



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

House of Commons Debates

Official Report
(Hansard)

Volume 152 No. 049
Monday, November 3, 2025

Speaker: The Honourable Francis Scarpaleggia



CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, November 3, 2025

The House met at 11 a.m.

Prayer

• (1105)

[*English*]

POINTS OF ORDER

ADMISSIBILITY OF COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS TO BILL C-4—SPEAKER'S RULING

The Speaker: I am now prepared to rule on the point of order raised on October 29, 2025, by the parliamentary secretary to the government House leader concerning the admissibility of amendments made to Bill C-4, an act respecting certain affordability measures for Canadians and another measure, by the Standing Committee on Finance.

I would like to thank the parliamentary secretary to the government House leader and the whip of the Bloc Québécois for their interventions.

The parliamentary secretary argued that Bill C-4 was accompanied by a royal recommendation specifically to authorize the Canada Revenue Agency to draw from the consolidated revenue fund to make a payment for first-time homebuyers who meet the terms, conditions and qualifications in the bill. This payment would be for an amount equal to the GST that the buyer paid to the builder of the house.

The parliamentary secretary further argued that 11 amendments adopted by the committee required a royal recommendation since they seek to advance the start date of the rebates scheme from May 27, 2025, to March 20, 2025, which would result in additional charges to the consolidated revenue fund. He also drew the Chair's attention to a Speaker's ruling from February 1, 2024, about the need for a royal recommendation for Bill C-356, an act respecting payments by Canada and requirements in respect of housing and to amend certain other acts.

[*Translation*]

In his response, the whip of the Bloc Québécois said that, according to a departmental news release, Bill C-4 would eliminate the GST for some first-time buyers of a property and reduce it for others. He added that buyers would apply to the government for a GST rebate, to be paid out once they prove they are eligible.

The whip of the Bloc Québécois argued that the legislative proposals to effect non-refundable tax credits or tax exemptions do not require a royal recommendation. He also cited a government back-grounder on Bill C-4 that referred to the elimination or reduction of a tax, as opposed to a refund that could exceed the amount of GST originally paid. This point, the member suggested, is what separates this situation from one that would require a royal recommendation.

With respect to Bill C-356, the member argued that the bill would have authorized the reallocation of roughly \$100 million for purposes unrelated to the GST rebate also envisaged in the bill, something that clearly required a royal recommendation, and that it was unclear whether the GST refund set out in Bill C-356 might exceed the amount of GST paid.

[*English*]

As the House knows, the Speaker does not normally intervene in matters upon which committees are competent to take decisions. However, concerns about the procedural admissibility of any amendments adopted by a committee may be brought to the attention of the Speaker once the bill is reported back to the House.

Accordingly, the Chair has reviewed the Standing Committee on Finance's clause-by-clause proceedings on Bill C-4. The 11 amendments modifying clauses 3 to 13, which are included in the committee's report and in the reprint of the bill, had been ruled inadmissible by the chair of the Standing Committee on Finance, as she determined that these amendments would impose a charge on the public treasury, which would affect government revenues and expenditures, and, as a result, would require a royal recommendation. The committee chair's rulings were challenged and overturned, and the amendments were ultimately adopted.

Fundamentally, the question before me is whether the rebating of a tax already collected constitutes an expenditure of the government or constitutes a reduction in taxation.

In its summary, Bill C-4 states that it is intended to “implement a temporary GST new housing rebate for first-time home buyers.” In other words, eligible buyers would be able to receive a refund of the GST they have paid. Furthermore, several clauses of Bill C-4 indicate that this is a GST rebate. This means that buyers who qualify would be reimbursed for the GST they have paid under this program.

As indicated in *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, at page 838, “a royal recommendation is not required for a bill whose effect is to reduce taxes otherwise payable.”

*Private Members' Business**[Translation]*

While this is a complicated and nuanced question, I am guided by a decision dated October 16, 1995, when Speaker Parent had to rule on whether the reimbursement of a tax constituted a levy on public funds that would require a royal recommendation. On page 15410 of the Debates, he stated:

...that the repayment of tax revenues already received was not an appropriation of public money.

