



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

House of Commons Debates

Official Report
(Hansard)

Volume 152 No. 041
Wednesday, October 22, 2025

Speaker: The Honourable Francis Scarpaleggia



CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, October 22, 2025

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayer

• (1400)

[*English*]

The Speaker: It being Wednesday, we will now have the singing of the national anthem, led by the hon. member for Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola.

[*Members sang the national anthem*]

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

FORESTRY WORKERS

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, forestry is a cornerstone of Canada's economy, supporting more than 200,000 good jobs and sustaining hundreds of rural, northern and indigenous communities from coast to coast, yet once again forestry workers are being left behind by the government's failure to secure a fair softwood lumber agreement. In August, the Prime Minister promised \$1.2 billion in support, to respond to Trump's tariffs and duties, which the sector is still waiting for, and just \$50 million is earmarked for workers. That is not a serious plan; it is a token gesture.

Almost 50,000 jobs in British Columbia alone are at risk, and entire communities could lose their livelihoods. Forestry families deserve more than press releases and photo-ops; they deserve real and urgent action. The government must stand with Canada's forestry workers, with urgent investments that protect jobs, strengthen communities and build a sustainable future.

* * *

[*Translation*]

MAUDE ROYAL

Abdelhaq Sari (Bourassa, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, October is Women's History Month, and I want to pay tribute to Maude Royal, a caring woman of action who has had a profound impact on the riding of Bourassa.

For 15 years, she enthusiastically managed the St-Hubert restaurant on Pie-IX Boulevard, making it into an inclusive gathering

place. In 2018, at the peak of the construction work on Pie-IX Boulevard, she played a key role in setting up the Association des commerçants de Charlevoix et Pie-IX, an initiative that led to the founding of a business development corporation in Montreal North. For the past seven years, she has also been serving on the board of directors for the Caisse Desjardins de Sault-au-Récollet-Montréal-Nord, and she is actively involved in governance and ethics.

Her commitment, vision and love for her community make her an inspiration to us all.

This Women's History Month, I thank Maude Royal for her leadership and dedication to the riding of Bourassa. I want to give a royal thank you to Maude Royal.

* * *

[*English*]

FINANCE

Brad Redekopp (Saskatoon West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, with Halloween almost here, Canadians are not scared of ghosts; they are scared of the Liberal budget on November 4.

After 10 years, families live in a haunted house of debt and a nightmare on main street: monster deficits, prices that jump-scare at the till and vampire taxes draining paycheques. Under the Liberals, too many cupboards are bare, and there are empty bank accounts, empty fridges and empty stomachs. Canadians do not need another pumpkin spice speech or a Frankenbudget stitched together with buzzwords; they need Conservative tax cut treats, not Liberal spending tricks.

Conservatives are calling for something simple: Make life affordable, end the hidden taxes that spook the grocery bill and stop the inflation tax by cutting waste and living within our means. Canadians have had enough of our carnival huckster Prime Minister's using scare tactics. On November 4, we had better see a real budget, not s'mores of his candy-coated, stomach-churning fudge-it.

It is time for the Liberals to put Canadians first, or will the budget be another nightmare on Wellington Street?

Statements by Members

● (1405)

TORONTO INTERNATIONAL CELEBRATION CHURCH

Salma Zahid (Scarborough Centre—Don Valley East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honour the Toronto International Celebration Church for its remarkable 25th anniversary celebration service. Founded in 2000 by Pastor Peter Youngren, alongside current lead pastor, Nathan Thurber, it has grown into a beacon of faith, love and community in North York.

As a non-denominational, evangelical church, it embodies the motto “We love because God first loved us”, welcoming over 1,000 worshippers from more than 70 nations each Sunday. This milestone reflects a quarter-century of transformative impact: prayer services, outreach to shelters, youth programs, evangelism training and specialized ministries like the Champions Club for special-needs families. Its global vision through World Impact Ministries has touched over 100 nations, fostering cultural harmony and purpose-driven lives right here in Toronto.

I offer congratulations on its 25th anniversary and on its devotion. May—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford has the floor.

* * *

SMALL BUSINESS

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is Small Business Week, and I want to take a moment to recognize the incredible role small businesses play in our communities and across the country. These entrepreneurs are the driving force behind innovation, job creation and local economic growth.

Small business owners are feeling the pressure, though, from rising costs, excessive red tape, unfair taxes, crime and ongoing economic uncertainty. Unfortunately, their struggles have been ignored by the Liberal government.

In recent years, Conservatives have pushed for overdue carbon rebates and have pushed against tax increases on payroll, capital gains and excise taxes. We are also leading the charge on criminal justice reform so people can operate a business safely. We will keep doing everything we can to help small businesses grow, through red tape reduction and tax cuts.

I encourage everyone this week to support a local small business. Know, on this side of the House, that we recognize the sacrifices entrepreneurs make and the taxes they pay to keep Canada going.

* * *

[*Translation*]**ROSALEEN DICKSON**

Sophie Chatel (Pontiac—Kitigan Zibi, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this Women's History Month, I would like to recognize the outstanding contribution of Rosaleen Dickson, a trailblazer in Pontiac—Kitigan Zibi.

[*English*]

In 1942, together with her husband, David, she acquired *The Equity*, the community newspaper of Shawville, which has long

served as the voice of our community. Rosaleen went on to serve as its editor-in-chief for more than 30 years. A passionate, dedicated journalist, Rosaleen gave a voice to those who had none but whose stories deserved to be told.

[*Translation*]

Rosaleen Dickson embodies the strength, independence and passion that characterize the women who built our country, just like the women of Pontiac who continue to inspire us with their strength and leadership.

[*English*]

I thank Rosaleen.

* * *

LATIN AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

Sandra Cobena (Newmarket—Aurora, CPC): Mr. Speaker, October is Latin American Heritage Month, a time to celebrate the contributions of over one million Canadians of Hispanic and Latino heritage.

When we think of Latin America, we think of flavour and music: food like tacos or a soup that warms the soul on a cold Canadian winter, or music that makes us dance before we even realize it. At Fiesta in the 6ix, hundreds gathered to celebrate those values, a reminder that our stories, though diverse, are bound by hope and love for this country that gave us a home and a future.

Gabriel Garcia Marquez once wrote that people do not stop pursuing dreams because they grow old but that they grow old because they stop pursuing dreams. The journey might not be easy, but it is worth it. Keep dreaming. Keep building. Keep contributing in every field to this beautiful country we now call home.

Que viva Latinoamérica y que viva Canada.

* * *

● (1410)

RICHMOND EAST—STEVESTON

Parm Bains (Richmond East—Steveston, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my hometown of Richmond, British Columbia, known for having the longest life expectancy in Canada, was recently recognized as Canada's most active city, winning the ParticipACTION Community Challenge, presented by Novo Nordisk.

ParticipACTION is a national charity that has been dedicated to promoting physical activity in Canada since 1971. The most active city award came with \$100,000 to support physical activity and sport in our community. Since the community challenge began in 2019, ParticipACTION has awarded \$1.5 million to communities across Canada.

I want to congratulate my community for its commitment to physical activity, and all communities that participated in the challenge. A healthier Canada is possible if we make room to move.

* * *

HOLLAND MARSH

Scot Davidson (New Tecumseth—Gwillimbury, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is unbelievable: This year marks 100 years since the Holland Marsh was established.

A century ago, Professor W.H. Day and a group of hard-working farmers looked over a vast swamp and saw possibility. With vision and grit, they transformed the black muck into one of the most fertile farming regions in Canada. For 100 years, that vision has fed communities, nourished generations and sustained livelihoods. Today, farmers steward more than 7,000 acres and grow over 60 crops, including four pounds of carrots for every Canadian. If we look across the marsh now, we see why it has earned the title of the soup and salad bowl of Canada. It is not just canals and fields but opportunity.

It is an honour to represent the Holland Marsh growers in Parliament and to have helped make Bill C-280 law.

Here is to the Holland Marsh's proud past and to the farmers who will carry its legacy forward.

* * *

[*Translation*]

UNIVERSITÉ DU QUÉBEC NETWORK

Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the administrators at the Université du Québec network and its president, our friend Alexandre Cloutier.

They inherited one of the most precious jewels bequeathed by the great builders of the Quiet Revolution, foremost among them the late great Guy Rocher: an institution of higher learning and research that literally elevated Quebecers, in French, to the status of one of the most educated and well-trained peoples in just half a century. The Université du Québec network, with its French-speaking students from all over and its outstanding medical program for the regions of Quebec, has quite simply become the most important academic institution in Quebec, but also in Canada.

Its facilities include the Université du Québec à Montréal, or UQAM, which is its flagship institution in a way. I would like to pay special tribute to its president, Stéphane Pallage, who very recently was awarded an honorary doctorate from the University of Warsaw's school of management. Through its strong partnership with UQAM, for the past 30 years the university has been offering a program that is on par with UQAM's program, proving that a university education in Montreal can shine around the world.

Statements by Members

The most recent person to have been awarded this honour was Volodymyr Zelenskyy. I want to congratulate Stéphane—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Burlington.

* * *

[*English*]

ELECT RESPECT CAMPAIGN

Hon. Karina Gould (Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Burlington's mayor, Mayor Marianne Meed Ward, and the Halton elected representatives group, which I am honoured to be part of, for launching the Elect Respect campaign.

This initiative began as a conversation among women elected at all levels of government in Burlington, in which we recognized a shared reality of harassment and threats. From those conversations came a commitment to create a safer, more respectful culture in public life. Elect Respect calls on both elected officials and citizens to pledge respectful and inclusive participation in our democracy. It reminds us that debate should be about ideas, not personal attacks, and that integrity and respect must guide our discourse.

Sadly, harassment of elected officials has been on the rise. In 2023, the RCMP reported more than 2,600 threats, which is double what was reported the year before. Campaigns like Elect Respect matter because they call on all of us to set a better tone for our colleagues, for our constituents and for the next generation of leaders.

I encourage all members of the House to join me in taking—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Peace River—Westlock.

* * *

CANADIAN ENERGY SECTOR

Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister promised to make Canada an energy superpower and get projects built at lightning speed. Six months later, not a single project permit has been granted. There are no pipelines, no mines, no energy corridors, just broken promise after broken promise.

Now the Prime Minister is pushing forward with an emissions cap that will wipe out \$20 billion in GDP, drive investment away from Canada and cost over 40,000 jobs right here at home. These are more broken promises. The Prime Minister seems to think that supporting oil and gas starts and ends with cheering for the Edmonton Oilers. Albertans do not need a Prime Minister to come up with a national wish list. We need him to get out of the way.

Statements by Members

A Conservative government would scrap the emissions cap, end Bill C-48 and Bill C-69, and scrap the industrial carbon tax. Instead of broken promises, we would restore the promise of a Canada in which hard work can buy an affordable home in a safe neighbourhood and put food on the table for every Canadian.

* * *

• (1415)

INNOVATION IN NEWBORN CARE

Hon. Nathaniel Erskine-Smith (Beaches—East York, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Joeyband is an incredible story of Canadian innovation and entrepreneurship. Hayley Mullins, Ashley Wade and Sarah Cox are co-founders of the company whose medical device Hayley invented and globally patented in 2013.

Joeyband is a data-backed device used by hospitals around the world to safely support skin-to-skin contact and bonding for thousands of newborns. Hospitals that use it have reported higher breastfeeding rates, reduced NICU admissions, reduced opioid use and healthier outcomes for mothers and babies. This ingenuity received an honourable mention in Time Best Inventions of 2025, a timely recognition as this is the WHO's year of maternal and newborn health, a call for nations to invest in early-life innovation. Joeyband is also part of the Femtech Canada network of 200 companies dedicated to advancing women's health technology.

When only 17% of international patent holders are women, Joeyband's success shows us what happens when we support Canadian femtech and women's entrepreneurship. We drive progress in health, equity and innovation.

* * *

CANADA REVENUE AGENCY

Kelly Block (Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in a scathing report from the Auditor General, it was revealed yesterday that complaints against the CRA's contact centres have risen 145% in the last three years. Their phone system is nearly four times over-budget, costing taxpayers more than \$190 million, but few get through and the ones who do receive the wrong information 83% of the time.

To add insult to injury, the Liberal government failed to properly review contracts worth tens of millions of dollars before issuing payments: "there was no process documented or followed to ensure the amounts invoiced...were accurate". Does that sound familiar? The Auditor General found the same issue during the Liberal arrive scam, in which federal policies were "frequent[ly] disregard[ed]."

Canadians are stuck with more of the same Liberal incompetence. Conservatives will continue to hold the government to account on its repeated failures to ensure Canadians receive value for their money.

* * *

PUBLIC SAFETY

Sukh Dhaliwal (Surrey Newton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians want safe neighbourhoods in which families and businesses can thrive.

Last week, I was proud to join my B.C. colleagues in Surrey for an echo announcement highlighting our government's new steps to combat crime. These measures include tougher bail conditions for repeat violent offenders, stronger penalties for organized retail theft and the addition of 1,000 new RCMP personnel across the country. This investment will help ensure that fast-growing communities like Surrey have the resources needed to keep pace with growth and protect public safety.

Our government is listening to Canadians, supporting law enforcement and taking real action to keep our streets and communities safe.

* * *

LOAVES AND FISHES COMMUNITY FOOD BANK

Tamara Kronis (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Loaves and Fishes Community Food Bank, based in Nanaimo, feeds more than 15,000 families up and down the island who cannot afford to keep up with rising grocery prices. They have done everything right, but they are still waiting for the \$5 million in federal funding they were promised by the Liberal government.

The Prime Minister said he would be judged by the prices Canadians pay at the grocery store, and Canadians are paying the price. Food inflation is double what it should be and beyond what we can afford. Liberal deficits are driving inflation every step of the way. Hidden Liberal taxes on fuel, packaging and production are baked into every grocery bill. Canadians do not see them on their receipts, but they feel them every time they buy food.

I will be watching this next federal budget closely, and I will be following up with the government to make sure Loaves and Fishes gets every penny.

* * *

AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN LONDON WEST

Hon. Arielle Kayabaga (London West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on October 15, I had the pleasure of joining local partners to announce 42 affordable housing units. Forty-two Londoners will now have a place to call home.

I want to thank the City of London and Indwell for their leadership and continued investment in the well-being of our communities.

Build Canada Homes is a national strategy that will get housing built faster, smarter and more affordably. It will cut red tape, unlock public land and preserve existing affordable rentals in the country. It brings every level of government together with mayors, builders and non-profits to deliver homes that Canadians can actually afford, in every region across this country. This is what leadership looks like.

While Conservatives continue to talk Canada down, our government is getting things built. Canadians can trust that we will get the job done.

ORAL QUESTIONS

• (1420)

[*Translation*]

FINANCE

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today, the Prime Minister and I will meet to discuss the tenth Liberal budget. Conservatives want an affordable budget so that Canadians can have an affordable life.

The Prime Minister has broken his promise to spend less. He has doubled the deficit he inherited from his government, and inflation is now on the rise. In fact, all measures are higher than the Bank of Canada's target.

Will the Prime Minister accept our demands for an affordable budget and an affordable life for Canadians?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this budget will be affordable and bold. It will be affordable in terms of operating expenses. We are going to streamline operating expenses.

However, we will be investing in Canada. It will be the largest investment in our country's history.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what this Liberal government promised 10 years ago. The result was that they doubled the debt, doubled the lineups at food banks and doubled the cost of housing. Investments in Canada have dropped more than investments in any other G7 country, and more than at any other time in our nation's history.

Today, two million Canadians are using food banks, and food inflation is skyrocketing.

Will the Prime Minister learn from his mistakes, lower the deficits and get rid of hidden taxes on food?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned earlier, this budget will get our country's operational spending under control for the first time in 10 years.

Not only that, but for the 21st consecutive month, Canada's inflation rate is within the 1% to 3% target set by the Bank of Canada. The current rate is 2.4%.

[*English*]

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today, the Prime Minister and I will meet to discuss the

Oral Questions

10th Liberal budget deficit. Our priority as Conservatives is an affordable budget for an affordable cost of living for the Canadian people. The Prime Minister promised he would spend less, but his deficit spending is 100% more. He promised he would be judged by the prices at the grocery store; they are now rising at two times the Bank of Canada's target, and inflation is now, once again, out of control.

Will the Prime Minister learn from the inflationary and costly failures of 10 years of Liberal government and accept our plan for an affordable budget for an affordable life?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this budget will get operational spending under control; it will balance our spending over the next three years, but we are not going to stop there. We are going to invest in this country. We are going to have the biggest investment in this country in generations, the largest capital spend in generations and the most ambitious trade diversification in our nation's history. We will do everything to help Canadians get ahead, as they have gotten ahead every single month since I became Prime Minister.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians, according to the Prime Minister, have never had it so good. If someone is a single mother out there walking down the grocery aisle, looking at prices rise before her eyes; if they are a senior choosing between eating and heating; if they are one of the countless Canadians who see that roasted coffee is up 41% since the Prime Minister took office, that nuts and seeds are up 15% and that food price inflation is now double the target; or if they are one of those two million people who are lined up at food banks every single month, the Prime Minister says they have never had it so good.

How is it possible for the Prime Minister to be so costly and so out of touch with reality?

• (1425)

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is time, once again, for our economics lesson. Getting ahead means people's wages grow faster than inflation. Let us look at the relationship between inflation and deficits. The food inflation rate in Canada is the G7 average, and we have the lowest deficit in the G7. What the government is going to do is use that deficit to grow this economy as has never been seen before.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is saying to that single mother, that small business owner and that senior I just referenced that he needs to give them economic lessons. You are the one out there who is watching prices rise right before—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: The hon. member knows to speak through the Chair, and there was a lot of noise, so the hon. member can start from the top.

Oral Questions

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is now lecturing Canadians who are lined up at food banks, telling them that they have never had it so good and that, if only they appreciated the many promises he has made, promises he has not even begun to keep, they would then be appreciative of the fact that fresh and frozen beef are up 14%, fresh and frozen cut chucks are up 12%, frozen meat is up 11% and coffee beans are up 40%.

Does the Prime Minister believe that people paying these exorbitant prices should be thankful for his economic lessons?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we promised to cut taxes for every Canadian, and 22 million Canadians have had their taxes cut. We promised to cut taxes for first-time homebuyers, and they have been cut. We promised to cut the carbon tax, and it has been cut. You were not here. It has been cut.

We promised to build this country strong. On November 4, the House will have a choice. Are you with us for those single mothers? Are you with us for those farmers? Are you with us to build this country strong so they can benefit?

The Speaker: Again, I will remind hon. members that we speak through the Chair.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I think the Prime Minister meant to say, “Are you with us for the bankers and bondholders, who have been collecting record interest payments on the newly doubled national debt?”

The Prime Minister has literally doubled the deficits that he inherited from the Liberal government, deficits that were already exorbitant and out of control, and inflation immediately started to rise. Two of the four measures are outside of the acceptable Bank of Canada range. All four measures are above the Bank of Canada’s 2% target.

The more the Prime Minister spends, the more things cost. Does he acknowledge at least that every dollar he spends comes out of the pockets of hard-working Canadians?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are putting more dollars in the pockets of hard-working Canadians because we cut taxes for 22 million Canadians. Our focus is on putting even more dollars in the pockets of hard-working Canadians. That is why we will have the most ambitious capital investment program this country has ever seen, the most ambitious homebuilding program this country has ever seen, the biggest investment in defence and in our industrial capacity this country has ever seen, and the biggest and most effective climate competitiveness strategy this country has ever seen.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

Yves-François Blanchet (Beloil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Paccar, a truck manufacturer in Sainte-Thérèse-De Blainville, just laid off 300 more workers after the White House imposed a 25% tariff. This comes six months after the election that brought in this Prime Minister, who was supposed to settle the tariffs and trade negotiations with a snap of his fingers.

Can the Prime Minister assure the workers and the company that jobs and the business will be protected, no matter what it takes?

• (1430)

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are very disappointed by the situation at Paccar, Stellantis and GM in the automotive sector.

We already have the best agreement with the United States. We have the lowest tariffs on cars and trucks. Nevertheless, we continue to work and negotiate with the Americans. We will be there to support the workers at Paccar, as the Minister responsible for Canada-U.S. Trade mentioned.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Yves-François Blanchet (Beloil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, if that is the best agreement, I would not want to see the worst. It raises a lot of concerns. People need a bit of certainty.

Can the Prime Minister assure us, beyond any doubt, particularly after he scrapped the 3% tax on web giants, that the cultural exemption will be protected in the tariff negotiations? Can he assure us that supply management will be fully protected, including processing, and that the percentages will be respected, without any compromise?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can assure the House that we will protect supply management in the negotiations. We will always protect Quebec culture and Canadian culture in the negotiations, period.

* * *

FORESTRY INDUSTRY

Yves-François Blanchet (Beloil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the word “fully” should be added in there as well.

I want to talk about the forestry industry. We are no longer talking about protecting it; we are literally talking about rescuing it. The crisis hitting our forests and the forestry industries is worse than in 2008. Closures and layoffs are on the rise. Hundreds of jobs have just been lost in Saint-Michel-des-Saints.

Can the Prime Minister guarantee that, in the face of the combined duty and tariff rate of 45%, there will be an immediate and comprehensive economic rescue plan for Quebec’s forestry regions?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is a plan and there are initiatives.

The Minister of Industry has just announced an initiative that will provide funding for the forestry sector in Quebec and Canada. It is a funding project from the Business Development Bank of Canada.

There is also the strategic renewal fund for the forestry sector. It is a thorough and comprehensive plan.

* * *

[English]

CARBON PRICING

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has tried to deny the existence of continued hidden Liberal taxes on groceries, but Canada's leading food price expert, the food professor, Sylvain Charlebois, has said the exact opposite. He said, of the industrial carbon tax, that the worst part is that it is still there. He was referring to the fact that farmers pay the tax on the steel that goes into their farm equipment, such as combines, tractors and bins, and fertilizer.

Is the Prime Minister really going to expect Canadians who cannot pay their grocery bills to believe that the cost of the carbon tax on our farmers does not get passed on at the grocery shelf?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am going to quote independent research of the Canadian Climate Institute, which finds that the net impact of the industrial carbon tax on food prices is, on average, "around zero per cent".

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister expects us to believe government-funded, so-called experts paid to push his agenda instead of believing in the obvious fact that, when we tax the things that go into making food, we tax all who buy food.

This is a Prime Minister who says he is a great expert, but he told CTV Nova Scotia that Canadians do not use steel anymore. Does he not know that there is steel in farm tractors, farm combines, farm bins and other farm equipment? Does he not think, for God's sake, that those costs get passed on to consumers?

• (1435)

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the folks are feisty over there today.

However, we have been hearing all week, all month, since the beginning of this session, about these imaginary taxes. These are imaginary taxes in the brain of the Leader of the Opposition that no one else seems to manage. I will tell him that there will be a budget. There will be some numbers and some tables that he can read, where he will not find taxes on food.

There is no tax on food. There will never be a tax on food.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, first, we are all disappointed to learn that Liberals think that Canadians who see grocery prices rising at record rates are just imagining things. I am further disappointed to see that the Prime Minister cannot stand in his place and address real questions about the cost of groceries for Canadians.

Oral Questions

It is not just the industrial carbon tax. It is also the government's fuel standard, which, according to its own department, is going to increase the cost of fuel by 17¢ on the farmers and truckers who bring us our food. Does he really expect consumers to believe that will not cost them as well?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what is not imaginary is that Canadians know who they can trust. In fact, time and again, they have seen these Conservatives across the aisle vote against their very interests, whether it is things like the school nutrition program or the early learning and child care. By the way, the average cost of child care is down to \$16 a day.

These are real savings for real Canadian families. The only thing that is imaginary is their own perception.

