick up on this issue of youth employment, and I want to talk a little about some of the programs we have put in place to help build that workforce for the future. As we proceed as a government to investment in major projects, as we proceed to invest in programs like Build Canada Homes, which is going to see an investment in affordable housing on a scale we have not seen since the Second World War, the one shared constant is that we are going to need the people and the talent to help us achieve these goals and to help us build the projects and the homes we need.

It starts with young people. It starts with education and training. It starts with programs like Canada summer jobs, which has a proven track record. Since 2019, it has provided more than half a million young people with summer jobs. Last year an audit of the CSJ program by the Auditor General of Canada found that participants in Canada summer jobs benefit from better long-term earnings than non-participants. Our government added an additional 6,000 summer job opportunities this past summer, and 70,000 jobs are already planned for this year.

However, we go beyond this. We are supporting approximately 160,000 opportunities for youth and students through the youth employment and skills strategy, or YESS, which includes Canada summer jobs, the student work placement program, the supports for student learning program and the Canada service corps. This year the YESS program delivered, in collaboration with 12 departments and agencies, job supports and skills development opportunities to more than 20,000 youth. These interventions work. An estimated 73% of young Canadian emerge from the YESS program employed or returning to school.

Picking up on the member's point about trades workers, right now in Canada over half a million skilled trades workers are on track to retire by 2031. This represents a massive challenge that needs both immediate and long-term solutions. We are going to need tens of thousands of skilled trades workers to build our country, to help solve our housing crisis and to deliver the major projects we are setting out to build. It is why the Government of Canada is investing nearly \$1 billion each year to support skilled trades apprentices.

I have been to those training centres. I have spoken with trades programs. I have spoken with the Canadian Apprenticeship Forum. The return on investment for every dollar we invest in apprenticeships for trades generates \$1.83 back to our economy. These are important programs and services. Along with the Canadian apprenticeship strategy, which offers financial supports for apprentices to encourage their certification in the skilled trades, we can help build the workforce we are going to need for the future.

We are also making post-secondary education more affordable for those who cannot afford it. We are doing so by extending increases to student grants and loans through—

• (1835)

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater):** The hon. member for Vancouver Kingsway.

**Don Davies:** Mr. Speaker, young Canadians do not need summer jobs; they need permanent jobs. The overlapping crises that Canadians currently face are not isolated problems; they are symptoms of an approach that is failing working people.

Now the Liberal government is threatening to make things worse with an austerity budget. That means cuts to the public services people rely on, fewer good jobs and less support for the people who need it most.

New Democrats will not support an austerity budget at a time of growing economic uncertainty, sky-high prices and rising unemployment. We need a federal budget that invests in people by creating good family-sustaining jobs, building millions of non-market affordable homes and strengthening our public health care system.

Will the hon. member and the Liberals work with New Democrats to invest in Canadians, or will they take a page from the Conservative playbook and introduce an austerity budget that deepens economic insecurity?

**Leslie Church:** Mr. Speaker, we are on track to deliver a budget that is going to invest in Canada. It is going to be a generational budget, a transformational budget.

Many of the priorities we are looking at are priorities that we have spoken to the House about already. We are going to build thousands of new homes that Canadians can afford. We are going to build major projects that are going to put tens of thousands of Canadians to work. We are making those generational investments in people.

I would urge the member opposite to join us in supporting the budget when it comes to the House on November 4.

## EMPLOYMENT

**Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC):** Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, we will see the latest job numbers from Statistics Canada. It is important to underline the magnitude of the challenge confronting people of all ages, but particularly young people. The unemployment rate has gone up to 7.1%. It has been continually increasing for years, ever since the end of COVID. Youth unemployment has hit 14.5%, which is already at recession levels. In just the last month, we saw a 12% increase in EI claims among working-age women. In the last Statistics Canada job numbers, if we include self-employed people, we had over 100,000 job losses.