The Chair can further add that while such measures may result in reducing the government's revenues, they are not, per se, charges on the consolidated revenue fund.

In this context, and after careful consideration of the specific measures contained in Bill C-4, the Chair finds that the amendments in question do not require a royal recommendation, and that the committee's report and the reprinted bill are properly before the House.

I thank all members for their attention.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

*[Translation]***CRIMINAL CODE**

Viviane Lapointe (Sudbury, Lib.) moved that Bill C-238, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (restitution orders), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

She said: Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to rise in the House today to speak to my bill, Bill C-238, an act to amend the Criminal Code with regard to restitution orders.

• (1110)

[English]

Every day in Canada, community organizations step in to support those affected by crime. They save lives, counsel survivors, and help families and neighbourhoods rebuild, yet the very people who absorb the cost of those crimes have no formal place in restitution. Bill C-238 would change that. It would ensure that when an offender is held accountable, communities that bear the harm can share in the repair, and it recognizes community harm as part of justice itself. This bill comes from a simple but powerful idea: that justice should recognize not only the individual victim, but also the communities that bear the weight of the harm.

Across Canada, our cities, towns and first nations are on the front lines of two intertwined crises: organized crime and the opioid epidemic. The human toll is heartbreaking, but there is also a quiet, grinding cost that falls on the shoulders of community organizations, shelters, counselling services, harm-reduction sites, addiction programs and first responders. Every day, they pick up the pieces after an overdose, after a trafficking rescue or after a family is shattered. They provide care, compassion and safety, often with too few resources and too little recognition. Meanwhile, those convicted of drug trafficking or human trafficking often profit from the suffering they cause.

[Translation]

It is entirely appropriate for our courts to be given a clear way to order restitution for those who help victims rebuild their lives.

[English]

Under section 738 of the Criminal Code, judges already have discretion to order restitution payments made by an offender to compensate for losses. That restitution is rightfully given to individual victims. Let me be clear: Bill C-238 would not change that principle; it would strengthen it. It would clarify and expand who can receive restitution in certain cases.

In cases of drug or human trafficking, courts would be able to order restitution directly to a community organization that provides frontline services and can show that it incurred measurable expenses because of that crime. This could include emergency shelters, medical services, harm reduction and overdose prevention programs, security measures for staff and clients, counselling for workers exposed to trauma, and additional staffing or training to meet surging demand.

This bill builds on existing judicial tools. It would not require new government spending. It would simply give courts a clearer signal from Parliament that restitution can and should flow where harm is proven and where recovery begins. This is a bill about justice with purpose and about pragmatic compassion. Punishment alone cannot heal the damage caused by trafficking or addiction, but when an offender is required to contribute directly to repairing that harm and when restitution helps fund the very services that support victims, justice becomes tangible.

[Translation]

This helps to rebuild trust, restore dignity, and show victims and service providers that the justice system cares about them.

[English]

In my community of Sudbury, I have met with police, outreach workers, addiction counsellors and victim service agencies. They told me in plain words that the current system leaves community responders invisible. At our meeting with Chief Sara Cunningham of the Greater Sudbury Police Service, she told me that the Ontario Association of Chiefs of Police has already discussed this bill and views it as a good and timely effort that would have a real impact across Ontario.

[Translation]

She noted that while proceeds of crime can sometimes be allocated to victim support services, resources remain limited. She emphasized that community groups such as Angels of Hope are essential partners in the recovery process and need more consistent funding.

[English]

Ali Farooq, who runs the Go-Give Project and operates Sudbury's warming centre, shared his support for this bill. His organization recently had to hire 30 additional staff to stay open 24 hours a day, seven days a week. He said plainly they are doing everything they can, but they need fair ways to recover costs directly tied to the crimes they respond to every day.