* * *

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is really disappointing the Prime Minister refuses to stand up to debate the real cost of his taxes on Canadian food consumers. It is the same thing with the auto sector. He promised that he would negotiate a win. He promised to get a rapid deal. There is still no win and still no deal. Elbows have gone missing, and so are the jobs.

[Translation]

Today, 300 workers lost their jobs at Paccar in Quebec.

[English]

Last week, we saw that it was in Ingersoll at the CAMI plant, and before that the GM plant in Oshawa. Is the Prime Minister selling out the auto sector in his attempt to back down to the U.S. President?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is no "I" in team, but apparently there is an "I" in Conservative. There is no team in the Conservatives. There is a team on these benches.

The government is in a position with the best accord with the Americans. We have the lowest tariffs on the auto sector—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: The right hon. Prime Minister, from the top.

Right Hon. Mark Carney: Mr. Speaker, there is no "I" in team, but there is an "I" in Conservative.

Oral Questions

There is a team in the Liberals that can answer these questions. This is what the Liberal team has accomplished: We have the best deal with the Americans of any country. We have the lowest tariff on our automobiles and trucks of any country, but we are not satisfied. That is why we are negotiating a new accord on steel, on aluminum, on energy, and on auto.

• (1440)

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the question was about jobs and the Prime Minister responded with a spelling bee. This is the guy who is supposed to negotiate a win for us, a guy who said he would have a deal by July 21. He is the guy who said he has had his elbows up. Since that time, his elbows have gone missing. The Canadian people need those jobs. He promised he would protect those jobs.

Will he stand up today, look the auto workers of Ontario and Quebec in the eye, and tell them why he abandoned them and sold them out?

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (President of the King's Privy Council for Canada and Minister responsible for Canada-U.S. Trade, Intergovernmental Affairs, Internal Trade, and One Canadian Economy, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government has no difficulty looking at the hard-working women and men who work in our auto industry and in industries across the country to say that we are fighting for their jobs, we are standing up to the Americans against unjustified tariffs and we are negotiating what we think will be agreements that will be in the best interests of Canadian workers and the Canadian economy. What we are also doing at the same time is taking steps to support those very industries in Canada.

That is what we were elected to do. That is what the Prime Minister is doing with everybody on this side of the House.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that was not what the Prime Minister promised. He promised that he would negotiate a win. He promised that he would have a deal by July 21. Neither of those things happened. He went to the auto sector and told the workers that not only would he protect their jobs, but also there would be an all-in-Canada supply chain that is being dismantled right before our eyes. It is not just his trade negotiating failures. His EV mandate has slammed the brakes on any investment in auto manufacturing in this country.

Will the Prime Minister take personal responsibility for this and announce today an end to the EV mandate, so we can get our workers back to jobs?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the auto workers, they know that we have their backs and that we will fight for every single job in this country in the auto sector. Do colleagues know why? It is because Canadian auto makers and Canadian auto workers are the best in the world. Therefore, we will make sure that Stellantis is held to account.

We are meeting with GM tomorrow in Ottawa about bringing back a model to the plant in Ingersoll. We will be there also for the employees at Paccar in Sainte-Thérèse.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's failures and capitulations are not just vis-à-vis the United States. He promised he would stand up for western Canadian farmers, but canola tariffs have now more than doubled. The Prime Minister, in response to this, has given the Communist regime in China a \$1-billion taxpayer-funded loan so that we can buy Chinese-made ships, and now he has announced that he has further conceded by removing tariffs on Chinese-made steel.

Why is it that in addition to selling out auto workers, he has sold out our farmers and rewarded foreign dictatorships that target them with tariffs?

Hon. Heath MacDonald (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our new government was elected to expand and diversify our international trade with reliable partners. We are in a volatile global economy. We are defending our trade interests, we are expanding into new markets and we are working alongside our farmers in every aspect.

* * *

[Translation]

CANADA REVENUE AGENCY

Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, service at the Canada Revenue Agency is worse than ever. Yesterday, the Auditor General confirmed that, eight years after a damning report by her office, the agency's services to the public have gone further downhill. The situation has not improved. Only 5% of citizens managed to get through to an agent within the 15 minutes specified by the service standards. The Liberals cannot claim ignorance. The Auditor General warned them about this situation back in 2017. They simply failed to resolve it.

After letting things slide for eight years, when are the Liberals going to step up and do something? People are tired of waiting.

• (1445)

Carlos Leitão (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are taking action. The Minister of Finance and National Revenue has already ordered the Canada Revenue Agency to review its procedures, and we are going to give the agency the financial resources it needs to hire staff and get the equipment needed to address these very important issues.

Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the situation is not improving at the Canada Revenue Agency, or CRA. Yesterday, the Auditor General confirmed what we already knew, that the CRA is not even answering the phone anymore. Worse still, the Auditor General revealed that when people do manage to get through to the agency, they are only being given correct information 17% of the time. In concrete terms, this means that we are just as likely to get an accurate answer from the CRA as we are to get an answer in French from the Prime Minister.

When will the minister fix this fiasco?

Carlos Leitão (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we did not wait for the Auditor General's report to take action. We have already given the Canada Revenue Agency rather clear instructions about changing its processes and hiring more people.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Carlos Leitão: Mr. Speaker, this is quite the spectacle. People are talking over everybody else. It sounds like a kindergarten class.

We are taking action. We are improving services at the Canada Revenue Agency.

* * *

FINANCE

Gabriel Hardy (Montmorency—Charlevoix, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in Quebec, rents have jumped by nearly 10%, double the Canadian average. We know that families spend nearly half of their income on housing and food. It is a worrisome trend. Meanwhile, the Liberal government continues to fuel its inflationary deficits, which are driving up the cost of everything from groceries to gas and housing. After 10 years of deficits and broken promises, families in Montmorency—Charlevoix and across Quebec have had enough.

Will the Prime Minister finally regain control of our finances and make life affordable for Canadians?

Carlos Leitão (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to share the following information with the House.

First, inflation in Canada is under control. It is at 2.4% and the Bank of Canada target is between 1% and 3%. We have been meeting the inflation-control target for 21 months.

Second, there is no link between the government's deficits and inflation. Inflation is a global phenomenon. Do COVID-19, the war in Ukraine and rising oil prices ring a bell to you?

The Speaker: I would remind the parliamentary secretary not to address members directly.

The hon. member for Montmorency—Charlevoix.

Gabriel Hardy (Montmorency—Charlevoix, CPC): Mr. Speaker, families, seniors and business owners in Montmorency—Charlevoix can no longer make ends meet.

Economists are saying that we are in a recession. The cost of housing has skyrocketed. There has been an almost 10% increase in

rent in Quebec, while interest rates fuelled by the Liberal deficits are crippling owners and SMEs. The Liberals promised to look after middle-class families, but instead they have brought them to their knees.

When will the Prime Minister stop making families pay the price of its inflationary deficits and put a stop to his reckless spending?

Hon. Joël Lightbound (Minister of Government Transformation, Public Works and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, given the exchanges we have heard in question period today, it is clear that the economists are sitting on our side of the House. They are not sitting across the way.

Since my colleague wants to talk about families in Montmorency—Charlevoix, what does he have to say to them when he and his party voted against the Canada child benefit, which helps thousands of them, and when he voted against the Canadian dental care plan?

The Leader of the Opposition does not even believe the Canadian dental care plan exists when six million Canadians have access to it.

We will take no lessons from the Conservatives when it comes to helping Canadian families. That is what we are doing, day in and day out.

[English]

Jonathan Rowe (Terra Nova—The Peninsulas, CPC): Mr. Speaker, when the Liberal government creates deficits by spending more than it receives in taxes, it creates inflation, costing Canadians more at the grocery store, more at the gas station and more everywhere else. New inflation data confirms that Canadians are being crushed by these Liberal deficits. All three core inflation measures are alarming. In just the last year, grocery inflation is up by 4% and rent inflation is up by nearly 5%.

When will the Liberals get the inflationary deficits under control to make life more affordable for Canadians instead of trying to outspend Justin Trudeau?

● (1450)

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government is focused on making the investments that are going to help Canadians get ahead. Whether it is investing in major projects, in affordable housing or in early learning and child care so people can make the best wages possible, our government is focused on one thing, and that is Canadians' success.

Canadians know that too. They do not trust those guys to protect their interests. They do not trust those guys for the long-term thinking that results in better outcomes for their families and their children. That is why we are on this side of the House.

*Oral Questions***INNOVATION, SCIENCE AND INDUSTRY**

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I represent one of the most trade-exposed regions in Canada, and Canadian manufacturers are being crushed by the industrial carbon tax and rising inflation. From steel, aerospace and auto parts to food processing, every step in the supply chain is costing more. Manufacturers cannot compete when the cost of everything keeps rising and businesses are burdened with more and more red tape.

Will the Prime Minister finally admit his industrial carbon tax policy and red tape policies like the plastics registry are unnecessary burdens doing nothing to improve competitiveness or protect the environment?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, of course we will be there to protect jobs, create jobs and attract talent and investment. When it comes to creating jobs, particularly in the manufacturing sector, we are doing this through our new defence industrial strategy, which will be about buy, build and partner. We will do that through major projects across the country. We have already announced five major projects, worth \$60 billion in private capital. We are coming up with next steps for new projects before the Grey Cup. By the way, the Grey Cup is November 16.

* * *

SMALL BUSINESS

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, if the industry minister had to be burdened with the paperwork and bills small businesses are facing today, she would act differently in this House. Take the food and beverage industry, for example. It runs on razor-thin margins, and after 10 years of Liberal deficits, food inflation continues to rise, to 4% this year. That is forcing restaurants to charge more and make less.

Is the government willing to address any of the costs small businesses are facing, or will it keep borrowing, spending and driving inflation even higher while job creators are left paying the price?

Hon. Rechie Valdez (Minister of Women and Gender Equality and Secretary of State (Small Business and Tourism), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government understands the importance of Canadian industries, and that is why we introduced the buy Canadian policy to strengthen supply chains and support small businesses with opportunities to succeed right here in Canada. We are also supporting small businesses hardest hit by the tariffs, are expanding Business Development Bank of Canada loans by up to \$5 million and have launched the \$5-billion strategic response fund so businesses can adapt and pivot during these challenging times. We are also reducing red tape, unlike what the member said just now. These measures are going to support Canadian industries, support Canadian workers and support our small businesses. Happy Small Business Week.

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

Bruce Fanjoy (Carleton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, independence is fundamental to the operations of the RCMP. My former MP, the current leader of the Conservative Party, recklessly criticized the

RCMP. His caucus does not want to talk about it, and even a former Conservative minister stated how “grossly imprecise” his comments were.

Can the Minister of Public Safety reiterate the importance of the RCMP's independence, which ensures the protection of all Canadians?

Hon. Gary Anandasangaree (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition has made some irresponsible statements relating to the RCMP. The RCMP plays an integral role in the safety and security of Canadians. It is an independent organization that abides by the rule of law. For the Leader of the Opposition to impugn the integrity of the RCMP is beyond the seat he holds.

I demand that he unequivocally retract those statements. We seek an apology for the RCMP, the men and women who serve this country.

* * *

● (1455)

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

Lianne Rood (Middlesex—London, CPC): Mr. Speaker, CA-MI families are getting pink slips, and the auto sector in Canada is hanging by a thread. The Liberal EV mandate is a bumper sticker, not a plan. It is a pipe dream that costs billions in taxpayer subsidies, and all for nothing. Over 6,000 Canadian families' livelihoods are at stake right now as auto manufacturers move their businesses to the U.S.

Will the Prime Minister tell unemployed auto workers why his failed policies helped send their jobs south?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me be clear: What is happening to the auto sector is actually linked to American tariffs.

When it comes to the EV mandates, the Minister of Environment and I, of course with the Prime Minister, have been working with industries to find solutions. By the way, right now they have been paused.

When it comes to the workers themselves, we will be there to support them and we will make sure that Stellantis is held to account. Meanwhile, we are working with GM to bring the Ingersoll plant a new model, because obviously these workers need to be supported.

We will build one Canada strong.

Oral Questions

Lianne Rood (Middlesex—London, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that is just more talk from the Liberals that does nothing to help people.

CAMI workers in Ingersoll are worried about paying their mortgages and putting food on the table. After handing out billions in subsidies, CAMI's indefinite layoffs come at the cost of the Liberals' failure to negotiate protections for workers. When CAMI bleeds, so do parts suppliers, tool and die makers, truckers, diners and other small businesses across Middlesex—London and southwestern Ontario.

Will the Prime Minister look auto workers in the eye and explain to them why he failed to protect their jobs?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is working with Doug Ford, I am working with Vic Fedeli and we are also working with Unifor to bring a new model to Ingersoll.

We will make sure to put pressure on GM, as it needs to honour its contracts. Meanwhile, we will make sure that, indeed, the workers we look in the eyes have confidence that we are fighting for their jobs.

Amarjeet Gill (Brampton West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Stellantis got \$15 billion in taxpayer money. That is over \$1,000 from every Canadian household. What is the result? Three thousand Canadian workers are losing their jobs as production moves to the U.S. If that is Liberal job protection, Canadians should be alarmed.

Will the Prime Minister tell us exactly how many Canadian jobs are guaranteed in that \$15-billion deal, or did the Liberals just write a blank cheque to protect corporate profits, not Canadian workers?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I understand the frustration on the part of my colleague, who is from the region.

That being said, I think we have to set the facts extremely straight. Support to the sector was linked to the fact that there would be the production of batteries. As production has only started, obviously \$15 billion in federal taxpayers' money has not been invested.

We negotiated very well the contracts to support the Brampton plant. Therefore, the opposition, including the Conservatives, will have access to the contracts in committee, and they will see that we have workers' backs.

Chris Lewis (Essex, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the finance minister handed \$10 billion to Stellantis to create 2,500 jobs in Windsor, but now it is threatening to ship 3,000 jobs from Brampton to the U.S. The Liberals have abandoned Canadian auto workers, who do not know how they will provide for their families and their futures.

What job guarantees did the Liberals actually negotiate? If there is nothing to hide, why will they not release the contracts outlining the specific details of the Canada-wide job guarantees?

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (President of the King's Privy Council for Canada and Minister responsible for Canada-U.S. Trade, Intergovernmental Affairs, Internal Trade, and One Canadian

Economy, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our colleague knows very well that we are working to support auto workers and the sector in Canada.

There is over 100 years of proud history of making vehicles in Canada. It is a manufacturing sector that is important to every part of the country. That is why we are not only taking measures with the Government of Ontario, partners across the country and unions to support the industry and those workers but we are also negotiating with the Americans so we can get a deal that is in the interests of the long-term security of Canada's auto sector.

• (1500)

[*Translation*]

Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent—Akiawenhrahk, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Paccar in Sainte-Thérèse has been manufacturing trucks for 60 years, but today 300 workers learned that they are losing their jobs. That is the sad truth about what the Liberal government has achieved in its dealings with Donald Trump. The Liberals are talking big, but they are failing to take action. Let us remember that they were elected by telling Canadians to keep their elbows up and that they would lift all tariffs. What is actually happening is that 300 people just lost their jobs.

What is the Prime Minister actually going to do to convince Mr. Trump that this does not make any sense? Most importantly, will he finally think about workers—

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Industry.

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of respect for my colleague, and I am very familiar with the Paccar plant, which I recently visited with the new member for Thérèse-De Blainville. I was in touch with the plant manager, Steve Anctil, again yesterday. This is bad news, news that we do not accept.

We will continue to fight to support our workers because the plant in Saint-Thérèse is a Quebec flagship. We will also be working with the Province of Quebec and municipalities across the country because we need to buy more trucks and buses that are manufactured here. We will protect our jobs.

Oral Questions

[English]

CHILD CARE

Laila Goodridge (Fort McMurray—Cold Lake, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Auditor General delivered a scathing report on the state of child care. Despite the Liberal government's spending billions of dollars on its child care plan, the shortage of available child care has gotten worse over the last five years. StatsCan showed that the proportion of parents who use child care and reported difficulty finding it rose from 36% in 2020 to nearly 50% in 2025. Only Liberals could spend more and get less.

Will the Prime Minister admit that his child care plan is yet another broken Liberal promise?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is the height of irony that a Conservative MP who voted against child care is now criticizing child care that exists across this country.

What the Auditor General said is that provinces and territories have to do a better job in terms of reporting. We are working with provinces and territories to make sure that we grow the number of spaces.

Let me leave members with this: \$16.50 a day is the average price families are paying for child care. That is a huge saving for Canadian families.

Laila Goodridge (Fort McMurray—Cold Lake, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is typical that the Liberals blame everyone but themselves. They committed to building 250,000 new child care spaces in five years. Three years in, there are fewer than half. Worse yet, they do not know how many spaces are going unused and do not know how much unmet demand exists, all while they are using funky, inconsistent math. Provinces are warning that the \$10 system could collapse when federal funding ends, with inflation and staffing shortages piling up.

How can the Prime Minister justify blowing through billions of dollars with families waiting on waiting lists?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again, I am really heartened to hear about the support the member has for early learning and child care. It is a real switch, given that she voted against it time and again.

I will say this. I have a meeting with my counterpart this afternoon, the minister from Alberta, to talk about exactly that: how we take the next steps, together, because, as the member would know, jurisdiction over child care lives in provinces and territories.

We have funded the system to such an extent that the average family is paying \$16.50 a day. What a saving this is for Canadian families.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Auditor General concluded that the Canadian Armed

Forces did not recruit and train the number of members it needs to meet operational requirements. She further said that our forces will struggle to respond to threats, emergencies and conflicts and to accomplish their missions. The report also revealed that on this trajectory, 13% of occupations are at risk of never being fully slated, and another 69% will not get there for over 10 years.

Our adversaries are not waiting for Canada to get our house in order. How does the defence minister expect our Armed Forces to meet our international obligations and protect Canada, without the personnel?

● (1505)

Hon. David McGuinty (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we thank the Auditor General for her work. As we rebuild, rearm and reinvest in Canada's military, we are making changes to our recruitment processes to get more people in the door, and faster. We have modernized our recruitment process by introducing a probationary period, streamlining the security clearance process, updating the aptitude test requirements and changing medical standards. We have also given our forces a very well-deserved pay increase. Recruitment has reached a 10-year high, but there is more to do.

James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the minister let 100,000 Canadians slip through his fingers.

The Auditor General also reported yesterday that the situation gets worse for our troops after they enlist. She said military housing is in "the kind of conditions you and I wouldn't want to live in" and that we should not expect our troops to live in either. The national defence committee came to the same conclusions in the last Parliament. Nothing has changed, and the report confirmed that the waitlist for military housing is growing to over 7,000.

How can the defence minister sleep at night, knowing our troops are living rough, and all he can do is reannounce old Liberal promises for 600 new housing units? Our troops need 7,000, now.

Hon. David McGuinty (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I sleep very well at night because of the incredible women and men in the Canadian Armed Forces. That is whom I count on. We are rearming, we are rebuilding and we are reinvesting in the Canadian Armed Forces. The member knows this.

When it comes to CAF housing, we are looking at new solutions through private sector partnerships to give our forces a safe and affordable place to call home. Last week, for the first time in history, we acquired a brand new, privately developed 37-unit apartment complex located near CFB Esquimalt, in five weeks. This is just one of the ways we are accelerating processes—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Madawaska—Restigouche has the floor.

* * *

[Translation]

CHILD CARE

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this week is child care worker and early childhood educator appreciation week in francophone minority communities. It is a time to celebrate professionals dedicated to helping our little ones learn, grow, and thrive. Early childhood is a crucial period for learning French and building identity.

I would like to ask the minister to speak to us about the measures our government is taking to support these educators and thereby strengthen this essential workforce that drives our Canada-wide system of affordable child care services.

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Madawaska—Restigouche for highlighting the exceptional work of early childhood educators across the country.

Our government has invested more than \$1 billion to recruit, train and retain more educators. We are working with the provinces and territories to improve salaries and training. When we support educators, we support families and the future of our economy.

* * *

CANADA REVENUE AGENCY

Eric Lefebvre (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this is embarrassing. The Prime Minister has the nerve to talk about economics lessons. His Minister of Public Works and Procurement wants to give lessons? Deal. I will take the deal, and Canadians can judge for themselves.

Here are the facts. The CRA's operating costs were \$4.1 billion in 2015. After nine years of Liberal mismanagement, they are now \$6.9 billion, a 70% increase. In response to that, today, the government is saying that it is going to increase the budget.

They have missed the point entirely. This is Canadian taxpayers' money. When will they start managing it wisely?

Hon. Joël Lightbound (Minister of Government Transformation, Public Works and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, do you want to know what is embarrassing?

What is embarrassing is the Leader of the Opposition suggesting that his political opponents be imprisoned. The opposition leader is the one undermining the rule of law in this country and bad-mouthing the RCMP. That is embarrassing.

Oral Questions

What is even more embarrassing is not that the Leader of the Opposition refuses to apologize, but that there are about a hundred MPs behind him who are unwilling to stand up and speak out against his completely unacceptable remarks.

The member should talk to his predecessor in Richmond—Arthabaska, follow his example, and speak out against the unacceptable.

• (1510)

[English]

Sandra Cobena (Newmarket—Aurora, CPC): Mr. Speaker, a business that fails to meet its service standards 95% of the time would go bankrupt, but under the Liberal government, that is the standard of the CRA. Its answer is to throw more money at the problem. Costs are up 70%, but still, 8.6 million calls are still being deflected, and 83% of the answers to individual tax questions are wrong. Even the CRA chatbot got questions wrong two-thirds of the time. It is hopeless.

If the Liberal government cannot even manage its own revenue agency, how can Canadians trust it to ever balance the budget?

Hon. Wayne Long (Secretary of State (Canada Revenue Agency and Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians deserve timely, reliable and accurate service from the CRA. That is why we thank the Auditor General for her report.

Earlier this fall, we embarked upon a 100-day plan to strengthen service, improve access and eliminate unacceptable delays, and we have good news: Since the launch of the plan, CRA call centre service levels have more than doubled, with 89% of Canadians getting an answer within 15 minutes.

The report will help the CRA build on significant service improvements it has made since September. It will also help guide our government to work—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Swift Current—Grasslands has the floor.

Jeremy Patzer (Swift Current—Grasslands—Kindersley, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Auditor General report shows that the CRA had a huge increase in deflected calls, from one million to eight million in one year. People in the southwest wait hours, sometimes days, to reach a service agent, and then they have to deal with huge delays in resolving their file, even if the CRA made the mistake. The CRA fails to meet its own service standards after already lowering them, and the odds are high that the agents will give inaccurate information, but its budget went up 70%.

Why is it that with the Liberals, Canadians always pay more but get less?

Routine Proceedings

Hon. Wayne Long (Secretary of State (Canada Revenue Agency and Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me be clear: The CRA is providing accurate information to Canadians in nearly all cases. The audit looked at a sample of 167 calls from last spring, before we launched our 100-day plan to fix our CRA service. The CRA reviews over 100,000 calls every year for accuracy and has found that more than 93% are accurate for inquiries related to taxpayer files.

We are focused on delivering service for Canadians. We will get this right.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

Hon. Terry Duguid (Winnipeg South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Kap Paper is an integral part of northern Ontario's economic security, supporting over 2,500 skilled, local careers in the region. However, a few weeks ago, the community was rocked by the news that Kap Paper would be shuttering its doors. This is devastating for the community and for workers and families throughout northern Ontario.

Can the Minister of Industry please tell the House how we are supporting Kap Paper and other industries and how our government is standing up for skilled careers and stronger communities?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my hon. colleague for his hard work, and I would also like to thank the minister for jobs and the minister for natural resources, because we worked together to lay down the groundwork for Kap Paper to continue its operations in the months ahead.

Through the conversation we had with Kap Paper, one thing became clear: It is the heartbeat of Kapuskasing and a vital part of the community. That is why we came to the table with solutions. We were able to protect the jobs, 300 of them, and all the jobs around Kapuskasing linked to the mill, 2,500 jobs, as well.