*Adjournment Proceedings*

It is important to look squarely at this data and say that the government's approach is failing badly when it comes to jobs. We are going to hear in this exchange, as we have, the government congratulating itself for various programs. However, we actually need to see changes in policy that change the result. The intentions of politicians do not matter to Canadians; what matters to Canadians is whether they have a job. Jobs for young people are of critical importance. They set people up on a track to build a career for the future. If they miss those critical early milestones because of a bad economy that hurts young people, it will have an impact that lasts throughout their life.

The Liberal Prime Minister promised to change from the approach taken by his Liberal predecessor, but unfortunately, we have seen the continuation of bad policies and a continuation of the trajectory on unemployment. The only thing that has changed is that things have continued to get worse.

Tonight and tomorrow, as we look at the new job numbers, we are going to hear Liberals talk about how they are going to tinker with subsidy programs. We heard it already tonight from the parliamentary secretary. She talked about the Liberal promise of 6,000 new summer job positions. This is in a context where approaching 20% of returning students did not have a job this summer. We have a population of over two million post-secondary students, and 20% were struggling to find a job this summer.

The government said it was going to subsidize 6,000 more eight-week positions. The average tenure for the summer jobs program is eight weeks, which, by the way, makes no sense. Employers are generally looking for summer jobs where they can employ people throughout the summer but what the government does is it shortens the tenure of those jobs for political reasons. It wants to show how many jobs it created. It uses the same amount of money to create jobs of shorter duration, when it would make much more sense to create jobs of longer duration.

Fundamentally, we are not going to solve the problems that are created by bad economic policy, bad immigration policy and misaligned training policy by subsidizing a few thousand more jobs for eight weeks. We are going to solve this problem by unleashing our economy, by fixing our immigration system and by addressing the gaps in training that have become so acutely problematic. We need wholesale policy change to address the Liberal job loss crisis that has been caused by Liberal policies over the last 10 years. The Liberals have broken their promises on change. They continue, after six months, to deliver more of the same. Over 100,000 jobs have been lost in the last month.

When will the Liberals reverse course so that young people can get back to work?

● (1840)

**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, there is no question that it is crucial for all Canadians to have a secure footing in the workforce, especially in this unusual period when our economy is under threat and when many people are feeling anxious about their job prospects. That is why our government is committed to preparing the workforce. We

are ensuring that workers of all ages have access to training, re-training and upskilling.

We need more Canadians working in the skilled trades. That is why we invest nearly \$1 billion annually in apprenticeship supports for the Red Seal program. House construction, automotive service technicians, power line technicians, millwrights, horticulturists and truck and transport mechanics are all key to Canada's road to a prosperous future, so we are actively encouraging young people to consider developing trade careers that will help them and help the country.

Let me say that after travelling across Ontario and hearing from skilled trades organizations this summer, I heard a common message. It was about the imperative of having child care on job sites and to help people go through training. If the member opposite is that concerned about ensuring we have a vibrant workforce, I would urge him to urge his party to support us in the building blocks of a strong economy. One of those building blocks is child care for parents who are working and want to take on some of these jobs in the skilled trades. That comes from people working in the skilled trades and training in the skilled trades and from the employers who employ them.

On June 6, the Minister responsible for Canada-U.S. Trade, Intergovernmental Affairs and One Canadian Economy introduced legislation to unify the Canadian economy. Bill C-5, the One Canadian Economy Act, provided the leadership to strengthen Canada's autonomy, resilience and security through economic integration. Building a stronger, more connected, more competitive Canada will drive business growth and set us on a path to create jobs from coast to coast to coast.

On top of that, the legislation removed federal barriers to labour mobility, which is vitally important for provinces and territories and the licences and certification processes that are right now barriers for labour to move across provinces. We have to work on bringing those barriers to worker mobility down. A worker authorized in one jurisdiction must quickly and easily be able to work in another. That would make it easier for skilled workers to do their jobs across Canada.