At Angels of Hope, an organization supporting victims and survivors of human trafficking, staff told me they were pleased to see this bill introduced. Its team, made up of survivors themselves, work in difficult conditions with limited short-term grants. As one worker put it, the funding ends, but the trauma does not. They reminded me that Sudbury, Thunder Bay and Niagara are hot spots for trafficking and that too many victims have nowhere safe to go once they are rescued.

These are the voices behind Bill C-238. They are not asking for charity. They are asking for fairness and for the ability to recover costs directly tied to the crimes themselves.

The preamble of this bill affirms what Parliament already recognizes: that crimes like drug and human trafficking have far-reaching community impacts, that acknowledging and repairing community harm is a legitimate objective of sentencing and that frontline organizations should have a clear legal pathway for restitution from offenders. This is fully consistent with the principles of proportionality, accountability and reparation already embedded in our sentencing framework.

• (1115)

[Translation]

It also aligns with the Canadian Victims Bill of Rights, which guarantees victims the right to seek restitution and have their losses recognized by the court.

[English]

Across Canada, municipalities and service agencies are struggling to absorb the costs of the opioid crisis. According to Health Canada data, more than 38,000 Canadians have died of apparent opioid toxicity since 2016. Behind every number are families, paramedics and community workers who respond to tragedy again and again.

In Sudbury, the police service reported a record number of overdose calls last year, and local shelters are often at capacity. Bill C-238 would not change the standard of proof or judicial discretion. It would simply direct what restitution is considered for trafficking offences. The court may include frontline organizations if they demonstrate specific, reasonable costs resulting from the crime.

Eligible expenses are practical and narrow: medical supplies, security, counselling and other operational costs that can be verified

Private Members' Business

by receipts or financial statements. This preserves judicial independence while giving meaning to the concept of community harm.

This proposal also reflects modern thinking about restorative justice. Restitution is not only about money; it is about accountability. It allows an offender to take part, in a very concrete way, in repairing the damage they caused. For many victims and service providers, that recognition matters as much as the funds themselves. It sends a message that justice is not blind to the broader human impact of crime.

In northern Ontario and across the country, frontline workers often feel invisible to the justice system. They see the same individuals cycle through addiction, arrest and relapse. They bear the secondary trauma, yet the system treats them as bystanders. This bill tells them that we see them, we value them and we will empower courts to recognize their losses.

Some might ask whether expanding restitution eligibility could reduce what is available to individual victims. It would not. Individual victims remain the first priority. This bill would simply add another category of possible recipients, allowing judges to decide fairly based on the facts of each individual case. Others might ask whether this would create new bureaucracy or costs. It would not. Restitution orders are offender-paid.

[Translation]

No new government programs or additional funding are required. The process already exists. We are simply making sure that communities affected by trafficking are not left behind.

[English]

Some people may also ask why the bill focuses only on drug trafficking and human trafficking. The answer is this: precision. These are crimes that inflict measurable cascading harm and are linked to organized networks that exploit people and communities for profit.

[Translation]

By targeting these specific offences, the bill remains focused and effective, addressing the most egregious examples of harm to the community.

*Private Members' Business**[English]*

Local police, frontline agencies and victim support organizations in Sudbury and across northern Ontario have expressed strong support. One outreach coordinator told me that the bill gives them hope that the justice system will finally acknowledge what they live every day.

Restitution orders are not a silver bullet, but they are a tool that can complement other efforts, such as treatment, prevention and law enforcement. They reinforce a simple truth: When harm is done, repair should follow. In clarifying that restitution can extend to community organizations, we strengthen local capacity, reinforce public confidence and promote offender accountability in a practical and restorative way.

The bill is about bringing the justice system closer to the communities it serves. It is about recognizing that safety and recovery are shared responsibilities. When courts are empowered to acknowledge community harm, they also acknowledge community resilience, the courage of those who keep showing up, shift after shift, to help others heal.

Bill C-238 would be a modest but meaningful change. It builds on what already works in our justice system. It asks no more of taxpayers and no less of offenders. It would ensure that restitution serves its true purpose: to help victims and communities heal. I am proud to bring forward legislation that reflects both compassion and accountability.