Eric Melillo (Kenora—Kiiwetinoong, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after years of talk, the Prime Minister is breaking his promise to get shovels in the ground when it comes to the constantly delayed Ring of Fire in northern Ontario. Thousands of jobs and billions of dollars are on the line, yet the Liberals refuse to move the project ahead. The roadway will not even be built until 2028, and the Liberals ignored the project completely on their national priority list, a huge slap in the face to people across northern Ontario.

Will the Liberals stop with the delays, stop breaking their promise and get shovels in the ground so our region can get to work?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I agree with the member that the Ring of Fire is an extremely important deposit in northern Ontario. We have been working with the Province of Ontario for years to ensure that we have a plan to move forward, and we have been working with the affected first nations in that riding, which is mine. We will continue to focus on the opportunity the

Ring of Fire presents for not just northern Ontario but all of Canada.

* * *

• (1515)

[Translation]

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the multinational company Newrest had an in-flight catering contract with Air Canada at the Trudeau airport. Even though the company knew that it was about to lose the contract, it still brought in temporary foreign workers on three-year closed work permits. Closed work permits are terrible things that prevent people from changing employers. Now, 50 people are left with nothing. They no longer have a job and are not allowed to find another one.

Will the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship listen to the request of the Confédération des syndicats nationaux and grant them open work permits so they can find new jobs?

Hon. Lena Metlege Diab (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, allow me to clarify things a little.

The purpose of the temporary foreign worker program is to allow Canadian employers to hire foreign workers when no qualified Canadian or permanent resident is available. We are still reducing the number of temporary workers. We are also going to work with the member. Our purpose is to protect Canadians, but also to protect employers and businesses that need foreign workers.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Patrick Weiler (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the second report of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans, entitled “Acting Together to Address Derelict and Abandoned Vessels in Canada”.

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

Mel Arnold (Kamloops—Shuswap—Central Rockies, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as the vice-chair of the fisheries committee, I would like to take a moment to thank the chair of the fisheries committee for co-hosting the Salmon Forever reception last night, where we worked across party lines in the interests of all wild Pacific salmon.

The Conservatives' supplemental report on derelict and abandoned vessels is attached to the main report. I thank all of the witnesses from coast to coast to coast for contributing to the study.

While the main report provides a number of recommendations, the Conservatives' supplemental report only contains two very important recommendations. I urge all Canadians, especially those concerned with derelict and abandoned vessels, to read the reports, especially the Conservatives' supplemental report for the solutions it provides, and let their local MPs know that it is time for the Liberal government to get serious about protecting our waters, fisheries and biodiversity.

* * *

● (1520)

PEACETIME SERVICE AND SACRIFICE MEMORIAL DAY ACT

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-252, An Act respecting a national day of remembrance to honour Canadian Armed Forces members who have lost their lives in peacetime in Canada.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to rise today to introduce the peacetime service and sacrifice memorial day act. Today marks 11 years since Corporal Nathan Cirillo was shot and killed while standing guard at the National War Memorial in Ottawa, and Monday marked 11 years since Warrant Officer Patrice Vincent was killed by a vehicular attack while on duty in Quebec.

Since 1914, an estimated 2,000 Canadian Armed Forces members have lost their lives in non-combat roles on Canadian soil during peacetime. I will take the time to extend condolences to each and every one of their family members.

This bill aims to honour these Canadian Armed Forces members, who made the ultimate sacrifice in service of their country. This bill proposes that October 22 become known as peacetime service and sacrifice memorial day and that the national flag of Canada on the Peace Tower be lowered to half-mast on this day.

I would like to thank the member for Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie for seconding this bill. I would also like to thank the former member for Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, Alistair MacGregor, who tabled this bill in the last Parliament.

I am honoured to carry this bill forward, and I hope all members of this House will support it.

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

* * *

GORE MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY

(Bill S-1001. On the Order: Private Members' Business:)

October 2, 2025—Connie Cody (Cambridge)—Second reading and reference to a legislative committee of Bill S-1001, An Act to authorize Gore Mutual Insurance Company to apply to be continued as a body corporate under the laws of the Province of Quebec.

Connie Cody (Cambridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, there have been consultations among the parties, and I believe you will find unanimous consent for the following motion:

Routine Proceedings

That, notwithstanding any Standing Order or usual practice of the House, Bill S-1001, An Act to authorize Gore Mutual Insurance Company to apply to be continued as a body corporate under the laws of the Province of Quebec, be deemed to have been read a second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole, deemed considered in Committee of the Whole, deemed reported without amendment, deemed concurred in at report stage and deemed read a third time and passed.

[Translation]

The Speaker: All those opposed to the hon. member's moving the motion will please say nay.

There being no dissenting voice, it is agreed.

The House has heard the terms of the motion. All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to a committee of the whole, considered in committee of the whole, reported without amendment, concurred in at report stage, read the third time and passed)

* * *

[English]

PETITIONS

PUBLIC SAFETY

Dan Mazier (Riding Mountain, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is always an honour to rise on behalf of the people of Riding Mountain.

The people of Swan River are experiencing an alarming increase in violent crime, which has threatened the safety and well-being of families across our region. A recent report by the Manitoba west district RCMP found that over an 18-month period, just two offenders in Swan River were responsible for over 150 offences.

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

I support the good people of Swan River.

NICOTINE REPLACEMENT THERAPIES

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present a petition on behalf of small businesses, including convenience stores, asking to remove restrictions on the sale of nicotine pouches. Many adult Canadians make use of nicotine pouches to help them quit other tobacco products by relieving cravings and withdrawal symptoms. Only allowing pharmacies to sell the product from behind a counter takes away the freedom to choose where and how adults can access such products. Small businesses have a track record of selling age-restricted products, including nicotine replacement therapies.

Routine Proceedings

The petitioners call on the Minister of Health to remove the restriction, and they would like to remind the government that in British Columbia, hard drugs are legalized, but they will not let convenience stores sell a nicotine pouch.

• (1525)

PESTICIDES

Cheryl Gallant (Algonquin—Renfrew—Pembroke, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition signed by the outdoor-loving residents of my great riding of Algonquin—Renfrew—Pembroke.

The petitioners are calling on the government to intervene in the aerial spraying of toxic substances. They are concerned that the spraying of these substances may pose serious health challenges to the rural and indigenous residents living in the valley and will disrupt local ecosystems. The nature-loving petitioners are also calling for the government to ensure the use of toxic chemicals in our forest does not occur at all.

I will be presenting more petitions on this matter.

ANIMAL WELFARE

Peter Schiefke (Vaudreuil, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to present a petition on behalf of animal rights activists and cat lovers across the country. Those who signed the petition from across the country have done so in hopes that the Government of Canada will take action to stem the tide of homelessness among the over four million homeless cats across the country and help support them.

They are calling upon the Government of Canada to put in place free sterilization nationwide, and the reason behind this is very simple. They say that sterilization would prevent unwanted litters and thus reduce the number of abandoned cats, would have positive effects on cats' behaviour, would reduce fights and the risk of communicable diseases, and, of course, would decrease the chance of cats being abandoned.

I support this 100%, and I thank all those who signed it from across the country.

CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS

William Stevenson (Yellowhead, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present a petition from concerned citizens in my riding and across Canada regarding a proposal by the Liberal-led finance committee to remove the advancement of religion as a charitable purpose under the Income Tax Act. More than 30,000 registered charities, approximately 42% of all charities in Canada, fall under the category of advancing religion. These faith-based organizations operate food banks, refugee programs, long-term care homes, schools, hospitals, shelters and much more.

Canadians are deeply concerned that removing charitable status from these organizations would undermine not only freedom of religion and expression, but also the ability of these groups to continue their work serving those in need regardless of their backgrounds or beliefs. Therefore, the government must reject this harmful recommendation and protect the charitable status of religious organizations.

HEALTH CARE

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to present a petition regarding health care. The backbone of our health care system is our nurses, and nurses are very much concerned about everything from credential recognition to the workloads they have and the whole issue of recruitment. They would like to see more of the provincial and federal governments working in co-operation for the betterment of our nurses, ultimately providing better-quality care for Canadians from coast to coast.

PEACEKEEPING

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present a petition that is organized by the peace train movement. The Canadians who have signed this petition are committed to advancing peace and human rights. It is timely, as the peace trainers have travelled across the country.

The petitioners note that Canada pledged itself to these principles with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948 and reaffirmed them through the Truth and Reconciliation Commission and the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

They highlight that justice, equality and freedom are essential to preventing conflict, while the lack of respect for these rights fuels violence worldwide. Petitioners further stress that Canada lost vital civilian-led capacity for research, education and training in peace operations with the closure of the Pearson Peacekeeping Centre.

Therefore, they call upon the Government of Canada to establish and fund a new centre of excellence for peace and justice to support conflict resolution, diplomacy and peacebuilding for Canadians and the international community, a place that could help advance conflict prevention and human rights at home and around the world.

• (1530)

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition that is timely as we approach Remembrance Day, on behalf of constituents in Saanich—Gulf Islands, Canadian Forces members and veterans who are looking at the compensation act and some implicit unfairness in the compensation act that requires veterans who have suffered injuries to remain inadequately compensated.

They point out that Veterans Affairs Canada evaluates disability benefits claims without reasonable time frames for viewing their injuries. They ask that the minister's mandate letter list a dedication to the "one veteran, one standard" approach.

Petitioners call upon the Minister of Veterans Affairs to remove any statutory limits on back pay eligibility for the disability allowance, to work with individual veterans to achieve a just and due compensation for disability allowance and to do so in a timely manner.

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 at this time, please.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would ask that all notices of motions for the production of papers be allowed to stand at this time, please.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Speaker: The hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands is rising on a point of order.

Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, it is a small matter, but just so the technical people know and the Speaker's office knows, an erroneous message was sent to all members that we were going to have a vote and that the bells were ringing. I know that the IT people do a spectacular job for us in this place, but I wanted to make sure that it was noted, so that the problem could be corrected.

The Speaker: I have been informed that it was in error. I thank the hon. member for raising that.

* * *

[*Translation*]

REQUEST FOR EMERGENCY DEBATE

CLOSURE OF B.C. SALMON FISHERY

The Speaker: The Chair has notice of a request for an emergency debate from the hon. member for Cowichan—Malahat—Langford.

[*English*]

Jeff Kibble (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to request an emergency debate to discuss the crisis facing British Columbia, given the Department of Fisheries and Oceans' impending decision for proposed recreational salmon fishery closures.

The impact that these proposed closures would have on small communities across the B.C. coast would be catastrophic. Port Renfrew, in my riding on south Vancouver Island, alone would lose \$11 million to \$12 million per year, effectively ending Port Renfrew. According to DFO's own statistics, B.C. could lose over 9,000 jobs, 300,000 salmon anglers and over \$400 million in household income per year.

DFO is proposing both commercial and recreational fishing closures with the stated goal of protecting the southern resident killer whales, with the decision next month. This proposal targets the recreational fishing industry and ignores numerous other factors

Government Orders

that contribute to salmon stock management and the welfare of the southern resident killer whales.

The recreational fishing impact on fish stocks is minimal. In the last few years, salmon stocks in B.C. have been healthy and are at record levels. In fact, some areas that are facing proposed closures are not even southern resident killer whale hunting grounds, indicating that there are other factors affecting the health of these important whales that are not being considered under this proposal.

Based on the catastrophic impact that this potential closure will have on small communities across British Columbia, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to acknowledge the emergency in British Columbia and the recreational fishing industry by granting an emergency debate.

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Speaker: I thank the hon. member for Cowichan—Malahat—Langford for his intervention. However, I am not satisfied that this request meets the requirements of the Standing Orders at this time.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1535)

[*English*]

STRENGTHENING CANADA'S IMMIGRATION SYSTEM AND BORDERS ACT

The House resumed from October 21 consideration of the motion that 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, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Ron McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge that we are gathered today on the traditional and unceded territory of the Algonquin Anishinabe people.

I rise today to speak about how the legislative amendments proposed in Bill C-12 would continue to uphold our humanitarian tradition and due process while focusing resources on those who need them and improving confidence in our asylum system. These amendments would strengthen and streamline Canada's asylum and immigration systems. They include new rules related not only to whose asylum claim can be referred to the Immigration and Refugee Board for a decision, but also how claims are received, processed and decided.

Under the legislation, the federal government would no longer refer claims to the Immigration and Refugee Board for an asylum claim decision for claims made more than one year after someone first arrives, after June 24, 2020, or claims made 14 or more days after someone enters Canada irregularly between border crossings. The amendments are designed to help protect our system against surges in claims, as well as people who want to use the asylum system to extend their stay in Canada when other mechanisms fail.

Government Orders

They are not designed to turn away people with well-founded fear for their safety should they be returned to their home countries. In these instances, claims would be referred to the removal process, which includes the ability to seek a pre-removal risk assessment. Individuals can request this risk assessment when they believe they have a well-founded fear of removal to a situation where they would face persecution, torture or other grievous harm, for example. This safeguard gives us confidence that reforms to our asylum system do not undermine our commitment to protecting the world's most vulnerable people.

The risk assessment upholds Canada's obligations under international human rights and refugee conventions. It is a well-established mechanism that operates within a larger system today, providing an opportunity for those facing removal to demonstrate that they would be at risk of persecution or harm should they be removed. A risk assessment request might highlight information such as conditions in their home country or personal circumstances that make their return unsafe. These could be, for example, political and economic upheaval, armed conflict or shifting social dynamics in a country. Similarly, personal circumstances, such as visibility in activism or family dynamics, can heighten the risk of harm should they return. The risk assessment ensures that these factors are thoroughly reviewed before any removal order is carried out. It is conducted by trained officers who carefully evaluate the credibility and significance of the evidence presented. This is a rigorous process rooted in a deep understanding of risk and refugee law. The importance of having such a process cannot be overstated. Without it, we would lack a critical safety net, and there would be risk of irreversible harm to individuals.

Canada's pre-removal risk assessment process gives people a fair opportunity to submit evidence while ensuring that each case is deliberated with the seriousness that it deserves. The process is supported by a wealth of detailed data on country conditions and officers trained to evaluate risk with a high degree of expertise and sensitivity to individual circumstances. This underscores the importance of the pre-removal risk assessment process in maintaining Canada's strong history of refugee protection.

The pre-removal risk assessment process also ensures that legislative changes made to our asylum system do not inadvertently expose individuals to harm. It acts as a backstop, allowing policymakers to modernize and strengthen various aspects of our immigration framework while knowing that there is a fail-safe in place. Whether we are streamlining initial asylum decisions, addressing backlogs or modernizing pathways to protection, the pre-removal risk assessment remains an essential safeguard that gives us the confidence to innovate responsibly.

● (1540)

It is important to recognize that the risk assessment is not a tool for delaying lawful removals. Instead, it is about making sure that each person's case is reviewed against the most current information and circumstances so that there is a full consideration of the risks they face and no one is sent into harm's way.

This House has the important responsibility of ensuring that Canada's immigration and asylum systems reflect our values of compassion and fairness, while also meeting the needs of an evol-

ing global context and addressing the pressures facing Canadians today. The pre-removal risk assessment process embodies this balance. It reassures Canadians that while we are taking urgent, necessary steps to strengthen our immigration system, we do so without compromising our commitment to protecting human life and dignity.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I appreciate the comments my colleague and friend has put on the record in regard to Bill C-12.

One of the issues I raised yesterday is the way in which the Prime Minister or the government as a whole is dealing with the issue of securing our borders; it is a lot more than just bringing forward legislation. We have witnessed the government materialize, in terms of budgetary purposes, and allocate an additional 1,000 border control agents. When we take a holistic approach in terms of what the Prime Minister said in the last election about securing Canada's borders, and we are now talking about legislation that is going to do just that, and complement it with the idea of adding 1,000 border control officers, I believe that is a very strong commitment fulfilled by the Prime Minister and the Liberal government.

Can the member provide his thoughts on why it was important that we maintain this campaign commitment?

Ron McKinnon: Madam Speaker, I agree 100% with the thrust of the member's question. Having robust borders and robust processes around our borders ensures that our systems perform correctly, so that the people who need to be here are able to be here, the people who need to be removed are removed, and they are removed in a very effective and just manner.

Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Madam Speaker, the member spoke about the pre-removal risk assessment process as though somehow that is a fair, due process for asylum seekers. Does the member realize that it actually lacks procedural protections, such as the right to oral hearings, the right to appeal and the right to have a decision made by an independent body? Does he not view those important measures as central for an asylum seeker and to ensure that Canada's asylum process is, indeed, independent, as opposed to one where decisions are made by the government's department?

Ron McKinnon: Madam Speaker, I agree with the hon. member that the process is important and that we do have to make sure the appropriate checks and balances are in place and people can get their story properly before the decision-makers. I believe that is the thrust of what the advance risk assessment process is about, to make sure that we put in that additional process and put in the additional checks and balances to make sure that the decisions coming forward are in the best interest of the country and of the individuals involved.

Government Orders

Jenny Kwan: Madam Speaker, perhaps the member should read the bill, Bill C-12. In fact, Bill C-12 takes away those procedural protections. It only relies on the pre-removal risk assessments because a host of people would be stripped of their right to go before the Immigration and Refugee Board to make their application. That is exactly the concern that I have.

If the government were to ensure that people's rights are protected and procedural rights are intact, then what the government has to do is withdraw this bill and ensure that the current system of the IRB review process for asylum seekers' applications is kept in place.

● (1545)

Ron McKinnon: Madam Speaker, once again, I thank the member for her concerns. They are important things to consider and to be wary of, but I would also rely on the committee to undertake a very strong study of this matter and come forward with appropriate recommendations and, of course, its deliberations.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, we know asylum has been an issue previously, such as in 2010 and 2011, when there were large numbers that required an adjustment to the system, and we had to make changes to the asylum system. What we have witnessed, whether it is through the pandemic or the international students issue, is that there is a need for change to be made. Bill C-12 would do just that, and I am wondering if the member could provide his thoughts on that, because at times we need to modernize and make changes to retain integrity in the system.

Ron McKinnon: Madam Speaker, yes, it is indeed time to modernize. The world is a very precarious place these days; it is very volatile, and there are many people around the world who are in danger and want to come to Canada. We want to make sure we provide a safe haven, but we need to provide the appropriate checks and balances to do so.

Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Madam Speaker, I rise to speak today in strong opposition to Bill C-12, the so-called border security and immigration act.

Let us be clear: The bill is not a new approach. It is a repackaging, a political sleight of hand. Bill C-12 is simply Bill C-2 with a fresh coat of paint. It would not fix the fundamental problems of its predecessor. It doubles down on the same anti-migrant, anti-refugee agenda that civil society, legal experts and human rights advocates have already rejected in overwhelming numbers. More than 300 civil society organizations, from the Canadian Civil Liberties Association to the United Church of Canada, have called for the full withdrawal of both bills.

The organizations are right, because Bill C-12 would maintain the sweeping new powers in Bill C-2 related to refugee asylum seekers, whereby the minister and cabinet, at the expense of transparency, fairness and human rights, could engage in a host of actions and would be given a host of authorities.

Let us talk about some of the most egregious elements of the bill and what it would actually do. Bill C-12 would give cabinet the authority to suspend or terminate immigration applications and cancel visas, work permits or permanent resident documents whenever it is deemed to be "in the public interest".

However, there is no definition of "public interest", none; there are no guidelines, no guardrails, no requirements for evidence and no judicial oversight. The government could use this clause to shut down entire classes of immigration overnight.

As reported by the CBC, for people who apply under the humanitarian compassionate stream, the processing time right now is up to 600 months. That is 50 years. For caregivers, it is nine years; for the agri-food stream, it is 19 years. For entrepreneurs, it is 35 years. This is unheard of. By the way, all this came out of the minister's transition binder.

The fear is that the government will just cancel applications en masse. That is what Bill C-12 would allow the government to do. It is stoking fear. If the government wants to say that Canada wants to shut its door to asylum seekers, then it should just say that instead of doing this under the pretense that somehow this is just and fair and respects procedural fairness.

This is not good governance. It is not just the actions that the government might take with this kind of power that we should be concerned about. It would be giving that power to future governments as well.

The bill also allows the government to block refugee hearings, to impose retroactive one-year bars on asylum claims and to strip people of their status en masse. These are powers that echo some of the most extreme anti-migrant policies we have seen south of the border.

The Prime Minister likes to claim that this is about modernization and efficiency. It is not. It is peddling a racist, discriminatory narrative with Trump leading the charge.

The bill would directly harm refugees and vulnerable migrants, people fleeing war, persecution and violence. Frankly, it is un-Canadian. Let us remember that Canada once prided itself on being a refuge for those in need. Bill C-12 sends the opposite message. It says, "If you didn't file your paperwork within a year, we don't want to hear your case."

We can imagine a woman fleeing gender-based violence, arriving in Canada with nothing, struggling with trauma, with no access to legal support, just trying to survive, and then being told she is too late to seek safety. As Women's Shelters Canada and LEAF have pointed out, arbitrary timelines such as these deny survivors the ability to seek protection when they need it most.

Government Orders

We should be upholding the rule of law, not concentrating power in cabinet. Bill C-12 represents a dangerous step backward. It undermines our international obligations, our charter values and our reputation as a country that welcomes those in need. The NDP stands with the hundreds of organizations across this country, civil liberties advocates, refugee lawyers, women's groups and faith communities who are united in saying that we should withdraw Bill C-12 and Bill C-2.

How can the government put forward legislation that will knowingly endanger survivors of violence or those being persecuted for who they love? Sixty-four countries criminalize homosexuality. That is not all. Under the U.S. administration, Trump's executive orders threaten the rights, the health care and the existence of transgender people. More and more, actually, my office has heard from people who are living in fear in the United States.

Bill C-12 is also a blow to civil liberties. It authorizes unprecedented information sharing across departments without proper safeguards. It empowers border agents to access private facilities and detain goods for export. It expands the Coast Guard's role into intelligence collection and surveillance.

• (1550)

Even though the government removed some of the most intrusive measures from Bill C-2, such as the warrantless access to Canadians' private data, the spirit of the bill remains the same: centralization of power and erosion of rights. The International Civil Liberties Monitoring Group has warned that the bill "fast tracks...the most egregious aspects" of its predecessor. It would not fix the problems; it would accelerate them.

Let us not kid ourselves: Bill C-12 exists because Bill C-2 became too toxic to pass. Rather than listening to the hundreds of organizations demanding its withdrawal, the government chose to split the bill into two, hoping Canadians would not notice. However, we do notice. We notice that these measures come at a time when asylum claims have dropped by 34% and when the average number of daily refugee claims has plummeted from 165 to 12.

What is the crisis, exactly, that the government is responding to? This is not about border security; it is about politics. It is about appeasing a Trump-style, anti-immigrant, anti-migrant narrative that is creeping into our political discourse. There is a dangerous pattern emerging under the current government, an obsession with centralizing authority and sidestepping accountability. It is carrying out the Conservatives' agenda but with a new Liberal leader dressed in red. Bill C-12 would expand cabinet's ability to rule by order. It would give ministers unilateral power to cancel applications, suspend rights and make regulations without parliamentary oversight. This is not the Canadian way. Our immigration and refugee system should be based on clear laws, fair processes and independent decision-making, not on who happens to sit in cabinet.

Let us recognize who would bear the brunt of these policies: women fleeing violence, LGBTQ2+ refugees seeking safety, migrant workers exploited in precarious jobs and indigenous people in border communities, who already face racial profiling. Bill C-12 would deepen these inequalities instead of addressing them.