As the Prime Minister has said, it is time to "build big, build bold, build now". There is a consensus on this approach. It is time to focus on what we can do in Canada to shore up our economy and create jobs here at home.

**Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Speaker, I happen to agree with some of the things the parliamentary secretary said. The biggest problem is that the Liberals are not doing them. It was our party that proposed significant increases in investments in the skilled trades through union-based training. The government has consistently failed on that over the last 10 years.

*Adjournment Proceedings*

Let me give members some numbers. The youth unemployment rate is 14.5%. We will get new numbers tomorrow on where it has been at for the last month. That is over 400,000 unemployed young people.

We are not going to subsidize our way out of this problem. What we need to do is address wealth-creation problems. What we heard at the human resources committee is that Liberal policies are blocking our energy sector and making investment in Canada so much more difficult. There is red tape, taxes and the failures on immigration policy. These things are holding our economy back. We need to fix the policy failures so we can unleash job growth for our young people.

**Leslie Church:** Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House, we are in the business of getting things done. The member opposite can claim that he supports whatever he wants, but when it comes to implementation, it is the government that has the responsibility of putting forward legislation and making sure that we deliver for Canadians, which is what we are doing.

We are going to build major projects. We have set up the Major Projects Office. We are working with provinces, territories and in-

igenous communities to get shovels in the ground and get things moving. We have created Build Canada Homes. We are going to build tens of thousands of affordable houses across this country. Both of these things are going to create well-paying, career-starting union jobs and jobs for young people.

We are securing our future in a global economy. We are building one Canadian economy by removing interprovincial trade barriers. Through it all, we are adding additional supports for workers and families through what are undeniably volatile times.

We have a plan to build Canada strong. We have a budget coming in November. I invite the member opposite and his party to vote for it.

• (1845)

**The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater):** The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 6:45 p.m.)

---





# CONTENTS

Thursday, October 9, 2025

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### Committees of the House

#### Procedure and House Affairs

Bittle .....	2571
Motion for concurrence .....	2571
Motion deemed adopted .....	2571

#### Citizenship and Immigration

Dzerowicz .....	2571
-----------------	------

#### Public Accounts

Williamson .....	2571
------------------	------

### Petitions

#### Agriculture

Johns .....	2571
-------------	------

#### Indigenous Affairs

Schmale .....	2571
---------------	------

#### Agriculture

Perron .....	2572
--------------	------

### Questions on the Order Paper

Lamoureux .....	2572
-----------------	------

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### Business of Supply

#### Opposition Motion—Cost of Deficits

Lantsman .....	2572
Motion .....	2572
Desrochers .....	2574
Champoux .....	2574
Kelly .....	2574
Kelly .....	2574
Gerretsen .....	2576
Brunelle-Duceppe .....	2576
Epp .....	2576
Johns .....	2576
Lamoureux .....	2577
Ross .....	2578
Champoux .....	2578
Gerretsen .....	2579
Blois .....	2579
Falk (Provencher) .....	2581
Brunelle-Duceppe .....	2581
Gerretsen .....	2582
Brunelle-Duceppe .....	2582
Lamoureux .....	2583
Viersen .....	2584
Larouche .....	2584
Leitão .....	2584
Perron .....	2585

Wagantall .....	2585
Blois .....	2586
Johns .....	2586
Chambers .....	2586
Leitão .....	2587
Brunelle-Duceppe .....	2588
Davies (Niagara South) .....	2588
Johns .....	2588
Kram .....	2588
Lamoureux .....	2589
Viersen .....	2589
Leitão .....	2590
O'Rourke .....	2590
Champoux .....	2591
Viersen .....	2592
Gerretsen .....	2592
Perron .....	2592
Kelly .....	2594
Joseph .....	2594
Champoux .....	2594
Leitão .....	2594
Poilievre .....	2594
Lamoureux .....	2596
Champoux .....	2596
Guglielmin .....	2596
Cobena .....	2597
Blois .....	2598
Brunelle-Duceppe .....	2598
Roberts .....	2598
Noormohamed .....	2598
Wagantall .....	2600
Champoux .....	2600
Blois .....	2601
Desrochers .....	2601
Genuis .....	2602
Champoux .....	2603
Deschênes-Thériault .....	2603
McCauley .....	2603
Blois .....	2605
Champoux .....	2605
Gill (Windsor West) .....	2605
Lobb .....	2605