Let us make sure we do this right. When we talk about immigration, we are talking about people: families, workers and children who come here seeking safety and a better life. We should be strengthening our refugee system and not weakening it. The Liberals put women and girls at risk of being deported back into danger. The one-year bar is a copycat of the U.S. refugee determination system. Get this: In the U.S., the one-year timeline starts at their most recent entry into the United States. Canada's proposal is actually worse; it starts at the beginning, the first time they visit Canada. This means that if someone visited Canada some years ago as a child and they are now being persecuted, they will not be able to apply for asylum here in Canada, and that is wrong.

• (1555)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, we see the extremes. We have the leader of the Conservative Party, who, in essence, wants everyone to leave. Then we have the NDP members. I do not think they fully understand what the situation or the reality is on the ground level. I really and truly believe that.

The New Democrats try to give a false impression that there is no need for us to modify or make changes to the system of asylum. I do not understand it. I deal with immigration virtually every day. Every Saturday, I talk with people who want to come to Canada. I do not understand where the member is getting her numbers from, to try to give the false impression that there is nothing wrong with the system.

We have a Prime Minister and a government that recognize that we have a very serious situation. We need to stabilize the whole asylum area and stabilize immigration in general. It is good for the Canadian economy for us to do that. Bill C-12 would, in good part, do that. I do not understand why the NDP does not support the legislation.

Jenny Kwan: Madam Speaker, the numbers actually come from the minister's transitional binder. I would advise the member to read the bill. The bill is egregious in its violation of rights. There has been plenty wrong, with the Liberals at the helm for the last 10 years, in Canada's immigration system. I can go on for days about that. However, stripping people of their rights or putting women who face gender violence in danger is not the right way to go. Putting the lives of LGBTQ2 members in danger is not the way to go. Stripping refugees of their right to due process is not the way to go. In fact, I tabled a private member's bill calling for an immigration ombudsperson. That is what we should do to ensure that we do this fairly and properly and not just give carte blanche power to a government.

By the way, the Liberals, although dressed in red, are acting just like the Conservatives.

Government Orders

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I guess, if we are throwing insults, she is behaving like a Communist. They are so far to the left.

Does the member understand that we have a 7% factor to a 5% factor in terms of temporary permits? Does she believe that Canada should be moving toward that 5%? The Prime Minister and the government do believe that we should be leaning toward 5% on temporary permits.

Does she support that? Does she support the government trying to address the asylum issue? There is an issue there. Does she believe we should address it, or should we just sit back, close our eyes and put our heads in the sand?

Jenny Kwan: Madam Speaker, let me put this on the record for all members to hear very clearly. My mother passed away on October 4. She left China, a Communist regime that attacked her and her family. They fled to Hong Kong and eventually moved to Canada, where we established ourselves. I am not a Communist. Let us be clear about that. I am actually being persecuted right now by the Chinese government under the foreign interference act. They are targeting me as an evergreen target.

Let us be clear. I am not Communist, but I stand for equality, justice and what Canada has always been in my eyes, which is standing up for people and protecting them. That is what the refugee system has been, and bit by bit, the Liberal government, under Bill C-2 and now under Bill C-12, is eroding that.

I want refugee and asylum claimants to have access to due process under the IRB. Yes, there needs to be reform, but not this way.

• (1600)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): Let me first offer my condolences to the hon. member.

Continuing with questions and comments, the hon. member for Waterloo has the floor.

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Waterloo, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I also want to offer my sincere condolences on the passing of the member's mother.

I do believe it is important, when we are having debates on such important topics, that we get to hear what can make legislation better. We are at second reading. The legislation will go to committee. I think that was a little of a reaction to the comments made by the member suggesting that wearing a certain colour makes someone of a certain party and whatever the case may be.

Right now, this is an important bill. We do need to try to get it right. Canadians are asking for it. We had an election. Canadians sent us, in our respective roles, in this chamber. The NDP knows that they did not even receive party status, but they do have an important role to play here. I know that I have constituents who also recognize their important work.

I would ask the member, does she see the value in this legislation? Could it be improved at committee? Does she have some feedback that she would like the government to hear so that we can try to get it right to serve Canadians in the way we all have a desire to do?

Jenny Kwan: Madam Speaker, let me say this: Over 300 civil organizations are against the bill and are calling for the government to withdraw it.

My question is this: Why should a person's claim be ineligible simply because they visited Canada sometime in the past?

This is more of an attempt of the government to try to hollow out Canada's refugee determination system, the IRB, by pre-emptively stopping people from even applying or making an application. Perhaps that is the goal of the government, after all, to move Canada's system to where almost no one will be heard by the IRB.

Canada can do better, and we must do better. The NDP do not support the approach the government has adopted. We have lots of suggestions of how the government can do better. Let us engage in proper consultation and scrap this bill. I will be at the table with the government to work with it to bring better legislation forward to enhance and support our immigration system.

Billy Morin (Edmonton Northwest, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is always an honour to rise and speak in the House. I rise to speak to Bill C-12. I would like to remind the House that it was Conservatives who forced the Liberals to back down on Bill C-2, which would violate Canadians' individual freedoms and privacy. The Privacy Commissioner confirmed that the Liberals did not even consult with him when trying to grant themselves sweeping new powers to access Canadians' personal information from service providers, such as banks and telecoms, without a warrant. Law-abiding Canadians should not lose their liberty to pay for the failures of the Liberals on borders and immigration.

Now the Liberals have introduced Bill C-12. Conservatives will examine this bill thoroughly to ensure that the Liberals do not try to sneak in measures that breach law-abiding Canadians' privacy rights.

Canadians are generous and welcoming. We believe immigration should be fair, compassionate and firmly grounded in the rule of law. After years of drift, this bill is a chance to restore integrity at our borders, disrupt transnational crime and reduce the flow of the deadly synthetic drugs that are devastating families across the country.

Government Orders

However, security is not just a line on the map. It is reducing the number of ineligible or bad faith immigration applications so we can better fill vacant health care roles in urban, rural and indigenous communities with qualified health professionals, including medical radiation technologists, rural doctors and nurses. It means making sure that the many families in Edmonton Northwest, who have waited months or years for IRCC to process applications, have certainty about whether their loved ones or caregivers can come and stay in Canada. It is also about welcoming people who are ready to invest their time and resources to help grow Canada's economy.

Security is built on trust and respect among neighbours, including indigenous partners on the Canadian border. It is today's newcomers learning Canada's story, joining the work of reconciliation and building strong communities. Bill C-12 can help us do all this if we get it right.

What does Bill C-12 do in a positive light? There are some things that we agree with. The Liberals have taken steps to strengthen some of the previous iterations of Bill C-2. First, it enables CBSA to access and examine goods upstream, in warehouses and transportation hubs, not just at the last gate. Officers will be able to find contraband hidden deep in supply chains. Second, it accelerates listing the precursor chemicals used to make fentanyl and other street drugs. Third, it improves information sharing among federal agencies, and affirms a coastal security role for the Canadian Coast Guard. This is critical across our vast shorelines and in the Arctic. Fourth, it clamps down on access to financial services by criminal networks that harm our communities. Finally, it helps to address the ongoing epidemic of crimes against indigenous women and girls by enabling information about sex offenders to be shared with indigenous police services.

Conservatives support many of these principles and aims because Canadians expect compassion, safety and accountability.

The toxic drug crisis demands urgency. Drug-related death and illness is a daily, unwelcome part of indigenous realities both on and off reserve and in our cities, where many indigenous people have chosen to live. This has had a devastating effect on current and future generations of indigenous people.

In Alberta, the toxic drug crisis is hitting indigenous people far harder than the general population, both on reserve and in cities. Despite first nations people being 3% to 4% of Alberta's population, we accounted for 20% of opioid poisoning deaths between 2016 and 2022, and death rates have been reported at five to nine times higher than those of non-indigenous Albertans. When I was last chief, the ISC regional director reported the life expectancy for indigenous men in Alberta to be 58 years old, a nearly 20-year difference between Canadians.

The urban impact is acute. From January to May 2025, Alberta saw a sharp rise in deaths involving carfentanil, with 68% of opioid fatalities province-wide and 78% in Edmonton involving carfentanil. The most toxic supply is concentrated in major centres where many indigenous people live, work and seek services. Organized trafficking networks exploit remote communities and urban corridors, causing loss of life every day.

• (1605)

The losses compound intergenerational trauma, housing and economic insecurity, and barriers to culturally safe care, ultimately the resources and capacity for nations to build self-sufficiency. Nationally, more than 53,000 apparent opioid deaths have been recorded since 2016, with B.C., Alberta and Ontario bearing most of the burden, regions with large indigenous populations both on and off reserve and in urban neighbourhoods.

The reasons are complex. They include racism in system of care, housing insecurity, unsupplied policing services, a poisoned drug supply and many more things. However, one part is clear: organized crime and transnational crime networks are flooding us with deadly products.

Bill C-12 could help to improve collaboration with indigenous police forces, such as the Blood Tribe Police Service's drug task force, which conducts drug-trafficking investigations and seizures with the RCMP crime reduction unit near the U.S. border. It could also help other indigenous police forces follow the lead set by Akwesasne Mohawk Police, which deals with human trafficking and other smuggling across its internal borders between New York, Quebec and Ontario. There are also opportunities to collaborate among first nations, CBSA, RCMP and the Coast Guard to build capacity, share crime data, and enforce Canada's laws and first nation laws on land and water.

Bill C-12 could also help to disrupt human trafficking networks and prevent crimes against indigenous women and girls. RCMP-related agencies would be able to better track and share information about registered sex offenders with law enforcement partners, indigenous governments and U.S. partners, as well as facilitate disclosure of offender travel data. Strong cross-border and inter-agency sharing can help track high-risk offenders who move between jurisdictions that intersect with indigenous communities on and off reserve.

Government Orders

I would like to acknowledge the Tsuut'ina Nation Police Service, which has worked with U.S. police forces. Doing this work is a real example of the leadership indigenous communities can show with their police forces this past year.

I ask the government to go beyond symbolic gestures using the tools provided in Bill C-12. After the Auditor General's scathing reports about the government's chronic failure to meet its fiduciary obligations to indigenous peoples, here is an opportunity to improve safety through collaboration and reconciliation.

In conclusion, security and reconciliation are not opposites. They reinforce each other when we walk together and grow trust. We must work with indigenous leaders on safeguards, such as clear limits on secondary use of data, strengthening community relationships and cultural safety, and indigenous-led measures, so the expanded powers do not encourage racial profiling or erode trust. Bill C-12 gives tools to make Canada safer if we work together with other communities, rural communities, rural Canadians and indigenous communities near our borders, our cities and beyond.

I encourage my colleagues to work in committee to amend this bill to better defend our borders and deepen our bonds through trust and security. Even with the Liberals' second attempt at such a bill, it still fails to address things such as bail reform. Catch and release is alive and well for those who traffic in fentanyl and firearms, as well as those who are using our porous border to victimize Canadians. Sentencing provisions have not been included as much as they should be. There are still no mandatory prison times for fentanyl traffickers. There are still no new mandatory prison times for gangsters who use guns to commit crimes, despite the Liberals' campaign against legal gun owners. House arrest is still permissible for some of the most serious offences.

Liberals continue to push for safe consumption sites near schools. At the health committee, my hon. colleague, the member for Riding Mountain, called on the Liberals to shut down fentanyl consumption sites next to children. This is a common-sense measure. However, the Liberal minister refused to rule out approving more consumption sites next to schools and day cares, despite acknowledging they are repositories for rampant fentanyl usage.

Only Conservatives will continue standing up for Canadians' individual rights and privacy, and hold the Liberals to account on the safety that is needed to protect Canadians.

• (1610)

John-Paul Danko (Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is really encouraging to see collaboration in the House, where we can hash something out at committee and come to a level of agreement for the best interest of all Canadians. In particular, I appreciate the member's highlighting the impacts of the opioid crisis on indigenous communities, and I would suggest some of those impacts are very similar for urban indigenous populations across Canada, including Hamilton, with subsequent issues, such as homelessness.

I am hoping, as we will very soon be tabling bail reform and strengthening sentencing legislation in the House, we will see a similar level of collaboration among all parties.

Billy Morin: Madam Speaker, I agree that bail reform, as mentioned, and being tougher on crime are needed, but collaboration is needed from Canadians from province to province; from different agencies, like the CBSA, the RCMP and provincial police forces; and from indigenous communities, urban and rural alike. I also think the Liberals need to look at their promises.

We put forward solutions on this side of the House, and they denied our solutions when it came to three-strikes laws and putting criminals away. I think this country needs to be a little more black and white. Tough love is still love in our communities, and I think the country needs to look itself in the mirror so that promises to keep Canadians safe can be kept.

[*Translation*]

Patrick Bonin (Repentigny, BQ): Madam Speaker, I would like to know what my hon. colleague thinks of the government's recent announcement that it plans to hire 1,000 additional Canada Border Services Agency officers.

According to the union, there is a shortage of 2,000 to 3,000 officers. Is my colleague satisfied with this announcement about hiring 1,000 additional officers? Does he think CBSA should aim more towards what the unions are calling for, which is 2,000 to 3,000 additional officers?

• (1615)

[*English*]

Billy Morin: Madam Speaker, I certainly agree that our police forces, whether they are the CBSA, the RCMP, provincial police forces or indigenous police forces, deserve that investment and recognition, but I do not get my hopes too high, to be honest. This announcement has been made a number of times over the last number of months, and not one officer has been hired.

Government Orders

I agree this is the way to go forward, but making announcements on spending money is not going to solve this. We just saw a scathing report on indigenous policing. In our communities, \$13 million has gone unspent. Money that went to the RCMP did not flow down for hiring officers, so I do not get my hopes high when these simple rhetoric-type announcements are made.

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Madam Speaker, what has become clear during our debate on Bill C-12 over the last number of days is that the measures in this bill respond to long-standing grievances outlined by the Conservatives, mainly on immigration and the open-door policies that Canada suffered under Justin Trudeau.

With some of the provisions in this bill, we hope to see some improvements in public confidence about immigration in Canada. What would the member from Alberta like to see with respect to changes to immigration policy to improve public confidence in our immigration system?

Billy Morin: Madam Speaker, I will reflect on my own family. They live on a first nation in a rural community next to a large urban centre, and they have been noticing that immigration has been mismanaged by the Liberal government. They feel forgotten in the conversation on how to improve the management of immigration.

Certainly, we welcome people who come to this country who can contribute, with compassion, and who have something to offer to Canadians, and we can live in harmony, but at this time, as we talk about employment, job readiness and a worker shortage, an indigenous population has been there forever and has been underutilized. I would like to see the engagement of first nation communities so they are part of the immigration policy context.

Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC): Madam Speaker, before I dive into my comments on Bill C-12, I want to acknowledge that I was here 11 years ago on this date, October 22, when Parliament came under attack by a lone gunman. I want to publicly thank the Parliamentary Protective Service and the RCMP for the safety they provided to all members of the House.

I also want to acknowledge that, during that same series of events, Corporal Nathan Cirillo lost his life while being part of the ceremonial guard at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. Constable Samearn Son took a shot to the foot here in Parliament, and Constable Curtis Barrett was able to neutralize the threat. I want to acknowledge those individuals as well.

The Liberal government is asking Canadians to believe that Bill C-12 is different from Bill C-2 and is a new safeguard for the country. It is not. Behind the new title lies the same design: more intrusion, more bureaucracy and less freedom for Canadians. Conservatives will stand as the barrier between Canadians and any act that weakens their privacy or erodes their freedoms, and mistakes government control for public safety.

Bill C-12 must be fixed. When Conservatives forced the government to withdraw Bill C-2, it was more than another Liberal failure. That bill sought to give cabinet sweeping authority to collect and share potential personal data without judicial oversight. By stopping it, we reminded the government and our country that freedom in Canada is not a privilege granted by the government but a charter right, which we will not tolerate being trampled on by the Liberal

government. The withdrawal of Bill C-2 proved that a determined opposition can still discipline a government that has grown careless with its authority and abuse of power.

When drafting Bill C-2, the government did not consult the Privacy Commissioner before proposing to grant itself warrant-free access to Canadians' financial and digital records. The text of Bill C-2, and now echoes of it in Bill C-12, envisioned power to retrieve information from banks and telecommunications providers as the "Minister considers necessary". Wow. There would be no court order, no independent review and no safeguard against those kinds of abuses. A government that can reach into private accounts and call it protection is not defending citizens; it is blatant overreach. Rather than protection, it is control over them, and Canadians deserve better than governance by surveillance.

Law-abiding Canadians should not forfeit their freedoms to pay for the government's negligence at the border. Years of weak enforcement and negligent immigration management have left Canada vulnerable to the very criminal networks that the bill claims to confront. Rather than tightening entry controls, the government has turned inward, treating every citizen as a potential suspect.

Bill C-12 is not a defence of sovereignty, but an admission that the government has been unable or unwilling to control those who seek to enter illegally, so it will instead attempt to control its citizens. Until the government can provide the security and protection of our freedoms and sovereignty, Canadians will be the ones who bear the consequences of bad Liberal policies, policies they never asked for.

Years ago, Justin Trudeau said that he admired what he called the "basic dictatorship" of Communist China. Those remarks were not casual. They revealed a mindset that efficiency matters more than consent, that control is strength and that democracy is a hindrance to decisive rule. Yet again, the Liberal government is demonstrating that it still thinks like Justin Trudeau.

Government Orders

Bill C-12 carries the same impulse. Translated into law, it hides coercion in the language of administration. It expands government access to personal data, centralizes authority in ministerial hands and calls this intrusion public safety. The bill would empower officials to require any person to provide any information relevant to the minister's determination. These are not targeted, investigative powers; they are open-ended instruments of surveillance disguised as administration. Canadians should believe the Liberals when they say things like this. The Liberal project has been to replace accountability with administrative control, one regulation, one surveillance clause and one warrantless power at a time.

Now the government has returned with Bill C-12, revised in wording, but unchanged in purpose. Canadians have learned what that means: less privacy, more bureaucracy and another significant overreach into their lives under the banner of safety.

● (1620)

We will examine every line, every clause and every authority that Bill C-12 would grant. We will ensure there are no hidden regulations that would turn oversight into surveillance. We are not a passive opposition; we are now the country's safeguard in Parliament.

Canadians may have elected the Liberal government, but we will still protect them from its overreach. We will defend their right to live free from suspicion, to transact without intrusion and to remain citizens, not data points in a government database.

Bill C-12 would do nothing to correct the failures of the bail system, which releases violent offenders back into our streets. A government serious about justice would not tolerate repeat offenders moving drugs and weapons while communities bear the costs. The reality is that Canadians are living with the consequences of a system that mistakes leniency for progress.

True public safety begins with control of the border and certainty of punishment. Those who traffic fentanyl, smuggle weapons or endanger lives must face penalties appropriate to the crime and ones that will keep our citizens safe. A government that fails to enforce its own law creates conditions for chaos. A nation that cannot or will not secure its border cannot guarantee the security of its people.

On sentencing, the failures are unmistakable. Bill C-12 leaves untouched the absence of mandatory prison time for those who traffic in fentanyl, an offence that destroys Canadian families and communities every single day. It introduces no new mandatory penalties for gang members who commit crimes with illegal firearms. The government imposes restrictions on law-abiding hunters and farmers while failing to strengthen penalties for those who commit crimes with illegal firearms, which is by far the vast majority of gun-related crimes.

This inversion of justice reveals a deeper problem: the failure to connect law with consequence. Deterrence works only when punishment is certain and proportionate. Without it, every sentence becomes a suggestion and every criminal learns that Canada will forgive what it refuses to prevent.

A government that governs without moral distinction cannot preserve order. When there is virtually no distinction between crime

and compliance and they are treated alike, the rule of law decays. Canadians do not ask for vengeance; they ask for accountability. They ask for a justice system that protects the innocent, restrains the violent, re-establishes moral clarity in law and provides appropriate punishments for criminals.

Even for serious violent offences, Bill C-12 would continue to permit house arrest. A criminal who has shattered lives should not complete punishment on the couch in his living room playing Xbox. The government calls this rehabilitation. In truth, it signals that consequences have been replaced by convenience.

When justice no longer imposes real cost on wrongdoing, crime becomes just another risk of the trade for those who profit from it. For those who are accountants and listening today, criminals do a cost-benefit analysis as well and have obviously determined that under the Liberal justice system, the cost is worth the potential benefit. This is so wrong.

The measure of justice is not leniency but credibility. Every time the government offers comfort to those who destroy others' lives, it destroys the authority of law and the safety of the public. If the government will not restore the proportion between crime and punishment, Parliament must.

The government's tolerance of so-called safe consumption sites near schools is a direct failure of responsibility and is abhorrent. No responsible nation permits narcotics facilities near schools and describes it as public health policy. These neighbourhoods deserve order, not policy experimentation presented as compassion by a woke government.

What the government calls harm reduction has become harm relocation, shifting the crisis from alleyways to doorsteps and from addicts to families. Leadership demands drawing lines, and the first line must always be to protect the innocent.

Canadians are watching a government that punishes the law-abiding citizen while excusing repeat offenders. It expands bureaucracy, weakens enforcement and governs through regulation instead of principle.

The Conservatives stand for something different. We stand for a nation where law protects the innocent, not the offender, where privacy belongs to the citizen, not to the government, and where power is exercised under restraint, not carelessly or impulsively. Real leadership defends the public without breaking its confidence. Real justice distinguishes guilt from innocence instead of confusing both through bureaucratic process.

Government Orders

Bill C-12 fails every one of those tests. It would add layers of control but no layers of accountability. It would strengthen institutions while breaking public confidence. It calls expanded surveillance “security” and judicial leniency “reform”.

• (1625)

As Conservatives, we will defend Canadians and ensure the government, once again, serves them rather than manages them. Canada deserves order rooted in freedom, justice grounded in truth and leadership that governs with courage instead of suspicion. That is what Conservatives will restore.

Will Greaves (Victoria, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I thank the member opposite for his comments and for expressing some sentiments we hear in communities across the country. Canadians are aware there are challenges in our cities and they have turned to the government and the leadership of the Prime Minister—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): I see a member is rising on a point of order. He will not be recognized because he is not in his seat.

The hon. member for Victoria.

Will Greaves: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague opposite for his remarks and for expressing sentiments that many Canadians share. We have challenges in our cities that require focused attention and require policy revisions, and that is what the government is taking on board. That is exactly the set of commitments that has already been announced and will be released in legislation forthcoming this week.

Does the member agree that one of the changes being called for by stakeholders across the country to address some of these challenges has to do with reforming our bail system? This means that people who are repeat violent offenders or repeat chronic offenders will no longer be on our streets creating some of the urban disorder that is ultimately leading to some of the challenges and social disruptions that the member is concerned about.

Ted Falk: Madam Speaker, I thank the member for Victoria for acknowledging many of the things I said in my speech. The lack of accountability, the lack of real consequences for repeat violent offenders and doing things like putting injection sites next to schools are all creating many problems in society and in our communities.

I applaud the member for his recognition of the things I identified in my speech. Together, I hope we can move legislation forward that will protect Canadians better, while not intruding on their privacy.

• (1630)

[*Translation*]

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot—Acton, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to know if my colleague agrees with us and with the customs officers' union. We all agree that there is a staffing problem. It is all well and good to say that staffing levels are going to be increased. It is time to do it. I am not minimizing the issue. There is a staffing problem; there is a staff shortage.

Does my colleague agree that Canada Border Services Agency officers should be allowed to patrol between border crossings? It is

not a matter of doing the RCMP's job for them, but about bringing more operational flexibility.

[*English*]

Ted Falk: Madam Speaker, of course, we were very disappointed in the Liberal government's failure to hire the 1,000 CBSA officers that were promised and would have strengthened our security at our borders.

Would we support expanding the authority that CBSA officers have in between ports, as they only have jurisdiction within a certain perimeter around each port of entry? I think that should be looked at and considered. It is not a bad idea. We need to strengthen our borders.

Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Madam Speaker, I understand that, at the health committee, one of our colleagues called on the Liberals to shut down fentanyl consumption sites next to areas with children. However, the Liberal health minister refused to rule out approving more consumption sites next to schools and day cares, despite acknowledging the fentanyl usage in the area.

I live in an area where there is a school downtown and I watch parents walk with their children in the morning out of apprehension. At 4:00 in the morning, there are cleaners out washing the streets because of the dynamics around two consumption sites in my community and near a school.

What would the member say in response to the fact that this is an issue related to families, children and safety in our communities? Police sirens and ambulances are heard night and day. People are living on the street and in the corners of retail spaces in the area where I walk to and from work.

Can the member expand more on how this is even allowed? It is incomprehensible when we think about the value of our children and families.

Ted Falk: Madam Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member from Saskatchewan for her observations about the damage being done by these supervised injection sites. It is reprehensible and abhorrent that some of these sites are located next to schools where children are exposed to that kind of activity. They also have to be careful that they avoid used needles and other debris and carnage from that kind of activity. I think that needs to be addressed.

I do not think there should be any supervised injection sites at all in Canada. I think we need to treat people. We need to give them hope. We need to help them out of their addiction—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): We are out of time.

Hon. Bardish Chagger: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I did not want to ruin the member's clip, but I think being accurate in this place is important. Applications are made to Health Canada, which can approve or deny them, but Health Canada does not pick the location. Conservatives should stop misleading Canadians.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): That is debate.

[*Translation*]

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 Haldimand—Norfolk, Justice; the hon. member for Nunavut, Northern Affairs; the hon. member for Terra Nova—The Peninsulas, Oil and Gas Industry.

[*English*]

Vincent Ho (Richmond Hill South, CPC): Madam Speaker, after 10 years of Liberal failure, Canadians now face a cost of living crisis, a crime crisis, a housing crisis and a border crisis, and the government has the nerve to stand up here today and pretend that Bill C-12 will strengthen Canada's immigration systems and borders.

This bill will not fix our immigration system and does not protect Canadians. It does little to stop the flow of fentanyl, guns, gangsters or illegal crossings, and most certainly does not defend the rights and freedoms of law-abiding Canadians. This bill is the second attempt at a failed Liberal bill, Bill C-2, which, of course, the Liberals did not spend much time working on over the summer.

Before we even get into Bill C-12, we have to remember how we got here. About a month ago, the Liberals tried to ram through Bill C-2, which would have given them sweeping, warrantless powers to seize Canadians' personal information from banks and telecoms. There would be no warrants, judicial oversight, transparency or respect for the charter or Canadians.

It was so abusive, invasive and offensive to our democratic tradition that the Privacy Commissioner confirmed the Liberals did not even bother to consult him. The Liberals planned a mass surveillance power grab and hoped Canadians would not notice. The Liberals got caught and Conservatives forced them to back down, go back to the drawing board and rewrite this bill.

That is the only reason we are debating Bill C-12 today, because the Liberals' first attempt was exposed as a direct assault on Canadians' privacy, freedom and basic civil liberties. Law-abiding Canadians will not be treated like criminals just because Liberals cannot control the border that they themselves have broken.

Now the Liberals are back with Bill C-12, promising that this time it is different. Conservatives scrutinize every line, every clause, every hidden catch, to ensure the Liberals are not sneaking in another assault on Canadians' rights, freedoms and civil liberties. The Liberal government has forfeited the benefit of the doubt. The Liberal government tried once to spy on Canadians without a warrant; only a fool would trust them a second time.

This bill barely touches on the number one border threat facing this country: the illegal flow of fentanyl, weapons and violent crim-

Government Orders

inals across our border. It makes no mention of the badly needed bail reform to the Liberals' catch-and-release, revolving-door justice system. It makes no reference to mandatory prison sentences when the Liberals brought house arrest to dozens of serious crimes, cracking down on fentanyl traffickers and gangs doing drive-bys in our once-safe neighbourhoods or hiring more CBSA officers, which the Liberals promised to do in their election platform.

Under the Liberal government, drug traffickers walk free on house arrest, gangsters avoid mandatory jail time and repeat violent offenders are released again and again under Liberal catch-and-release bail. None of this will stop a single fentanyl dealer or gun smuggler with real punishments and consequences.

The government actually believes that someone trafficking poison into our communities should be able to serve their sentence at home, on the couch, watching TV. Remember, the Liberals legalized hard drugs, they brought in taxpayer-funded hard drugs and flooded them into our streets and they also brought in drug consumption sites.

Conservatives believe that fentanyl traffickers and drug kingpins should be in prison and those possessing 40 milligrams or more should be treated like the mass murderers they are and should receive life imprisonment, yet this bill does absolutely nothing to change that.

The Liberals obsess over legal gun owners while doing absolutely nothing to put the gangsters behind bars. The Liberals target law-abiding hunters and farmers while letting fentanyl traffickers out on bail. It is backward and dangerous, and Canadians are paying the price.

While this border crisis spreads fentanyl into our communities, the Liberals are opening and defending drug consumption sites near schools and playgrounds.

Conservatives demanded not too long ago that the Liberals shut down overdose sites next to locations with children. What did the health minister have to say? They refused to rule out approving more drug-injection sites, even though they acknowledged that these sites are filled with rampant fentanyl use.

Government Orders

• (1635)

The Liberals will not reverse the policies that got us into this mess in the first place. The Liberals will not jail fentanyl traffickers. The Liberals will not stop illegal border flows. The Liberals will not ever protect school zones from drug consumption sites. This is not compassion; it is government-orchestrated chaos.

Let us talk about the reality that Bill C-12 pretends it would address, but would not. Canada now has three million temporary residents, over 7% of our population, and that number is going up every day. Canada now has 500,000 undocumented individuals, and that number is also going up every day. Canada has 300,000 asylum claims in the queue, and of course that is also growing every day. The result is that our housing market is collapsing, our health care is collapsing, our job market is collapsing and our communities are simply overwhelmed. The Liberals created chaos, and now they want more power, not to fix it, but to cover up the mess they made.

Let us not forget how much this border crisis is costing taxpayers. Conservatives uncovered just how badly the Liberals have mismanaged the interim federal health program. Under their Liberal government, federal health care costs for asylum claimants have exploded to \$456 million per year, representing a 1,186% increase since 2016. Coverage includes benefits that many Canadians pay for out of pocket or do not receive at all, including vision care, counselling, physiotherapy, assistive devices, home care, nursing homes and pharmaceuticals.

Canadians are a compassionate people, but is it really fair for non-citizens to get health care coverage that Canadians themselves do not receive?

There has been a 376% increase in claims and a 1,100% increase in reimbursements since the Liberals took office. The Liberals spent \$1.1 billion on hotels for asylum claimants and gave \$1.5 billion more to provinces for refugee costs, while Canadian citizens wait in ER hallways, seniors cannot get long-term care and families cannot find a family doctor.

Canadians are compassionate, but is it really fair that non-citizens get better benefits than Canadians and law-abiding newcomers alike who have paid their taxes and paid their dues their entire lives? Only the Liberals could think that was an acceptable situation.

The Liberal Prime Minister and his Liberal MPs have created a system where Canadians wait, Canadians sacrifice, Canadians pay and everyone else gets priority. Canadians have been paying into our health care system for their entire lives. Our seniors and families all across Canada deserve to reap the rewards of their hard work by getting health care when they need it. Instead, our health care system is already overwhelmed and overcapacity, and Canadian seniors cannot get the treatment they need. It is not sustainable.

Canadians are a proud and caring people, but unvalidated asylum seekers should not be getting better benefits than Canadians do. We need immediate reform. The Liberals call that compassion, but I call it betrayal of Canadian taxpayers. This is not sustainable, it is not fair and Canadians expect more from this Liberal government.

Let us expose this bill's failures every step of the way and make sure that it works for Canadians. Conservatives will always stand up for secure borders; privacy and freedom; jail, not bail for fentanyl traffickers and violent criminals; no more drug sites next to schools; and an immigration system that is fair, sustainable and puts Canadians first. Because compassion must have limits, immigration must be lawful and sovereignty must be preserved. This country is worth fighting for. Our borders matter, our safety matters, our freedom matters, our privacy matters and Canadians matter. Conservatives will always stand up and fight for hard-working Canadians.

The Liberals continue to distract from a border crisis, a crime crisis and an immigration crisis entirely of the Liberal government's making. The bill would not fix the problem; it would not stop the flow of drugs, guns, gangs or illegal crossings that are flowing over the border at record levels. We will not let the Liberals use the bill as a back door to violate the privacy, rights and freedoms of Canadians again.

Conservatives will fight for Canadians. We will fight to restore public safety on our streets, secure our border, restore our sovereignty and put Canadians first once again.

• (1640)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, someone saying something does not necessarily mean it is a reflection of reality. Let me give a specific example.

This member and other Conservatives have consistently been saying "injection sites" and been critical of the federal government. To be very clear, the injection sites are the provinces' responsibility, and they are the ones that ultimately give consent as to where those injection sites go. The Conservatives are saying that Ottawa should override a provincial responsibility, but they do not say that. Instead, they try to give the impression that the federal government wants injection sites by playgrounds, which is just wrong, and I find in the comments they often give in the speeches the same sort of thing. A simple statement is expressed, but when I dig into it, I find out that it is exceptionally misleading.

Why do Conservative members consistently do that?

Government Orders

• (1645)

Vincent Ho: Madam Speaker, this is another example of the Liberals' trying to divide, deny and distract. Canadians are fed up. Over 50,000 Canadians have died from the opioid crisis, which is a higher death toll than from the Second World War. Liberals continue to do nothing about it.

Conservatives will lock up the fentanyl kingpins as the mass murderers that they are and keep them in prison for life, but the Liberals want to deny, deflect, divide and distract.

I have a question for the Liberal member: Will he stop the expansion of drug consumption sites next to schools, day cares and playgrounds?

[*Translation*]

Mario Simard (Jonquière, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am inclined to offer my colleague a word of advice. It is perfectly acceptable to be critical of a bill, but one still has to keep one foot in reality.

When I heard my colleague talking about fentanyl and supervised consumption sites earlier, his comments did not in any way reflect the message that we are getting from the experts who are trying to help people struggling with addictions.

During the election campaign, we supported a supervised consumption site that presented us with a lot of scientific evidence to show that these sites are an indispensable public health tool. Furthermore, I do not think that people are taking fentanyl at these sites.

It is the same thing with firearms. No one has been able to give me an example of a hunting weapon that has been made illegal. Assault weapons have been made illegal, but hunting weapons have not. The duty of a legislator is to provide information to the public, and we have to be careful about what information we are providing.

[*English*]

Vincent Ho: Madam Speaker, I find it very rich. The member is asking for information, so let me give him some. This is from the Health Canada website. Is Health Canada also misleading? The Liberal member keeps accusing members of the House of misleading Canadians.

According to the Health Canada website, again, fentanyl and its analogues were involved in 33% of opioid-related poisoning visits to the emergency department from January to June 2024. The number of all opioid-related poisoning emergency department visits that involve fentanyl and its analogues has increased 106% since 2018, when national surveillance began. This is a real problem. It is not just killing Canadians. It is not just ripping up families. It is not just destroying communities and causing trauma for loved ones. It is also overwhelming our health care system.

Conservatives will take action. The Liberals will continue to distract, defy and deny.

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

My hon. colleague was just asked a question by the member for Winnipeg North. The member intimated that nobody wants safe in-

jection sites next to schools. I think that we can all agree with that. Where I part company with the Liberal Party is on whether we will permit safe injection sites near schools.

The problem is that under the current regime, there have been safe injection sites that are far too close to vulnerable people. Does my hon. colleague agree with this, and would he like to expand, because clearly these things are happening far too close to vulnerable populations and nothing is being done? It is not a matter of wanting it; it is a matter—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member for Richmond Hill South has the floor.

Vincent Ho: Madam Speaker, when I was campaigning for the election and was knocking on doors, parents told me that they do not want their kids to be stepping on needles when they go to the park to play.

Leah Gazan (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Madam Speaker, I rise today quite disturbed and deeply disappointed that despite the widespread criticism of Bill C-2 from civil liberties groups, migrant groups, experts and human rights advocates, the Liberals are attempting to repackage pretty much the same bill under a new title, Bill C-12, which has so many of the same alarming and unacceptable abuses of international law and charter rights.

The revised border security bill would maintain a host of the government's new immigration powers introduced in Bill C-2, including the ability to limit immigration applications and cancel existing documents when the government deems it to be in the public interest, all the while pushing through huge, overreaching powers for the Prime Minister and his cabinet. I am the proud representative of Winnipeg Centre, home to 70% of refugees who move into Manitoba. They are my neighbours and my friends, and they have a right to have their human rights upheld.

The bill has raised much concern, including what experts are flagging as a detrimental impact on women and LGBTQ people.

We know what the bill is about. It is not about border security, from my perspective, but about appeasing a leader to the south who is showing us more every day that he would even have the military go after his own citizens. It is about appeasing a right-wing, authoritarian leader in the White House. We know his immigration policy includes ICE's ordering masked federal officers to go into communities and arrest people, individuals whose human rights are protected under international law.

It is funny to me to watch the member for Winnipeg North across the way smiling during my speech, when his constituency is in fact home to a vibrant and diverse immigrant population. It is a border that I am very proud to share—

Government Orders

• (1650)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): The government chief whip is rising on a point of order.

Hon. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, the member for Winnipeg North and I were having a conversation, and then we overheard his name being mentioned by the member in her speech—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): It was not his name but his constituency.

Hon. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, it was his constituency. The point is that the member is making an outlandishly false claim right now by suggesting that he was laughing or smiling at her in a mocking way. That simply was not the case, and she should not be engaging in that kind of activity—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): I was not actually looking, but the hon. member was making her speech and has a certain leeway in what she can say in it.

The hon. member for Winnipeg Centre has the floor.

Leah Gazan: Madam Speaker, we know that much of what is happening in the States with attacks on immigrants and attacks on asylum seekers is primarily impacting people of colour in cities across the United States. I do not want Canada to appease the kind of racist, dogmatic, fascist behaviour that we are seeing south of the border.

Just as in the case of the unconstitutional Bill C-5, Bill C-12 would create power for cabinet to create “Orders Made in the Public Interest”. This would give the government an unchecked power to stop receiving applications for visas and for other residency permits, to suspend processing of immigration applications and to target measures against “certain foreign nationals”.

There is no definition of “public interest” in Canadian law, and no explanation in the bill, so how do we know that the Liberal cabinet, or any future cabinet, would not in fact pursue its own interests or, worse yet, the interests of the Trump administration through this unconstitutional legislation?

The bill would also be very problematic for the safety of women and girls. Several women's organizations, in fact, including Women's Shelters Canada, the Canadian Women's Foundation and the Women's Legal Education and Action Fund, stated, “Survivors of...violence are uniquely harmed by arbitrary timelines and restricted pathways in immigration, which deny survivors the ability to seek protection when they most need it. Any changes to C-2 that do not remove the immigration provisions will continue to put vulnerable women at risk.”

A broad coalition of civil liberties groups, data privacy organizations, refugee and migrant rights organizations and gender justice organizations strongly opposes the government's introduction of Bill C-12, which seeks to fast-track rather than address many aspects of Bill C-2's myriad problems. In fact, a coalition of over 300 organizations is reiterating its call for a full withdrawal of both bills. That coalition includes Amnesty International, the Canadian Civil Liberties Association, the British Columbia Civil Liberties Association, the Canadian Labour Congress, the United Church of Canada, the Migrant Rights Network and the Canadian Council for Refugees.

Tim McSorley, who is part of the International Civil Liberties Monitoring Group, indicated:

Bill C-12 does not fix Bill C-2; it fast tracks some of the most egregious aspects, while still moving forward with the rest. Our government has made it abundantly clear that they will continue to fight for every privacy-violating measure Bill C-2 still contains, and are only introducing Bill C-12 to get restrictions on migrant and refugee rights adopted sooner.

As parliamentarians, we are obliged to uphold international law, and that includes international conventions that we are signatories to, including for international human rights that grant asylum seekers the right to seek protection from prosecution. This is most notable in article 14 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in the 1951 Refugee Convention. A core principle is non-refoulement, which means that countries are prohibited from returning refugees to a place where their life or freedom is at risk. Countries are obliged to assess asylum claims fairly and protect refugees from being sent back to danger.

I think about the number of refugees who have made Winnipeg Centre their home, whom I am proud to now have as neighbours and who fled life-and-death circumstances. We have a legal obligation to not close our borders to them.

• (1655)

Article 14 states, “Everyone has the right to seek and to enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution.” Article 14 further notes that this right does not apply to those genuinely prosecuted for non-political crimes or acts against the UN principles.

This is a fundamental principle: the principle of non-refoulement. This fundamental principle of international law is also found in other international human rights treaties that we are signatories to. It prohibits the forced return of refugees to a country where they face a serious threat to their life or freedom. This is considered a customary international law that applies to all countries.

I felt very strongly about the NDP's position on this particular bill, a bill that would violate international law. It is a bill that, in fact, would violate the rule of law. It is a bill that would have an impact on our reputation around the world and that feeds into the racist, anti-immigrant, xenophobic tropes that we are seeing coming from the south. Let us put silence on that voice and let us be what Canada has always been, a home welcoming to all.

• (1700)

Frank Caputo (Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is always a pleasure to rise on behalf of the people of Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola. I am hoping to work together with my colleague on a private member's bill that I put forward with respect to an area of mutual interest.

It is interesting that the member spoke about immigration, because my parents, as I have spoken about many times, emigrated from Italy to Canada. Therefore, I owe everything I have to immigration. Standing on this green carpet was an immigrant's dream really, so that just caught my ear.

Government Orders

With respect to Bill C-12, the member talked about immigration. If she could have one amendment, sitting at the committee table, is there anything else that she sees in Bill C-12 that she would point to that must be addressed?

Leah Gazan: Madam Speaker, I appreciate my colleague's very thoughtful question. I support the more than 300 civil liberties organizations that are saying we need to get rid of the bill. I am ashamed, as a member of Parliament and as a legislator, that we are being forced to vote on a bill that is in direct violation of the rule of law and is in direct violation of conventions we have signed on to. We need to listen to those recommendations and take them seriously. If the bill should be salvageable, which I do not believe it is, then we need to pretty much write a whole new bill.

John-Paul Danko (Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I thank the member opposite for continually raising some of the very troubling issues that we are seeing from the U.S. administration south of the border. One aspect in particular is the tendency to use the justice system as retaliation against political foes. I wonder if the member opposite has any comments on the Leader of the Opposition's comments and bringing that style of U.S. justice system retaliation against political foes to Canada.

Leah Gazan: Madam Speaker, certainly that is irresponsible of a leader, but the Liberals are abusing their powers as government to violate international law and give cabinet and the Prime Minister unprecedented amounts of power. With all due respect to the member across the way, he needs to clean up his own backyard in addition to commenting on others.

[*Translation*]

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot—Acton, BQ): Madam Speaker, there are fairly significant differences of opinion between the Bloc Québécois and the NDP but, on the issue of workers' rights, I think we can often find common ground.

In this particular case, a customs union has commented on the bill, saying that they have been making demands for many years yet nobody is listening to them and they are not being consulted, either on this matter or in several others, which has led to the disastrous results we are now familiar with.

Does my colleague agree that the government should listen more closely to the union representing the workers who make sure our borders are secure, day in and day out?

[*English*]

Leah Gazan: Madam Speaker, we are targeting the wrong people with the bill, quite frankly. When Trump accused Canada of being a key exporter of fentanyl across the border, that was a bunch of hooy.

We talk about workers, and the bill would impact migrant workers. We know that the most exploited workers are migrant workers. Migrant workers are protected under international law. The bill would violate the rights of migrant workers, refugees and asylum seekers, as well as people's civil liberties. We need to get rid of the bill and replace it with a bill that addresses the concern without attacking immigrants, refugees and migrants.

• (1705)

[*Translation*]

Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable—Lotbinière, CPC): Madam Speaker, before I begin my speech, I want to take a moment to thank Divya Dey, who is participating in the parliamentary internship program and who gave me the great privilege of choosing me for her first stint with a member of the House of Commons. She is a brilliant and dynamic young woman from the Greater Toronto Area who speaks excellent French and who chose a member from a rural region in Quebec. I hope that many people from Toronto will do the same thing and follow her example in order to discover the beautiful regions of Quebec.

Today Divya helped me research and write this speech. Obviously, I added the partisan side of my speech myself because interns have to remain non-partisan during their time with us. I wanted to warn people that some of the passages are my own creation. I congratulate all the interns on their achievements and thank the organizers and sponsors of this wonderful program, which gives young Canadians the opportunity to experience first-hand the decision-making process on our beautiful Parliament Hill.

Let me get back to today's topic, namely Bill C-12. Before going into the details of the bill, I would like to take a step back and look at the big picture of what this Liberal government has done in 10 years. Since this Prime Minister was elected, I believe that we have witnessed the largest pothole repair operation in Canadian history.

What is a pothole? After a long, hard winter, when the snow melts, we discover that our roads are full of holes. There are big ones, little ones, huge ones and potholes in the making. There are holes everywhere, especially in the municipalities. Just before summer, at the turn of spring, municipal road crews get to work filling as many holes as possible as quickly as possible to keep them from getting bigger, to prevent cars from breaking down and to ensure pedestrians do not get hurt. I have no doubt that all this is done with the best of intentions.

However, anything goes when it comes to filling holes. They act quickly. They know that what they are repairing will not really be repaired because it is just a quick fix. They will have to come back a little later. They intervene for appearances' sake, knowing full well that the repairs are cosmetic, which means that instead of being fixed, the problem will get worse year after year. The following year, they will have to come back because the hole will be a little bigger. If it is only a quick fix, they will have to come back again the year after that.

What does this have to do with Bill C-12? Before the members opposite ask me that question, I will explain. It is very simple. It is as though we are coming out of an extremely long 10-year winter during which the Liberals dug holes everywhere. There are potholes in every department after 10 years of Liberal mismanagement. Whether we are talking about justice, immigration, passports or delays at the Canada Revenue Agency, there are potholes everywhere after the long Liberal winter.

Government Orders

I did not talk about the biggest pothole of all, and that is the country's finances. That is the biggest pothole of all with a deficit that has doubled and inflationary spending that has created many smaller holes in the pockets of all Canadians, who can no longer make ends meet at the end of the month. Canadians are \$200 away from being in the red, from no longer being able to pay their bills at the end of the month. They are struggling and they are being forced to make tough choices at the grocery store.

Today, the Liberals would have us believe that spring is right around the corner. They have looked under the snow after 10 years in power, and what they saw was really not pretty. Their woke Liberal ideological policies have caused a great deal of damage, and Canadians will be left to pay the price for years to come.

As I said, a pothole repair operation is a superficial fix that is not used to repair holes for good, but rather to simply fill them in. After how badly Bill C-2 failed, Bill C-12 is a superficial fix to tackle the damage caused by the Liberals over the past 10 years. By the way, this part was not written by my intern. I just want to clarify that.

• (1710)

Let us talk about immigration. The government made our businesses dependent on temporary foreign workers. Now, with Bill C-12, the government is going to punish the very people it made promises to when they decided to come settle here in Canada. This is not just about compassion. It is contradictory. The government made our businesses dependent on these workers and now it is trying to break that dependency without a plan, leaving businesses and workers in limbo. Most importantly, the government is forgetting that those affected are human beings with children, families and a dream, a dream of settling in Canada.

In the beginning, the temporary foreign worker program had the very specific goal of addressing temporary labour shortages. However, under the Liberals, this program grew and it became a permanent solution to problems that the government refused to address. This program was working well and meeting its objectives, but the Liberals created so much chaos and neglected the program so much that, today, people who should be able to go through the proper channels no longer have time to do so because the system is so broken.