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

### Leader in Veterinary Medicine

Dhaliwal .....	2607
----------------	------

### Calgary Canucks

McKenzie .....	2607
----------------	------

### Human Rights in Iran

Sgro .....	2607
------------	------

<b>Digital Health Care</b>	
Jeneroux .....	2607
<b>International Day of the Girl Child</b>	
Ntumba .....	2607
<b>Nigel Wright</b>	
Williamson .....	2608
<b>Autonomous Shuttle in Kanata</b>	
Sudds .....	2608
<b>Public Safety</b>	
Davies (Niagara South) .....	2608
<b>World Egg Day</b>	
Perron .....	2608
<b>Outstanding Athlete in Port Moody—Coquitlam</b>	
Royer .....	2608
<b>World Mental Health Day</b>	
Doherty .....	2609
<b>Canadian Egg Farmers</b>	
Klassen .....	2609
<b>Liberal Party of Canada</b>	
Tolmie .....	2609
<b>Global Dignity</b>	
Mingarelli .....	2609
<b>Toronto Blue Jays</b>	
Brassard .....	2610
<b>Tribute to a Father</b>	
Villeneuve .....	2610

## ORAL QUESTIONS

<b>International Trade</b>	
Poilievre .....	2610
Carney .....	2610
Poilievre .....	2610
Carney .....	2610
Poilievre .....	2610
Carney .....	2611
Poilievre .....	2611
Carney .....	2611
Poilievre .....	2611
Carney .....	2611
<b>Natural Resources</b>	
Poilievre .....	2611
Carney .....	2611
<b>International Trade</b>	
Blanchet .....	2611
Carney .....	2611
Blanchet .....	2611
Carney .....	2612
Blanchet .....	2612
Carney .....	2612

<b>Employment</b>	
Barrett .....	2612
Anand .....	2612
Barrett .....	2612
Anand .....	2612
Thomas .....	2612
MacKinnon .....	2612
Thomas .....	2612
MacKinnon .....	2613
Patzer .....	2613
Leitão .....	2613
<b>The Economy</b>	
Paul-Hus .....	2613
Leitão .....	2613
Paul-Hus .....	2613
Leitão .....	2613
<b>Justice</b>	
Fortin .....	2613
Fraser .....	2613
Fortin .....	2613
Guilbeault .....	2614
<b>Forestry Industry</b>	
Ross .....	2614
Hogan .....	2614
Ross .....	2614
Hogan .....	2614
Malette (Kapuskasing—Timmins—Mushkegowuk) .....	2614
Hajdu .....	2614
Bélanger (Sudbury East—Manitoulin—Nickel Belt) .....	2614
Hajdu .....	2615
Albas .....	2615
Hogan .....	2615
<b>Foreign Affairs</b>	
Sodhi .....	2615
Anand .....	2615
<b>Automotive Industry</b>	
Kirkland .....	2615
Naqvi .....	2615
Kirkland .....	2615
Naqvi .....	2616
Baldinelli .....	2616
Anand .....	2616
Baldinelli .....	2616
Anand .....	2616
Lewis (Essex) .....	2616
Hajdu .....	2616
Gill (Windsor West) .....	2616
MacKinnon .....	2617
Davidson .....	2617
MacKinnon .....	2617
<b>Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship</b>	
Rempel Garner .....	2617
Diab .....	2617
Rempel Garner .....	2617



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>