Bill C-12 is not fixing the problem of temporary workers. This bill would make it harder for all these people, whom we welcomed with open arms after the former prime minister sent a tweet inviting them to come to Canada. This message was heard across the country, but today, it is making many people unhappy. We have all heard about it in our riding offices. This improvised approach hurt people, it hurt families and it hurt businesses.

After a decade of the Liberals' absolutely disastrous mismanagement of the immigration system, the number of refugee claims has risen to 296,000 today. That is huge. Think about it. Ten years ago, we only had 10,000 and now, we have 296,000. At the current pace, it would take the government 25 years to process the 296,000 pending files. Let that sink in. It is absolutely unacceptable. It is a disaster. The Liberal government's attitude to immigration as a whole has created some really desperate situations that are heartbreaking for the people experiencing them.

Let us now turn our attention to crime. I will let the numbers speak for themselves. After 10 years of Liberal governance, the total number of violent crimes is up 49.84%. Homicides are up 28%. Gang-related homicides are up 78%. Sexual assaults are up 74%. Extortion is up 357%. What action did the Liberals take last winter to protect Canadians? They took no action. On the contrary, they made the situation worse by passing legislation like Bill C-5 and Bill C-75, which set criminals loose, let abusers serve their sentences at home and forced judges to let criminals go as fast as possible.

Sadly, since taking office seven months ago, this Prime Minister has done nothing to act on his promises. Bill C-12 may close a few loopholes, but it will not quiet the fears of Canadians who have never before seen their country change as much as it has in the past 10 years of this long Liberal winter.

Time is flying by. The Liberals would have us believe that spring is coming. However, they have not even started fixing the potholes, and winter already seems to be right around the corner. Never before have we seen a pothole repair be botched so badly. This Prime Minister promised to spend less, but he is spending twice as much as his predecessor. He promised to maintain the deficit, but we now know that it will be much bigger than the one predicted by Canada's most spendthrift prime minister before him. They are not repairing potholes; they are digging more and making them bigger. We were seeing the first signs of spring, but instead we are in for another storm of Liberal spending.

Just today, the Prime Minister confirmed in the House that he will run a generational deficit on November 4. They are not fooling us. Bill C-12 will plug a few holes, but the root causes of the Liberal legacy of the past 10 years will unfortunately remain.

• (1715)

[English]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, as members can see, the member opposite is getting excited about November 4. There will be a lot of wonderful things for Canadians in the budget. He will find that it will be a reflection of what Canadians have been telling this government for months now.

Government Orders

The new Prime Minister has made it very clear, whether on asylum, temporary permits or permanent residents, that we want to stabilize things. That is the goal of the government and the Prime Minister, and we are moving in the right direction with respect to that. Bill C-12 is a significant step forward. It is like in 2010-11, when asylum was a major issue and the Harper government brought in changes to the asylum system. At times, we need to make changes, whether for the pandemic or the international student issue, something that was created through the provinces, post-secondary institutions and a lot of private institutions. We have to take some responsibility on that, but it is being fixed.

I wonder if my friend could provide his thoughts with regard to the new Prime Minister and how we are stabilizing the immigration file.

[*Translation*]

Luc Berthold: Madam Speaker, is the House familiar with the concept of a pyromaniac firefighter? Essentially, it is when a person starts a fire and then sits by the phone waiting for a call to come in saying that there is a fire for them to go put out. The person causes problems and then tries to pretend to fix the problems that they themselves caused.

The Liberals say that a new Prime Minister means a new approach. They say that they now realize they created some problems but that they are going to fix everything. The trouble is that it is the same government, the same actors, the same people. In fact, the Prime Minister is the same person who advised the former prime minister to make his bad decisions.

It is six of one and half a dozen of the other. The government is like a pyromaniac firefighter with a hero complex. What it is offering are superficial fixes.

Mario Simard (Jonquière, BQ): Madam Speaker, I agree with many of the observations my colleague raised about the Conservatives' negligence in matters of immigration. I am sorry, I meant to say "Liberals". I quite agree with him regarding asylum seekers, and Quebec has taken in more than its share of asylum seekers without being able to benefit from the money that should have come back to us from Ottawa.

However, I would like my colleague to elaborate on temporary foreign workers. The Leader of the Opposition made some unfortunate comments about temporary foreign workers stealing the jobs of good Canadians. I do not know about my colleague, but in my riding, that was very negatively perceived because many people in the manufacturing sector, for example, need these skilled workers, who are so much more than just cheap labour. These are people with expertise who are keeping viable businesses in the regions, thereby generating considerable economic activity.

I would like to hear my colleague's thoughts on that.

Luc Berthold: Madam Speaker, I think that my colleague is still a bit confused. He mixed up the Liberals and the Conservatives, and I think his statements are still a bit muddled. As I see things, it was the Liberal government that lowered the thresholds. When they were lowered from 30 to 20 and from 20 to 10 overnight, without any warning to businesses, families or workers that this was coming, that was a Liberal decision.

I know that my colleague is eager for the Conservatives to be in power so that he can criticize them, as we saw at the start of his intervention. Right now, however, the situation we are in was caused by the Liberals' ineptitude, incompetence and negligence in matters of immigration.

I would just like to remind my colleague that he can ask the Liberals some pointed questions on this matter too. The Conservatives are not to blame for the situation we are in today.

[*English*]

Tako Van Popta (Langley Township—Fraser Heights, CPC): Madam Speaker, my colleague made mention of a poorly thought-out social media post by the former prime minister, who said Canada is open, come on over, and a flood of refugees followed. I cannot help but make the comparison to another world leader who also makes poorly thought-out social media posts, shaping government policy on the fly.

I would like my colleague to comment on the negative impact that can have on our nation.

• (1720)

[*Translation*]

Luc Berthold: Madam Speaker, I can just say one thing: Canada will always be a country that is open to refugees who are truly in need. For refugees fleeing war and hardship, Canada will be open.

However, sending a tweet inviting the whole world to come settle in Canada and then forgetting about these people is unacceptable, immoral and, dare I say, heartless.

[*English*]

Matt Strauss (Kitchener South—Hespeler, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to have this opportunity to speak to Bill C-12. This is the fourth time I am speaking to a piece of government legislation in this Parliament.

For the first time, I think it is the story of the bill rather than its content that I find most interesting. I apologize to those following at home if it seems a little bit like inside baseball, but in every Parliament, the government introduces bills and numbers them sequentially. After the pro forma throne speech, Bill C-1, came Bill C-2. The present bill, Bill C-12, is the parts of Bill C-2 that had to be salvaged from the flaming dumpster fire of that original piece of legislation. It is as though the Liberals set their own legislative agenda on fire and the Conservatives had to comb through the charred remains to find something salvageable. What an embarrassment it is for the government.

Government Orders

The new Prime Minister ran on his expertise in government, having spent most of his career as a bureaucrat. He had been waiting in the wings for 10 years to plant his legislative agenda. Do members opposite remember when he was asked if he would ever become prime minister? He said, “Why don’t I become a circus clown?” Well, now he has. He has beclowned himself.

Bill C-2 is the very first piece of legislation that the Prime Minister's government introduced, and it had to be split up in this manner. What an embarrassment that is.

Why did it need to be split up? It is because the forefather of Bill C-12 contained clauses that were so howlingly bad that no one on either side of the House, nor from any coast in this country, could bring themselves to defend it.

Bill C-2 includes a provision that would allow the police to ask a doctor, without a warrant, if their services had ever been used by an individual. This is reprehensible. I am a physician; frankly, this does not just offend me as a Canadian and as a person, but it offends my whole profession. It would violate not just our Charter of Rights and Freedoms but the Hippocratic oath. If a member opposite or their child went to see a doctor who specializes in addictions, mental health, sexually transmitted diseases or reproductive medicine, on what possible planet would they think it was appropriate for the police to ask that physician to disclose them as a client?

Again, I suspect members opposite are getting ready to say that I am somehow being outlandish in my interpretation of their proposed law. Here, once again, I will read them their own darned bill.

In part 14, clause 158, it reads:

A peace officer or public officer may make a demand...to a person who provides services to the public requiring the person to provide, in the form, manner and time specified in the demand, the following information:

- (a) whether the person provides or has provided services to any subscriber or client

This is bananas. This is, once again, a Chinese Communist Party level of state overreach.

Once again, if the Liberals do not trust my interpretation of their legislation, the Canadian Civil Liberties Association's interpretation or the Canadian Constitution Foundation's interpretation, will they believe their own public safety minister, the one who introduced the legislation? He was quoted in *The Globe and Mail* in an October 9 article by Marie Woolf, entitled “Public Safety Minister says he wants to push through refined warrantless...powers to help police”. She wrote that the Minister of Public Safety acknowledged that the “provisions in Bill C-2, the original strong borders bill, [allowing police to ask a] doctor without a warrant” if their services had been used by someone, constituted “overreach”.

This is not the first time the Minister of Public Safety has had to throw the Minister of Public Safety under the bus. Who could forget that, just last month, he told his tenant that his own gun confiscation program was a bad idea that he did not support? I would love to believe that it is merely incompetence over there. It is incompetence; it is just not “merely” incompetence.

I am a physician. I do not sign prescriptions that I have not read. I do not give out prescriptions that I do not believe in, because prescriptions are important documents and I have a professional duty

to read them. On the other side of the House, we have a Liberal minister who seems not to read the legislation that he tries to pass in the House. On other occasions, he executes a gun grab he does not believe in. This sort of conduct would not be tolerated from any physician in this country. I dare say it would not be tolerated from any professional under any professional body in this country. Why does the Prime Minister tolerate it from one of the highest officeholders in this land?

As I said, it is not merely incompetence over there. I take it that the public safety minister did not write the legislation, but someone did. I want to know who, because this is not a one-off oopsy doopsy in which a junior staffer wrote a law that would violate the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. This is a clear pattern with the government.

The last three pieces of government legislation that I have debated in the House, Bill C-8, Bill C-9 and now Bill C-12 have involved significant power grabs by the Prime Minister. I want to know why.

Bill C-8 would allow the Liberals to kick people off the Internet without a warrant. Bill C-9 would allow the Liberals to police speech on the Internet. Bill C-12, in its previous iteration as Bill C-2, would not only violate patient-physician confidentiality but also allow the government to read letter mail without a warrant.

What is going on over there? Why is the Liberals' response to every conceivable social problem to violate our charter rights? Who is writing the legislation?

● (1725)

I know that as soon as I am done, the member for Winnipeg North will ask why we do not fix this at committee, to which I would say, yes, we are going to have to, but every member in this House should be protecting charter rights. The committee should not be the goalie. The Conservatives should not be the goalie. The Liberals should not be trying to get charter violations past the Conservative goalies. They are the Liberals. They are supposed to believe in liberty. I am honestly starting to wonder if they even know what their party's name means anymore.

Here is the Encyclopædia Britannica entry on “liberalism”:

political doctrine that takes protecting and enhancing the freedom of the individual to be the central problem of politics. Liberals typically believe that government is necessary to protect individuals from being harmed by others, but they also recognize that government itself can pose a threat to liberty.

Do the members opposite see themselves at all in this definition today? It has been six months since I was elected to this House, and not once, in between their power grabs, have I heard them make even passing reference to individual liberty or to the fact that the government itself can threaten that liberty.

Conservatives seek to conserve our liberty. Liberals are supposed to seek to expand our liberty. However, this is three times in six months they have tried to get one past us. I am asking them honestly to reflect on this. Are they even Liberals anymore, or have they become something darker? How is it that they have betrayed the Liberal tradition again and again in this House?

I would ask the Liberal backbenchers, in particular, if this is what they signed up to do when they took out a Liberal Party membership and if the Prime Minister's Office ran any of it by them before it tried to ram it through the House. Why do they not do the right thing and withdraw Bill C-2 entirely instead of trying to get it passed piecemeal?

One piece of Bill C-2, Bill C-12, is going to go to committee, but we must not forget the omnibus monstrosity from which it came. We must not forget the questions of competence that the story of Bill C-12 raises, and we must also not look away from the authoritarian tendencies of the so-called Liberals that this story reveals.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, those are interesting comments. When the leader of the Conservative Party sat around the Harper cabinet inside the Conservative caucus, they passed laws that did not meet the charter challenge. We had the superior courts actually rule them out of order. Now the member makes accusations about the current Liberal government or the past Liberal government. Can he cite any legislation that we have introduced that has gone against the charter, an actual bill that has been ruled as going against the charter in terms of individual rights? We are the party that brought in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

Matt Strauss: Mr. Speaker, I am so surprised to receive that question. I think I explained it to the member during my last two speeches on government legislation.

The Liberals violated the Charter of Rights and Freedoms when they imposed the Emergencies Act, sections 2 and 8. That is not me, but Justice Mosley of the Federal Court who found that. I would love to hear the member apologize for that violation.

Bill C-8, Bill C-9 and Bill C-2 also violate our charter. I am not going to let it get through the net.

Hon. Ginette Petitpas Taylor (Moncton—Dieppe, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I listened attentively to my colleague's speech today. He questioned at one point if we signed up to support this bill.

My question for the member opposite is this. Having worked for the RCMP for 23 years as a civilian member, I have seen the hard work of the many women of the RCMP, day in and day out. I have seen them put their lives on the line. I wonder if my colleague agrees with the leader of his party when he questioned the independence of the RCMP. Also, when the Leader of the Opposition indicated—

• (1730)

The Deputy Speaker: I have to interrupt the member to give the member for Kitchener South—Hespeler a chance to respond.

Matt Strauss: Mr. Speaker, I am heartened, I suppose, that the member opposite heard and understood the question. I am terribly

Private Members' Business

disheartened that she decided not to answer the question. I take it as a tacit admission that she does not support this legislation.

As for my leader's comments, it is my job here to criticize the appointments the government makes. Criticizing their appointments is well within what we as a democratic body have to do.

* * *

[*Translation*]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The Deputy Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed the following bill, to which the concurrence of the House is desired: Bill S-233, an act to amend the Criminal Code with regard to assault against persons who provide health services and first responders.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

CANADA'S INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

Hon. Ahmed Hussen (York South—Weston—Etobicoke, Lib.) moved:

That, in the opinion of the House, the government should strengthen the accountability, effectiveness, and mutual benefits of Canada's international development assistance by:

- (a) implementing new policies to ensure that Canadian international assistance programming integrates opportunities for reciprocal economic benefit, including through the participation of Canadian small and medium-sized enterprises, innovators, and workers;
- (b) establishing a dedicated Economic Partnerships Window to support projects that align poverty reduction abroad with economic security at home, and that utilize Canadian economic strengths such as clean energy, agriculture, digital technology, and education; and
- (c) requiring the Minister of International Development to report to Parliament annually on the extent of Canadian participation in international assistance projects, the measurable benefits for partner countries, and the economic opportunities created for Canadians.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Motion No. 14, a motion that embodies a simple but powerful idea, that Canada's generosity abroad should also help build opportunities at home.

For decades, Canadians have led with compassion, building schools, strengthening food systems, empowering women and literally saving lives across the world. We have done so not for recognition but because it is who we are. As the world changes, our development approach must change with it. We must continue to be generous but we must also be strategic, innovative and accountable.

Private Members' Business

The global development landscape has evolved dramatically. Today, many donor countries are pulling back, according to the OECD's 2024 report. International development assistance dollars have declined for the first time in years. Several major countries facing domestic pressures have cut back their international development dollars to the tune of billions.

Canada must not follow that path. We must do what we do best but do it even better. We must stay engaged, stay innovative and make our international assistance work for both our partners and our people.

The global economy is shifting. Emerging markets are no longer just recipients of aid; they are engines of growth. They are innovators. They are our trading partners. Nine out of the top 20 fastest-growing economies this year are in Africa. Countries like Rwanda, Niger, Senegal and Côte d'Ivoire are experiencing growth rates of between 6% to 11% per year. In Asia, the ASEAN region is now the fastest-growing economic bloc in the world, even surpassing the G7 on a per capita basis. In these regions, Canada has a depth of credibility. We are seen as long-term partners who have been there through thick and thin.

The first pillar of Motion No. 14 calls on us to embed reciprocal economic benefit within Canada's international assistance program. This is not about turning aid into trade. It is about aligning our compassion with our capabilities. When a Canadian clean energy start-up helps deploy solar microgrids in a Caribbean country, it not only lowers emissions abroad but it helps create skilled jobs right here in Canada.

When a Canadian agri-tech firm supports farmers in producing more and higher yields in East Africa, we not only get to tackle hunger over there but we also help Canada's agricultural innovation sector. When our colleges deliver digital skills training, we not only empower youth in the developing world, we also continue to enhance Canada's reputation as a leader in education. This pillar ensures that Canadian innovation becomes part of the world's solution to global challenges while ensuring that Canadians share in the opportunity that innovation creates.

The second pillar proposes the creation of a dedicated economic partnerships window. This window would bridge Canada's development priorities and our domestic economic strengths. It would support projects that advance poverty reduction and sustainable development abroad. It would strengthen Canadian sectors such as clean energy, agriculture, digital technology and education. It would mobilize small and medium-sized enterprises to become global problem-solvers. We already have glimpses of what this model looks like through FinDev Canada.

• (1735)

[*Translation*]

In 2022, FinDev invested \$8 million U.S. in the Central American small enterprise investment fund, which supports high-growth SMEs in the agri-food, manufacturing, education and information technology sectors in Central America and the Caribbean. The fund focuses on job creation, women's economic empowerment and local value chains.

[*English*]

In 2025, FinDev invested \$15 million U.S. in EcoEnterprises Partners, a women-led impact fund backing 20 SMEs in Latin America working in agritech, renewable energy, sustainable forestry and biodiversity conservation. This is exactly the kind of clean-growth collaboration this motion envisions. In Colombia, FinDev partnered with IDB Invest and the U.S. DFC on a \$319-million U.S. facility with Banco Davivienda, expanding financing for small and women-led businesses and for green projects.

These examples prove that Canadian finance, innovation and know-how can generate shared prosperity. A dedicated economic partnerships window would scale up this model by opening more pathways for Canadian SMEs and workers to plug into these global value chains.

The third pillar of Motion No. 14 would strengthen accountability. It would require the minister of international development to report annually to Parliament on the extent of Canadian participation in international development projects. It would also require the minister to table measurable benefits for partner countries, as well as economic opportunities created for Canadians right here at home. This transparency would ensure that every dollar of development assistance delivers a real impact, measurable progress and tangible benefits, both abroad and at home. It would turn good intentions into accountable outcomes.

This motion is not about changing who we are; it is about strengthening who we always have been. Canadians are compassionate, but we are also innovative, entrepreneurial and globally minded.

Motion No. 14 reflects a modern, confident Canada, one that sees international development not as a cost, but as an investment in shared prosperity. It tells the world that partnership is the future of aid and that Canada's economic security and global solidarity go hand in hand. By aligning our values with our strengths, we can make every act of assistance an act of opportunity in the world for Canadians.

I want to conclude by saying that I have seen first-hand the impact that Canadian international development and assistance programs have had on people's lives. From allowing people to access education and clean water to encouraging entrepreneurship and hope, Canada has always been a global leader in this field. What this motion seeks to do is build on that proud tradition and propel it into the future. It would ensure our aid remains generous, effective and accountable, but also smart, strategic and innovative.

When we help others, we rise with them, so let us pass Motion No. 14 and make Canada's international development policy a model of shared progress for a changing world.

• (1740)

Sukh Dhaliwal (Surrey Newton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the hon. member for the work he did as minister of immigration and minister responsible for international development.

He touched on how the motion would create opportunities for Canadians. Can he expand on how Canada's international development work can create and strengthen economic opportunities for Canadians?

Hon. Ahmed Hussen: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for his great work.

When we are more focused on and strategic in how we deliver international development projects, we can be more definitive in our ability to create more opportunities for small, medium and large Canadian enterprises. I will give an example. If we look at areas in which we have led the world, such as clean tech, agribusiness, education and digital skills training, we can find ways to bring forth SMEs so they can benefit while we help our partner countries.

Lianne Rood (Middlesex—London, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the text of the motion says it would establish a “dedicated Economic Partnerships Window to support projects that align poverty reduction abroad with economic security at home”. I am just wondering if the member could comment on that a little further and expand on the intention of that part of the motion.

Hon. Ahmed Hussen: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member opposite for that important question. It allows me to elaborate on what this motion is trying to do, which is to make sure that we enable small, medium and large enterprises in Canada to benefit from the global value chains that result from international development projects. International development projects are not only small, community-based projects. They can also be massive initiatives that bring in the private sector and bring in multiple countries to partner with us to make sure we are solving global challenges.

In that regard, those massive projects enable Canadian SMEs to not only showcase their innovation but also take advantage of those global value chains, thereby creating prosperity and jobs right here at home.

[*Translation*]

Mario Simard (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his very enlightening speech.

We know that things are tough right now when it comes to international co-operation because of the current global context. I also

Private Members' Business

know that my colleague is working closely with the member for Lac-Saint-Jean on this issue.

I would like to hear his thoughts on an amendment proposed by the member for Lac-Saint-Jean to ensure that the smaller centres of international co-operation and solidarity in the regions are not overlooked. They may be smaller in scale than the ones in major urban centres, but they are just as essential. I would like to hear my colleague's comments on that.

[*English*]

Hon. Ahmed Hussen: Mr. Speaker, I have had discussions with the member for Lac-Saint-Jean. He brings up an important point in his amendment. As we reinvigorate our international development program, we should always have space for small and medium-sized organizations that punch way above their weight. We should make sure we create processes that treat them equally and give them an equal chance at the investments we make around the world. We should also keep an eye on internationally minded small and medium-sized organizations in rural Canada.

[*Translation*]

Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this is a sad day for the House. With the Liberals, we are seeing the “Trumpification” of international co-operation and international aid, which are becoming transactional. In other words, what the Liberal government is essentially telling us today is that if something does not benefit the government, it will not help. That is not what international aid is all about. The point is to lift people out of poverty, to educate girls, to improve the future of humanity with common goals.

Why is the government taking such a hyper-capitalistic approach to international aid?

• (1745)

[*English*]

Hon. Ahmed Hussen: Mr. Speaker, that is completely not true. In my speech, I said Canada must not follow that path, the path of those countries that have cut international development dollars. We are treating our partners with respect, acknowledging their growth and innovation, and saying that Canadians should also benefit while we work to lift others outside of Canada.

Lianne Rood (Middlesex—London, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after 10 years of this Liberal government, we have seen nothing but consistent reckless spending. From arrive scam to the green slush fund of the last Parliament, Liberals just cannot seem to stop giving away taxpayer dollars to their friends and allies. We are six months post-election, and nothing has changed. With conflict of interest breaches circling the current Prime Minister, Canadians are in for another season of more Liberals getting rich off their wasted taxes.

Private Members' Business

I say all this as a preamble to the discussion at hand today on Motion No. 14, which is about Canada's international development assistance. After I read the motion, I reflected. This is from our current Liberal government. Words like "accountability" and "effectiveness" seem distant from the actions of the current and previous Liberal administrations. Under Conservative governments, these were not merely words, but pillars in the Conservative approach to international development.

The Prime Minister is looking to "rein in spending". As our Conservative leader has said, that is a goal worth co-operating on. Under the Liberal government, international development programming has been seen as overly generous, to the point of being wasteful. Programs have not been yielding results and have been ideologically leaning toward woke causes. There have also been reports of abuse and of development funding being misappropriated by terrorist groups or organizations sympathetic to terrorist causes.

The words and actions of this government are at odds. As Canadians struggle with high taxes, record food bank usage and an unaffordability crisis, the Secretary of State for International Development recently announced nearly \$140 million in overseas funding. Motion No. 14 serves as a request for the oversight the Liberals neglected when they got into power 10 years ago.

Canada's commitment to international assistance is rooted in decades of real-world impact. Conservative governments in particular have often pioneered focused, high-impact initiatives. By examining a few historical case studies, we can draw lessons on what works and what a Conservative-led development policy should champion.

One of the clearest examples of focused Canadian aid delivering results was Prime Minister Stephen Harper's maternal, newborn and child health initiative, launched at the G8 Muskoka summit in 2010. In the face of high mortality rates among mothers and young children in developing countries, Canada rallied global partners to take decisive action. The Harper government committed a total of \$2.85 billion over five years to improve maternal and child health, including \$1.1 billion in new funding and \$1.75 billion in renewed support, establishing this as a long-term Canadian priority.

This infusion of resources went to practical interventions like training health workers, funding immunizations and building clinics in some of the world's poorest regions. Just as important as the money was an emphasis on outcomes. As Prime Minister Stephen Harper announced, "Accountability for results will be an integral part of Canada's contribution". He announced this with a rigorous framework to measure progress and ensure aid dollars are used effectively.

That accountability paid off. Alongside other donors, Canada's push helped save countless lives by expanding vaccination programs and maternal care, contributing to a significant drop in the under-five mortality rate globally in the early 2010s. I have seen first-hand the benefits of freshwater well sites and maternal health clinics and the positive impact they have had in the communities in Tanzania. The people are grateful, and they want more of this type of support. Because of a Conservative initiative, their lives have been measurably improved permanently.

The Muskoka initiative demonstrated how a Conservative government's focus on a clear priority, coupled with demand for results, could mobilize the world. Canada once led the way in mobilizing support among G8 and non-G8 leaders, key donors and private foundations to tackle this challenge. This legacy guides our vision. We will target aid to where it makes a measurable difference, in this case the health of mothers and children, while insisting on transparency and effectiveness in every dollar spent.

Another example of international development done right was in 2014, after Russia's first incursion into Ukraine. When Ukraine's sovereignty came under attack, Prime Minister Harper took swift action, condemning Russian aggression and backing words with aid.

• (1750)

In March 2014, Canada announced a package of over \$220 million to help Ukraine stabilize its economy and support democratic development. This assistance, delivered as loans and grants, helped the new Ukrainian government pay its bills and implement reforms during a pivotal moment of transition. Canada also deployed hundreds of election observers and provided technical support to bolster Ukraine's fragile democracy. The message was clear: Canadians stand with those fighting for their freedom and self-determination.

Canada currently spends over \$8 billion annually on foreign aid. At a time when so many Canadians are struggling to make ends meet, this number should be much lower. We should also be transitioning from government handouts to partnerships that benefit Canadian interests and bolster our economy. This is something the motion proposes, but we will have to wait and see if the government can follow through.

In the text of the motion, we read that the government will be, "establishing a dedicated Economic Partnerships Window to support projects that align poverty reduction abroad with economic security at home". Unfortunately, as we have seen in the last 10 years, the Liberal government has a habit of creating more bureaucracy. Consider the newly announced Build Canada Homes, a new government body that plans to build 4,000 factory-built affordable homes at a price tag of \$13 billion, or \$3.25 million a house.

If the government is serious about producing results, it will ensure that the economic partnerships window is not another opportunity to balloon the government. The mission, expectations and outcomes for the economic partnerships window need to be crystal clear. It should also be funded from the current international development budget and not require the taxpayer to shoulder more debt. The required parliamentary report from the Minister of International Development is a welcome addition to this motion.

The Liberals put up frequent roadblocks and have maintained a general, pervasive mentality away from transparency that has made it difficult for the official opposition to hold the Liberal government accountable and give Canadians the information that they deserve. Name the scandal or issue, whether it is inflation, the economy, crime or food prices, the Liberals have shown no accountability for anything or remorse for the harm they have caused. If this motion is serious, it will usher a shift in Liberal policy, championing transparency over secrecy and issue avoidance.

Canada is a generous nation, but there is room to strengthen our leadership. The motion is in no way innovative; the actions highlighted within should never have been abandoned in the first place. When dealing with taxpayer funds, accountability should be the first consideration, not an afterthought. Global Affairs Canada has rightly earned the reputation for being one of the highest wastefully spending departments. Motion No. 14 could be a signal to the end of that.

There is a right and wrong way of stewarding the public purse. Conservatives have a strong record of doing it the right way; the Liberals, not so much. Given the history of Liberal waste, I cautiously give my support for this motion. The economic partnerships window should not cost the taxpayer more. If accountability is the new way forward, the international development budget should cover this initiative.

Let us see if this becomes a model for other departments to follow or if this will be another scandal that Conservatives will need to unearth down the line. For now, we are going to give co-operation a chance, and I look forward to working with the member on his motion going forward.

[*Translation*]

Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in 2023, the Auditor General noted that Global Affairs Canada had failed to demonstrate whether its \$3.5 billion in annual development assistance, allocated under the government's feminist policy, had improved the lives of women and girls. Furthermore, only half of the projects funded were included in the annual reports to Parliament. It was therefore impossible for the department to properly report on the results of the projects it funded.

The motion moved by my colleague from York South—Weston—Etobicoke demonstrates a desire to improve performance measurements in order to determine whether investments are producing the desired outcomes. The third paragraph calls on the Minister of International Development to table an annual report in Parliament to measure the effectiveness of international assistance and its impact at home. As we know, the Bloc Québécois is in favour of greater transparency, especially when it comes to how the money of Quebec and Canadian families is being spent.

Private Members' Business

In its election platform, the Bloc Québécois proposed investing 0.7% of gross national income in international assistance, albeit with better monitoring of investments and priority given to issues such as education, health, climate change adaptation and poverty reduction.

It is crucial to recognize that assistance is also a cost-effective investment that plays a fundamental role in global stability. It is often criticized, and rightly so, because it generates so much red tape, carries colonialist overtones and can be weaponized for political purposes. Nonetheless, assistance is still the only mechanism for transferring resources internationally and the only framework we have right now for co-operation and maintenance of international standards.

However, I must point out that, under the Liberals, the Canadian government has achieved the unenviable feat of doing worse than Stephen Harper's government in terms of international assistance. In addition, Canada failed miserably at securing a seat on the UN Security Council after mounting a last-minute campaign in 2020. Experts attribute this failure in part to Canada's abandonment of humanitarian assistance. Canada currently spends 0.3% of its GDP on international assistance. The UN asks countries like Canada to contribute 0.7%. The average for OECD countries ranges from 0.4% to 0.44% of GDP.

We are doing worse under the Liberals than we were under the Harper government. The government that has been the most stingy in terms of providing support for international human rights as a percentage of GDP is the current government, or the old government, as the Liberals like to remind us. It is six of one, half a dozen of the other.

As we know, Canada is not a military or economic power. However, it can play a role in humanitarian assistance and international development. Under commitments made by the UN in 1970, Canada must increase the amount it spends on official development assistance to 0.7% of its gross national income. By the federal government's own admission, however, Canada has no plan to reach the 0.7% target.

While international assistance is often criticized for all the red tape it generates, it is also important to acknowledge the benefits to the countries receiving and providing the aid.

My colleague's motion assumes that international assistance can—

● (1755)

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Could you please ask members who are not interested in the speech to take their conversations outside?

The Deputy Speaker: I thank the hon. member for that reminder. Yes, if members wish to engage in discussions during this speech, I would ask them to do so outside the House.

Private Members' Business

The hon. member for Lac-Saint-Jean may continue his speech.

Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, my colleague's motion assumes that international assistance can have a positive impact on our domestic economy.

The motion does not say that the government should stop funding international organizations or put a stop to more traditional assistance, but rather that it should encourage projects that are mutually beneficial. On this point, we agree.

Of course, there is no denying that corruption is present in the development assistance sector. In our view, by ensuring that international assistance benefits businesses here as well, we can mitigate the risk that funds will be misspent due to corruption. We would also be ensuring that some of the money stays in this country.

Still, make no mistake: Provided that the money is properly invested, development assistance is not a waste of public funds. This is partly why I support my colleague's motion. However, I do have some concerns.

I am concerned that the Liberal government is using the motion as a way to withdraw from international assistance. I am concerned that the government's economic ambitions will unfortunately influence its decisions on funding international assistance.

Yes, funding projects that provide reciprocal economic benefits can be a way to help other countries while keeping some of the money in our economy. However, I fear that the federal government is looking only at the economic benefits, without considering any other official development assistance objectives.

For example, it is not hard to imagine the Liberal government funding mining companies abroad under the pretext that it creates jobs, even though we are well aware of many horror stories about local populations being exploited, not to mention all the other impacts it can have on communities.

I am also concerned that the smaller players in the development assistance sector will be at a disadvantage when it comes to securing funding for their projects, which may be smaller but are just as important and beneficial for communities.

My riding is home to the Centre de solidarité internationale du Saguenay—Lac-Saint-Jean. It is headquartered in Alma and does exceptional work. Its work is often very concrete and measurable, and it has a direct, local impact on the people.

That is why the Bloc Québécois would like to amend the motion moved today in order to emphasize the role of non-profit organizations and small international co-operation centres. In my opinion, this amendment befits the principle of the motion moved by my colleague from York South—Weston—Etoibicoke.

We will support the motion, but we hope that the member who moved the motion today will agree to the following amendment.

I move:

That the motion be amended by removing “and” at the end of (b) and by adding the following at the end of (c):

“; and (d) by ensuring that small non-profit organizations (NPOs) and international cooperation centres located outside major urban areas have the same opportunities for federal funding as larger organizations”.

• (1800)

[English]

The Deputy Speaker: It is my duty to inform hon. members that pursuant to Standing Order 93(3), no amendment may be proposed to a private member's motion or to the motion for second reading of a private member's bill unless the sponsor of the item indicates his or her consent.

Therefore, I ask the hon. member for York South—Weston—Etoibicoke if he consents to this amendment being moved.

[Translation]

Hon. Ahmed Hussen: Mr. Speaker, I agree with my colleague. I accept the amendment.

[English]

The Deputy Speaker: The amendment is in order.

Resuming debate, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade.

Yasir Naqvi (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade and to the Secretary of State (International Development), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate being recognized to speak in support of Motion No. 14, which calls upon the government to strengthen the accountability, effectiveness and mutual benefit of Canada's international development assistance.

I want to first thank the member for York South—Weston—Etoibicoke for bringing forward this motion. I really appreciate the work he does in his community and the work he has done over the last 10 years in Parliament in his various ministerial roles, including as minister of international development. I am proud to call him a friend and have always reached out to him for guidance. Once again, through this motion, he is demonstrating his thoughtfulness on important issues that not only set Canada up for success, but also set our stature internationally.

[Translation]

This motion responds to new global realities that are transforming the development landscape and highlights how Canadian aid can promote economic resilience, both here and abroad.

• (1805)

[English]

The motion proposes three key measures. The first is implementing new policies to ensure that Canadian international development assistance integrates opportunities for reciprocal economic benefit here at home, including through the participation of Canadian small- and medium-sized enterprises, innovators and workers.

The second is establishing a dedicated economic partnership window to support projects that leverage Canadian economic strengths, such as clean energy, agriculture, digital technology and education, and that align poverty reduction abroad with economic security at home.

The third is requiring the minister of international development to report to Parliament annually on the outcomes of Canadian participation in international development assistance projects, the measurable benefits for partner countries and the economic opportunities created for Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Our government strongly supports this motion, which proposes concrete measures to modernize our approach to international development assistance and strengthen Canada's collaboration with trusted partners around the world, so that our aid remains accountable, effective, and results-oriented.

[*English*]

We are in the early phases of refocusing Canada's international development assistance to better support and advance mutually beneficial economic partnerships in alignment with the spirit of the motion, while continuing to advance our core values of gender equality, human rights and environmental sustainability.

We recognize that a stable, equitable and prosperous world serves Canada's long-term national and strategic interest. The challenges facing developing countries today are complex and interconnected, from climate change, food insecurity and conflict to displacement, gender inequality and limited access to financing, opportunities and innovation.

[*Translation*]

To meet these challenges, we must mobilize all sources of financing, including domestic resources, official development assistance and private sector investment, to stimulate inclusive economic growth and build innovative partnerships around the world.

[*English*]

When we align development objectives with Canada's economic strengths, we amplify our impact on global poverty reduction. While the motion encourages the integration of reciprocal economic benefits into our international development assistance, I want to be clear that poverty reduction remains central to Canada's international development assistance efforts, in line with the Official Development Assistance Accountability Act.

Any economic partnerships supported through official development assistance would be grounded in tangible, measurable improvements to the well-being of communities in partner countries. The concept of an economic partnership window reflects an important idea: that our programming tools can both advance economic security and better leverage Canada's strengths at home and abroad.

Our government's aim is to make development partnerships more strategic, innovative and resilient, responding to partner countries' requests for stronger economic collaboration and investment. We are actively assessing the most effective mechanisms to achieve these objectives.

Private Members' Business

On the issue of reporting, Global Affairs Canada currently fulfills its obligations under the Official Development Assistance Accountability Act by publishing an annual report to Parliament. As we look to the future, we will continue to consider how best to communicate the economic benefits created by Canada's international development assistance.

There is an opportunity to strengthen the reporting of these benefits, both internationally and domestically, within our existing annual report to Parliament, thereby ensuring greater transparency and reinforcing confidence in Canada's international assistance efforts.

Supporting the motion would not mean stepping back from our long-standing international development commitments, including our support for poverty reduction, gender equality, human rights and environmental sustainability. These are core Canadian values. They will always provide a frame for Canada to engage internationally, whether it in our foreign policy, whether in our defence policy and, of course, in international assistance. Instead it would reflect an approach that recognizes the importance of strategic partnerships, economic inclusion, transparency and accountability, as fundamental to effective and responsible international assistance.

Our new government supports the motion as a signal of a broader shift, in Canada and among other donor countries, toward ensuring that international development assistance not only supports global poverty reduction but also creates economic benefits for our partners and for Canadians at home.

● (1810)

[*Translation*]

By aligning our values with our economic strengths, Canada can exercise leadership in creating inclusive and sustainable development partnerships that move the world forward while creating real economic opportunities for Canadians.

[*English*]

Let me conclude by reaffirming our government's unwavering commitment to international assistance that is accountable, effective and results-driven, advancing both Canada's global leadership and our national interests. It is our intention to support this motion.

Once again, I want to thank the member for York South—Weston—Etobicoke for the work he has done. I look forward to continuing to work with him and continuing to rely on his expertise in this area.

Tamara Kronis (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to join the debate on Motion No. 14, and I begin by thanking the member for York South—Weston—Etobicoke for bringing it forward.

Private Members' Business

It appears that the minister has been listening to those of us on this side of the House, because the motion speaks to three things. First, it speaks about strengthening the accountability and effectiveness of Canada's international development assistance. Second, it speaks about making sure that our international development efforts bring reciprocal economic benefit to Canada. Third, it speaks about making the minister more accountable to this House by requiring an annual report to Parliament not only on the benefits received by other countries, but also on the economic opportunities created for Canadians.

Importantly, the focus of this motion is not on the big companies that often benefit from government largesse, but on the workers, innovators, and small and medium-sized businesses that have long been a priority for Conservatives. All of this is a good start.

At a time when so many Canadians are struggling to pay their mortgages, put food on the table and pay their bills, I would have liked to see the government go further. I would have liked a commitment to redirect a portion of the roughly \$8.4 billion we spend on foreign aid to be used back home to reduce the deficit and help Canadians with their bills.

However, as I said at the outset, this motion is a good start, a welcomed move in the right direction. I rise today to support it, while offering some constructive suggestions on how we can work across the aisle to restore accountability, results and value for money in Canada's international development work.

Canada currently spends about \$8.4 billion a year on foreign aid. Of that, roughly \$5.5 billion flows through Global Affairs Canada's grants and contributions programs. Earlier this year, the department promised that 86% of that spending would finally be subject to more rigorous checks. I cannot help but ask what happened to the other 14% and the remaining \$2.9 billion. I urge the government and the minister to work toward ensuring that every penny of Canada's foreign aid is properly audited and accounted for. The Prime Minister has ordered all departments to rein in spending. When he talks about tightening belts, this is one of the places he should begin.

In recent years, Canada's international development programming has become increasingly disconnected from its results. The Auditor General found that Global Affairs was not effectively monitoring its funded projects and, in some cases, did not even have a clear idea of what it wanted to achieve. Too many projects have been overly generous, overly ideological and light on accountability. There have even been reports of funds being misused or diverted to organizations that are sympathetic to terrorism, and I find this to be totally unacceptable.

What this motion offers is a partial but constructive path forward. Canadians want to know that their tax dollars are making a real difference. They want to know that those tax dollars are saving lives, strengthening economies and building stability both abroad and at home, not disappearing into bureaucracy or ideology.

The motion's requirement for new policies to create opportunities for reciprocal economic benefit should allow Canadian expertise and innovation to play a greater role in delivering development goals. When Canadian farmers share their knowledge to improve

food security or when educators bring digital learning tools to developing nations in ways that benefit both partners, that is a step in the right direction because teaching and contributing has benefits that we can enjoy back at home. That is how international development should work: projects that lift people out of poverty while also supporting Canadian jobs and Canadian innovation.

The motion also proposes a dedicated economic partnerships window "to support projects that align poverty reduction abroad with economic security at home, and that utilize Canadian economic strengths such as clean energy, agriculture, digital technology, and education".

● (1815)

Right now, those are just words on a page, but I can see how they represent an idea worth exploring, so long as this concept does not lead to yet another layer of Liberal bureaucracy, where yet another friend of the Prime Minister ends up with yet another a \$600,000 salary. The goal should be efficiency, not expansion, and if the minister would like help in developing this concept in a lean and efficient way, my door will always be open to him.

The new window should be funded within the existing envelope, not on the backs of taxpayers. It should focus on clear priorities: Canadian innovation that leads the world; agriculture and agri-tech, where our farmers and researchers have proven expertise; digital technology, which expands access to education and opportunity wherever it finds itself; and skills training, which helps young people abroad build a future for themselves. Each of these concepts connects compassion abroad with economic security and development here at home.

The motion also calls for the Minister for International Development to report annually to Parliament. That requirement is essential. Accountability turns spending into trust. When Canadians can see how their tax dollars are used to benefit both Canada and the world and see real results, their confidence grows. Transparency is not an obstacle to compassion; it strengthens it. When Canadians see tangible results, they are proud to give. Under Conservative governments, accountability and effectiveness were not just words; they were principles. Our more limited assistance abroad will show that disciplined, focused aid saves lives and builds global credibility. That same discipline is sorely needed today. Instead of sprawling programs that lack oversight, we need targeted initiatives with clear objectives and measurable outcomes. Compassion must be matched with competence.

Private Members' Business

As Conservatives, we will continue to scrutinize every dollar the government spends. Canadians are facing record costs, higher taxes and a deepening affordability crisis. They deserve to know that their contributions are used wisely and that their generosity is respected, because generosity must always come with responsibility. Stakeholders in the international development sector understand this. They know that success depends not on the number of announcements made, but on the real difference that programs make in people's lives. From my vantage point, the government makes too many announcements with promises that it does not fulfill. I hope this motion will be different and that it will inspire similar measures across government.

This motion does not require new money; it requires a new mindset. It calls for results, accountability and mutual benefit. It recognizes that Canada is strongest when we pair compassion with competence, leadership with integrity, and generosity with accountability.

Conservatives will support this motion because it sets a standard the government should already have been meeting. We will watch closely to ensure that this commitment becomes reality. We will also continue to push the government to spend less abroad and more at home during these challenging times, but for now, Motion No. 14 represents a tentative step in the right direction. With the government, I will take it and hope to build on it.

• (1820)

[*Translation*]

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot—Acton, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this is an important issue, especially in these troubled times, these times of crisis, these global hard times. The world is changing in potentially dangerous ways. However, we should not overlook the fact that the global issues of misery, poverty, exploitation and violence have never been completely eradicated at any point in history. Too often, most of the time in fact, they fall through the cracks of public debate.

There has never been an era of endless prosperity. The grand assurances of the 1990s that globalization would lift the planet out of poverty have not become reality. As we can see today, the promises of a bright future have not actually come to pass. We are still living in one of the darkest and most difficult times, despite everything. Given the rather explosive and challenging global context we are seeing today, it is easy to see and safe to say that we are not where we thought we would be.

In his speech earlier, my colleague from Lac-Saint-Jean mentioned aspects that extend beyond humanitarian assistance. I will come back to humanitarian assistance and to the motion in a moment. We need to keep in mind that a motion is non-binding. It is always better to have one than to have none at all, but it is better still to have an effective policy, an actual law with binding force on governments, especially when our confidence in the government is so low. A while ago, my colleague said that the government funds a number of Canadian mining companies operating abroad that are guilty of exploitation. I would like to talk about that a little.

We heard from representatives of Export Development Canada a few times in committee. They are not entirely sure where the money is going. It is nominally intended to support development and

wealth creation, but no one checks whether human rights abuses are being committed over there.

While participating in human rights observation missions in Chile and Colombia, I met with populations that had been harmed by Canadian mining companies. Often, these mining companies are not actually Canadian, but they register in Canada because it is extremely easy and because Canada is a flag of convenience. They also register as Canadian companies to benefit from the legal, tax and speculative advantages that come with being listed on the Toronto Stock Exchange. I met with people who had suffered due to air and water pollution and people who had been subjected to violence. I myself witnessed a private security system in Colombia stopping people from crossing public land.

Canada is a haven for mining companies, especially since there is no real ombudsperson. The ombudsperson's complaints office cannot compel the production of documents or compel witnesses to appear. This shows that Canada will not be able to restore its reputation in international assistance simply by proposing motions. It should start by cleaning up its own backyard.

Let us get back to the motion. As we have said, we support it. We know that the government has been spending for many years. We are not against the idea of spending. We ourselves advocate a certain minimum level of spending on humanitarian aid, but it is important to measure the impact of that spending. Take, for example, the so-called feminist international assistance policy. Of course, we fully support the principle, but there are no checks and balances in place to ensure that the money spent will achieve the goal. We are not the ones saying this; it is the Auditor General.

While international assistance must sometimes be delivered through agencies or organizations like the Red Cross and the World Food Programme, for example, spending on individuals or businesses should be limited in order to avoid waste. We should also look for potential benefits for Quebeckers and Canadians, where possible, and not just economic benefits.

For example, funding for French-language education programs in Africa could help improve the vitality of the French language on that continent. This would also have positive repercussions on the status of French in Quebec, if we are to continue taking in so many immigrants from these areas. This could improve the vitality of French in Quebec and in the rest of Canada.

• (1825)

This is an example of something we can fund that will benefit people here at home, but it does not mean that it is strictly an economic benefit that can be calculated clearly and spontaneously using indicators.

Adjournment Proceedings

There are also countries like Chile, which, as we know, uses international assistance to advance its economic interests. Sorry, I meant to say “China”. It was a slip of the tongue, although Chile is not one of the most reputable regimes either, and China also has interests in Chile. Anyway, take the example of China and the new silk road. This is a system that has evolved constantly, as we know. It was supposed to be only a few sectors at first, but more and more were added, and it became very digital. The new silk road has really shifted toward technology and digital infrastructure.

A number of developing countries, including African countries, see this in a positive light. Now, we also know that these countries are receiving crumbs from the west, which also explains China's ideological appeal in Africa. It is extremely appealing to African regimes. However, the conditions attached to the assistance continue to generate strong criticism, and for good reason. I have no qualms about describing these conditions as unfair. China is investing heavily in developing countries. It is building ports and roads, rail lines and infrastructure to secure its own supply of raw materials. When countries are unable to repay their debt, China, the lender, repossesses the infrastructure and resources.

Ultimately, this allows China to gain the same advantages that large metropolises once derived from their colonies, without necessarily encountering the same disadvantages. It gets to have its cake and eat it too. In addition, China usually imposes a 99-year lease to maintain control over the infrastructure. This is a real problem, and it is something that should be monitored. We have to be wary, because I do not think anyone here is particularly keen on the idea of a new colonialism, like the Canadian neo-colonialism that mining companies are already engaging in. Now it could expand, if assistance is viewed purely as an economic proposition. Fortunately, I am extremely pleased that the proposed amendment to the motion was accepted.

It should also be noted that the Liberals have achieved a remarkable feat: They have done less than Stephen Harper's government in terms of international aid. This was evident when Canada failed miserably to secure a seat on the UN Security Council after its last-minute campaign in 2020, a failure that, according to several experts, can be largely explained by Canada's abandonment of humanitarian aid. We reap what we sow. Canada is very far from reaching its target of investing 0.7% of gross national income in international aid. Instead, it is hovering around 0.3%. In fact, Canada even reduced aid in its 2023 budget.

When I say we reap what we sow, I think this motion may be the beginning of something, and that is interesting to me. We hope that it will not just be a symbolic motion. Luckily, we were able to put to rest the ridiculous notion of humanitarian aid being justified by purely economic gain. I am happy about that for the reasons I explained earlier. Now, there are so many other things to look at. Let me dispel the notion that Canada is still driven by the lofty ideals of peacekeeping. That is no longer Canada's role. It is no longer the envy of the world. We saw that even during the recent pandemic, when there was a vote at the World Trade Organization to lift patents on vaccines. Canada was among the countries that blocked this, that voted against it.

Canada can be a humanitarian country, but it can also be quick to jump into bed with multinationals, depending on where its interests

lie. I have already talked about mining companies. I also talked about the idea of having an ombudsman. Canada has a lot of house-keeping to do before it can claim to be a great champion of humanitarian aid.

• (1830)

[*English*]

The Deputy Speaker: The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired, and the order is dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence on the Order Paper.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

[*English*]

JUSTICE

Leslyn Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is my honour to rise today on behalf of the good people of Haldimand—Norfolk to speak to a serious crisis in our country. Ten years of irresponsible Liberal crime and justice policies have led to the need for communities across Ontario and across Canada to grapple with growing violence and brazen crime in their neighbourhoods. The consequences of these policies are real. Since 2015, violent crime is up 55%, firearms crime is up 130%, extortion has skyrocketed 330%, sexual assaults are up 76% and homicides are up 29%.

When I asked the government to address its record and to commit to reversing laws such as Bill C-75, which allowed repeat offenders back on the streets, I referenced the tragic case of 29-year-old Greg Pierzchala. He was a young constable killed by a repeat offender released on bail. The assassination of this young police officer in the line of duty happened in Hagersville, Haldimand County, which is a community that I represent. His loss rattled the community. The outpouring of sadness, the support and the tributes for this young constable at the beginning of his career and of his life were both heartbreaking and deeply moving.

Too many families are grieving with unimaginable pain because they lost a loved one to violent crime. The truth is that the same violent offenders are released back into the community, sometimes within hours of their arrest. Because judges are constrained by Liberal laws to impose the least onerous conditions possible, this so-called principle of restraint compels the courts to release at the earliest possible opportunity and impose only reasonably necessary bail standards, even when there is a strong chance of reoffending.

Instead of addressing this very real concern of mine, the parliamentary secretary ignored it entirely. When more than half of Canadians no longer feel safe in their own neighbourhoods, my constituents expect seriousness from the government, not non-answers and silence.

Adjournment Proceedings

The uncomfortable truth is that the current Liberal government has undermined safety and justice in Canada by imposing its ideology on the justice system, resulting in preventable deaths. Canadians, including victim advocates, provincial governments and police associations, have long been calling on the government to fix what it broke. Will the Liberals finally adopt our full Conservative plan to end the scourge of violent crime, by passing the Conservative jail not bail act and repealing Bill C-75?

Patricia Lattanzio (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am thankful for this opportunity to rise and debate this important issue. I also want to thank my colleague opposite for raising a concern that we actually share: the safety of Canadians and keeping violent repeat offenders off our streets.

First, we must recognize the tragic murder of 29-year-old Constable Greg Pierzchala. Our thoughts are with his family, colleagues and the Haldimand—Norfolk community. No family should endure such a loss. Such tragedies remind us that keeping Canadians safe is our solemn duty.

It is important to clarify a persistent misunderstanding about former Bill C-75. Contrary to some claims, Bill C-75 did not alter the fundamental law of bail in Canada. What it did was codify key principles already established by the Supreme Court of Canada. The law has always been clear: No one should be released on bail if doing so would compromise public safety or undermine confidence in the administration of justice. That is clearly established under subsection 515(10) of the Criminal Code.

In fact, the argument presented is self-defeating. The member suggests that repealing former Bill C-75 would improve public safety. In reality, repealing Bill C-75 would actually make it easier for some individuals, like those previously convicted of intimate partner violence, to obtain bail.

Let us be clear about the Conservatives' position over the last six months. First, they campaigned on repealing all of Bill C-75, including protections for victims of intimate partner violence. When we called them out, they suddenly shifted and said that they only wanted to remove the principle of restraint from former Bill C-75, and now their own justice critic publicly states on social media that he is open to amending the principle of restraint. That is three different positions over the last six months. It is hard to take them seriously. They clearly have no plan, no consistency and no idea what they are doing.

Meanwhile, on this side of the House, the Minister of Justice has spent months working in consultation with law enforcement, provincial and territorial partners, constitutional experts and victim advocacy groups building a consensus on how to keep violent offenders off our streets and accountable to the public, and protect individuals and victims.

Canadians want solutions, not slogans. They deserve careful, evidence-based policies grounded in Canadian law and not in imported ideas. What do I mean by “imported ideas”? It is striking to see the types of proposals that the Conservatives continue to push, whether it is the provision of their bail bill, Bill C-242, the shoot-first policy or a three-strikes law. These measures have all failed in every jurisdiction where they have been tried in the United States. If the Con-

servatives had been paying attention to the last election they lost, they would know that Canadians want laws made here in Canada, in consultation with provinces and territories, that actually work in our communities.

This government is also investing in federal policing, including the hiring of 1,000 new RCMP personnel and expanded resources to combat financial crime, organized criminal networks and online exploitation. These investments reflect a broader strategy, one that combines enforcement with prevention and recognizes that community safety depends not only on strong laws, but also on strong institutions.

• (1835)

Leslyn Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I thank the parliamentary secretary for that response, but the Liberal government has been in power now for 10 years. Why is it now putting forward half measures to address the mess that Bill C-75 has caused?

The government rejected Conservative proposals to strengthen bail laws and to protect our communities, yet it is now repackaging some of those same ideas as its own, showing that the Liberals care more about political credit than the real accountability for their failures. Despite the tough talk, it is just not enough. Violent criminals will continue to be released if the Liberal principle of restraint in Bill C-75 remains.

It is time for the government to take responsibility and to show that it cares about protecting Canadians by working with Conservatives to end the Liberal bail experiment and restore safety to our communities.

Patricia Lattanzio: Mr. Speaker, Conservatives are not telling Canadians the truth about the principle of restraint. Whether it is in the Criminal Code or not, it exists in common law, so their attacks on Supreme Court precedents are nothing but political theatrics.

First, we respect the rule of law and will never use the notwithstanding clause to override Supreme Court decisions. Second, we do not go online to attack Crown prosecutors or call the brave men and women of the RCMP, who protect our country and Canadians, “despicable”. Third, unlike the member for Haldimand—Norfolk, we do not present petitions calling for Canada to withdraw from the United Nations and the World Health Organization, which shows just how extreme Conservatives are willing to be.

Adjournment Proceedings

That is the difference between this principled Liberal government and the Conservatives' reckless politics.

• (1840)

NORTHERN AFFAIRS

Lori Idlout (Nunavut, NDP): *Uqaqtittiji*, the cost of living in Nunavut is grossly unfair. I have sought answers from the Minister of Indigenous Services and have not heard back. To my questions related to this late show, the minister has responded by citing the Canada child benefit.

I am sorry. I have the wrong document. Can I have a quick minute?

The Deputy Speaker: It is the member's time, so the member can use it whichever way she wishes.

Lori Idlout: *Uqaqtittiji*, families in Nunavut have so few economic opportunities that many families end up relying heavily on government programs. Many are on income support. Indeed, some have supplemental benefits like the Canada child benefit, which is not sufficient to meet the high cost of living.

Even when the Liberals offer programs like the nutrition north program, it fails to feed families. Why? It is because the program subsidizes for-profit corporations like the Northern Store. The Northern Store had profits in the hundreds of millions while it was allowed to put our tax dollars into the pockets of shareholders.

The Liberals did one good thing: They created the hamlet food voucher program within the Inuit child first initiative. The funny thing is that once they realized they did a good thing, they immediately cancelled the programs having positive impacts on Inuit families. While I share this based on feedback from hundred and thousands of families in Nunavut, this will not be enough for the Trump-loving Liberals.

I have data to share. The Qajuqturvik Community Food Centre in Iqaluit collected data during the hamlet food voucher program on what happened when the program was cancelled without consultation or explanation. When the ICFI hamlet food voucher program was running, the number of visits to the Qajuqturvik declined. All of a sudden, the food voucher program was feeding families and bills were being paid.

The community of Pangnirtung has similar data. In May 2025, the community reported in its evaluation that during the program, families were able to pay their bills. They reported that families finally had enough support to provide healthy foods. In the community, 95% accessed the program. It is interesting to share that the Northern Store reported an increase of 1.9% in its quarterly reports at the end of July.

When former Liberal minister of northern affairs Dan Vandal kept refusing to answer my questions, I had the indigenous and northern affairs committee agree to study the barriers to providing affordable groceries by bringing in CEOs of Canadian North, Calm Air, the Northern Store and a local co-op from Nunavut. We learned through the study that the CEO of the Northern Store earned millions in income. We also learned that only 76¢ of every dollar went to food subsidies at the Northern Store.

Having—

• (1845)

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Northern and Arctic Affairs has the floor.

Brendan Hanley (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Northern and Arctic Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we do indeed recognize the hardships faced by Inuit and by all residents in Nunavut and indeed across the north, where the cost of food and the cost of basic necessities continue to pose real challenges, particularly for families. In Nunavut alone, 42% of children live in poverty. That is the highest rate in Canada. I know that behind these statistics are real lives and real struggles.

Just this past weekend, I had the good fortune to travel to Old Crow, mainly on the theme of the devastating loss of Chinook and chum salmon in the Porcupine River, part of the Yukon River system. In addition to the effect that has on the community's food supply, it also means significant losses over the decades to the culture and the very identity and heritage of the Gwich'in people. There is much work to do there together to restore the salmon to even a fraction of its former abundance.

While there, we also visited the local co-op store and had a chance to see some of the high food prices, even with the northern food subsidy that is applied to a variety of foods there. Everything in Old Crow has to be flown in. This is one more example where addressing food insecurity takes concerted effort and collaboration among indigenous partners, all governments, self-governing first nations and the Government of Canada.

Our government is addressing food insecurity in the north through nutrition north Canada, which includes retail subsidies, the harvesters support grant and the community food programs fund, as well as the Inuit child first initiative, which my colleague referred to. Each has a distinct role in supporting food security and family well-being in Inuit communities. Nutrition north Canada's subsidy helps lower the price of food and essential items. Last year, the program's retail subsidy was just under \$145 million. It increases by roughly 5% annually.

To better meet the needs of northerners, in February 2025, Aluki Kotierk was appointed as the minister's special representative to lead a review of NNC and produce a report. Her report will be really important to inform reforms to the program. To inform the review, retailers, suppliers, local growers, food producers and charitable organizations participating must show how the subsidy reduces costs for consumers.

Adjournment Proceedings

The harvesters support grant is another way that food security is being addressed. It supports traditional hunting, harvesting and food-sharing activities in isolated communities while reinforcing cultural practices. This is about food autonomy and food security. Wherever I go in the north, the harvesters support grant receives a lot of positive feedback, and I believe that there are many more communities that could benefit from it.

There is a lot to describe. I will conclude for now by saying that while progress has been made, we recognize that a lot more needs to be done to address systemic challenges in the north. We remain committed to working with Inuit, territorial and community partners to build lasting and locally driven solutions.

Lori Idlout: *Uqaqtittiji*, Michael Janke from Cambridge Bay recently compared the prices of oranges and sugar. He found that oranges are more expensive than sugar and explained that this is why Nunavummiut choose to buy groceries that are junk food as opposed to healthy foods; it is cheaper.

The Liberals love to brag about Canada's place among the G7 countries. They love to brag about its credit rating. Indeed, Canada is a rich country, for the most part anyway. Inuit are left out of economic opportunities, resulting in heavy reliance on federal programs. All the communities I represent are fly-in communities. There are no roads to help make living more affordable. Therefore, ICFI was seen as a success. The Liberals were very quick to cancel the program when Inuit were being lifted out of poverty.

Will the Liberals finally help allow the wealth of Canada to be shared with Inuit so that families can afford to feed their families?

• (1850)

Brendan Hanley: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this member's advocacy for the people of Nunavut and, indeed, for the people across the north. I reaffirm this government's commitment to address food insecurity in northern communities on a priority basis. Programs like nutrition north Canada, the harvesters support grant and the community food programs fund, as well as the Inuit child first initiative, provide essential, much-needed support to children, families and individuals in the north.

We will continue working with Inuit, indigenous, territorial and other partners to improve existing services and develop new ones that are viable and culturally appropriate solutions for families in the north. We will measure our progress not by the dollars committed, but by the ability of every child to thrive, learn and dream without the burden of high food costs and hunger.

OIL AND GAS INDUSTRY

Jonathan Rowe (Terra Nova—The Peninsulas, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today I rise to talk about the oil and gas industry in Newfoundland and Labrador with regard to our production and specifically our refining.

Newfoundland and Labrador had an oil refinery meeting our province's consumption demands since 1976. There is no doubt it had its ups and downs, but over the years it employed thousands of people including myself, my father, my mother and many friends and family throughout the community. At one point, it was 5% of our province's GDP. There were no royalties from the throughput, but simply income tax revenues and other spinoffs.

The refinery used to produce 100% of our island's diesel, propane, jet fuel and gasoline. Then the Liberal government wasted \$89 million of federal tax dollars while the province wasted another \$17 million on a conversion that converted only to biodiesel fuel. Now we have to ship fuel in from all around the world and everyone is paying the price, literally. Newfoundlanders are paying five cents per litre to accommodate the added cost of storage and shipping from these other countries. The Liberal government refused to build pipelines to bring Alberta oil to the east coast, so instead we are shipping it in from France. We are not even getting Canadian oil. We are not getting Newfoundland oil. We are getting oil refined in France.

On June 6, a Liberal colleague from Newfoundland proudly announced that the North Atlantic Refining company was expanding. I thought that was exciting. I rejoiced until I found out that it was expanding into France, not Newfoundland, not Canada. While the Prime Minister was flying around Europe to try to find a good deal, I wonder if he forgot which country he was finding a good deal for. He blames Trump for continuously losing car manufacturing plants to the United States; I wonder what his excuse is for losing refining jobs to France.

I just cannot wrap my head around how somehow a group of Liberals thought it would be a good idea to spend \$100 million to take a refinery that produced 130,000 barrels a day to fuel our province's demands and reduce it to a mere 14,000 barrels a day of only biodiesel that could not even service our gas stations. How on earth could any business produce 10% of the throughput and maintain the same number of workers and the same amount of GDP contribution? How could they not see that this refinery conversion would be on a road to disaster? It has only been open a little over a year, and they are already announcing that they are on shaky ground, so shaky that they just had to accept another \$25 million from the provincial government just to keep the doors open.

When will the Liberal government abolish its green fantasy and actually support oil and gas investments in this country that make sense? Or will it at least get our of the way and steal our common-sense policies to put Canada back on track?

Adjournment Proceedings

Claude Guay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in this chamber on the unceded territory of the Algonquin Anishinabe people with confidence and conviction to address Canada's unwavering commitment to a more prosperous future, a future we are actively building together. Our collective efforts to advance the biofuel sector are not just about energy; they are about powering our country's economy, strengthening our sovereignty during a time of unjustified tariffs levied by the United States and China, and creating good jobs for Canadians across every region, including in Newfoundland and Labrador.

Let me begin by reaffirming this government's steadfast belief: biofuels are essential to Canada's environmental leadership and economic strength. They are fundamental to lowering emissions while unlocking new opportunities for innovation and growth. Across the country, including in rural and indigenous communities, biofuels are creating new jobs, reducing our carbon footprint and helping Canada meet ambitious environmental and economic goals.

Our government is securing important jobs while also supporting innovation in our energy sector and progress toward more sustainable fuel sources. We are moving forward for our workforce and the future of clean energy in Canada.

• (1855)

[*Translation*]

Canada is taking bold and decisive action to strengthen our biofuels sector and accelerate investment for the future. We are re-launching and extending the clean fuels fund and stimulating clean fuel production with an additional investment of \$776 million from 2025 to 2030.

Through the Canada Infrastructure Bank, we are committing at least \$500 million under green infrastructure to develop, expand, and support biofuel production right here at home.

In addition, thanks to the clean fuels regulations, funds will be reinvested each year directly to support Canada's clean fuel producers, giving them certainty and a competitive advantage.

These measures are not being taken in isolation. We are building strong partnerships with provinces, territories, indigenous communities, and industry leaders. Together, we are shaping a sector that is resilient in the face of global competition and responsive to market realities. We are investing in projects that create and open up new opportunities for Canadian ingenuity.

We have seen incredible growth in biofuel production in recent years. Canadian workers and innovators across the country are proving every day that we can be competitive and adaptable world leaders.

[*English*]

To face American tariffs, our government is making Canada an energy superpower in both clean and conventional energy. Newfoundland and Labrador's energy opportunity extends far beyond any one project. To get Canada building, we are working with Newfoundland and Labrador to ensure they can compete and win in the low-carbon economy. This means working together to ensure the further development of Churchill Falls and Gull Island, which

were specifically referenced as part of our transformative strategies. We encourage the opposition to think big and support our efforts to build Canada strong.

Jonathan Rowe: Mr. Speaker, there was a lot there, and I thank the parliamentary secretary for that. I thank him for his commitment to Newfoundland and Labrador.

What I am surprised about, and perhaps I misunderstood, is that the plan for this refinery going forward is continued government subsidies rather than just trying to find a business plan, investments that make sense and investments that actually bring in more investment from other countries and develop our own.

You talked about Donald Trump's investment—

The Deputy Speaker: The member is to speak through the Chair to the other side. I invite the member to continue his comments without using the word "you".

Jonathan Rowe: Mr. Speaker, my apologies.

My colleague mentioned Donald Trump's tariffs, which is affecting our country right now, but it should not affect our ability to build our own country and export our stuff everywhere else. I am not sure why we do not have pipelines going from Alberta to the east coast, so that if we are going to continue this refinery the way it is, we can at least get Canadian oil and gas in our province and not from other countries.

My colleague from the other side mentioned Churchill Falls. I am really looking forward to seeing what the proposal is for that, and hopefully we will see a transmission line that goes all the way to Labrador.

Claude Guay: Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with my colleague on the opposite side in the future for the benefit of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Our government is working hand in hand with our partners to identify new paths forward, support innovation and drive solutions tailored to the realities of our biofuels market. We are listening, acting and, above all, committed to building a future where Canadian biofuels are a pillar of our national prosperity and environmental leadership.

Let us move forward with confidence. Let us ensure Canadian workers and industries, including the ones from Newfoundland and Labrador, are empowered to lead the world in clean and renewable fuels. In every region, for every Canadian, our government is building a future that is stronger and full of promise.

Adjournment Proceedings

• (1900)

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: The motion that the House do now adjourn is 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 7 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Wednesday, October 22, 2025

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS			
Forestry Workers		Carney	2841
Johns	2837	Poilievre	2841
Maude Royal		Carney	2841
Sari	2837	Poilievre	2841
Finance		Carney	2842
Redekopp	2837	Poilievre	2842
Toronto International Celebration Church		Carney	2842
Zahid	2838	Poilievre	2842
Small Business		Carney	2842
Vis	2838		
Rosaleen Dickson		Automotive Industry	
Chatel	2838	Blanchet	2842
Latin American Heritage Month		Carney	2842
Cobena	2838	International Trade	
Richmond East—Steveston		Blanchet	2842
Bains	2838	Carney	2842
Holland Marsh		Forestry Industry	
Davidson	2839	Blanchet	2842
Université du Québec Network		Carney	2842
Blanchet	2839	Carbon Pricing	
Elect Respect Campaign		Poilievre	2843
Gould	2839	Carney	2843
Canadian Energy Sector		Poilievre	2843
Viersen	2839	MacKinnon	2843
Innovation in Newborn Care		Poilievre	2843
Erskine-Smith	2840	Hajdu	2843
Canada Revenue Agency		Automotive Industry	
Block	2840	Poilievre	2843
Public Safety		Carney	2843
Dhaliwal	2840	Poilievre	2844
Loaves and Fishes Community Food Bank		LeBlanc	2844
Kronis	2840	Poilievre	2844
Affordable Housing in London West		Joly	2844
Kayabaga	2840	International Trade	
		Poilievre	2844
		MacDonald (Malpeque)	2844
		Canada Revenue Agency	
		Lemire	2844
		Leitão	2844
		Garon	2845
		Leitão	2845
		Finance	
		Hardy	2845
		Leitão	2845
		Hardy	2845
		Lightbound	2845
		Rowe	2845
		Hajdu	2845
		Innovation, Science and Industry	
		Vis	2846
		Joly	2846

ORAL QUESTIONS

Finance	
Poilievre	2841
Carney	2841
Poilievre	2841
Carney	2841
Poilievre	2841

Small Business	
Vis	2846
Valdez	2846
Royal Canadian Mounted Police	
Fanjoy	2846
Anandasangaree	2846
Automotive Industry	
Rood	2846
Joly	2846
Rood	2847
Joly	2847
Gill (Brampton West)	2847
Joly	2847
Lewis (Essex)	2847
LeBlanc	2847
Deltell	2847
Joly	2847
Child Care	
Goodridge	2848
Hajdu	2848
Goodridge	2848
Hajdu	2848
National Defence	
Bezan	2848
McGuinty	2848
Bezan	2848
McGuinty	2848
Child Care	
Deschênes-Thériault	2849
Hajdu	2849
Canada Revenue Agency	
Lefebvre	2849
Lightbound	2849
Cobena	2849
Long	2849
Patzner	2849
Long	2850
Employment	
Duguid	2850
Joly	2850
Melillo	2850
Hajdu	2850
Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship	
Boulerice	2850
Diab	2850

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Committees of the House	
Fisheries and Oceans	
Weiler	2850
Arnold	2850

Peacetime Service and Sacrifice Memorial Day Act	
Johns	2851
Bill C-252. Introduction and first reading	2851
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	2851
Gore Mutual Insurance Company	
(Bill S-1001. On the Order: Private Members' Business:)	2851
Cody	2851
Motion	2851
(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to a committee of the whole, considered in committee of the whole, reported without amendment, concurred in at report stage, read the third time and passed)	2851
Petitions	
Public Safety	
Mazier	2851
Nicotine Replacement Therapies	
Vis	2851
Pesticides	
Gallant	2852
Animal Welfare	
Schiefke	2852
Charitable Organizations	
Stevenson	2852
Health Care	
Lamoureux	2852
Peacekeeping	
Johns	2852
Veterans Affairs	
May	2852
Questions on the Order Paper	
Lamoureux	2853
Motions for Papers	
Lamoureux	2853
Request for Emergency Debate	
Closure of B.C. Salmon Fishery	
Kibble	2853
Speaker's Ruling	
The Speaker	2853

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Strengthening Canada's Immigration System and Borders Act	
Bill C-12. Second reading	2853
McKinnon	2853
Lamoureux	2854
Kwan	2854
Kwan	2855
Lamoureux	2856
Chagger	2857
Morin	2857

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>