I believe that members on all sides can agree that the costs of these crimes should not rest solely on the shoulders of the people already struggling to respond. The principle is simple: The people who profit from harm should contribute to the repair.

To my colleagues, I say that we should stand together for justice that restores as well as punishes, give our judges a clearer path to supporting the organizations holding our communities together and send a message to every community across Canada that Parliament hears them, values them and is willing to act.

● (1120)

[Translation]

Let us show Canadians that Parliament listens to them and values them. We are ready to take action.

[English]

Larry Brock (Brantford—Brant South—Six Nations, CPC): Madam Speaker, a general theme running through the member's speech was offender accountability, and I think every member of the House appreciates that principle. However, I say to the member that if she were truly concerned about accountability, she would know that accountability also promotes meaningful consequences for individuals who prey on other humans in order to traffic them and for those individuals who traffic deadly substances that often lead to deadly results.

Instead of focusing on providing community supports and restitution, why did the member in fact support and vote for Bill C-5, which eliminated mandatory minimum penalties for people who traffic in humans and for those who traffic in fentanyl?

Viviane Lapointe: Madam Speaker, the question goes to the heart of this very bill, which is to make criminals pay for the crimes and the havoc they wreak in our communities. The bill focuses specifically on human trafficking and drugs because we can see the devastating harmful effects these have had in communities all across Canada. In our downtowns, the opioid epidemics and the numbers of deaths are very clear. We know that behind every one of those numbers is a family, and the bill is a step toward bringing justice for them.

[Translation]

Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Madam Speaker, yes, it is important to make criminals pay. Yes, it is important to support organizations that help victims, that provide victims with assistance. However, there already exists a process that works for victims.

The Canadian Victims Bill of Rights, which my colleague referred to, does indeed affirm the right to restitution. The same Canadian Victims Bill of Rights also defines a victim as an individual who has suffered harm and is entitled to this remedy.

It seems to me that this bill complicates matters by adding something, like adding another dancer in a two-person dance like the tango. It complicates matters rather than simplify them. In a sense, victims will have to compete with community organizations for compensation, even though everyone agrees that community organizations have other things to worry about.

I would like my colleague to explain why the government wants to complicate something that is already working.

Viviane Lapointe: Madam Speaker, I am so glad my colleague asked that question. There is no question that, when it comes to compensation, priority is given to victims and families. This bill in no way changes that priority. That is very important. It simply allows judges to choose more organizations that provide services to the victims of these crimes. The process does already exist. This bill has the potential to make the system more effective.

● (1125)

[English]

Michael Coteau (Scarborough—Woburn, Lib.): Madam Speaker, Bill C-238 looks at putting first responders, victims and communities at the forefront of justice and repair.

I would like to ask the member to take a minute to explain the balance between justice and punishment, and repair.

Viviane Lapointe: Madam Speaker, the bill really does speak to being able to heal a community, as well as to holding offenders accountable. Restitution connects that responsibility to repair, and it turns words of accountability into real, tangible action. It is about making criminals pay for the devastation of their crimes in our communities all across Canada. It also helps rebuild trust in the justice system and shows that our first responders and service providers are visible to all of us, including within the justice system.

Larry Brock (Brantford—Brant South—Six Nations, CPC): Madam Speaker, every member of the chamber has seen the toll that addiction, trafficking and exploitation take on our communities. I have spoken with first responders who arrive at overdoses of the same people night after night. I have met with outreach workers stretched to the breaking point and with volunteers who keep showing up because no one else will.

I want to begin by recognizing what the bill is trying to do: help those community frontline services that are carrying the heaviest load in the fight against crime and addiction. That is the goal every member can respect, but good intentions alone do not make good law. As we look more closely at Bill C-238, we have to ask whether it would actually deliver on its promise, or whether it would simply add another layer of process to a justice system already overburdened and under-resourced.

Section 738 of the Criminal Code already lets judges order restitution for losses to victims or organizations; the provision is there. It is tested, and it works, though only to a degree, sadly. Restitution has been part of Canada's Criminal Code since the code's inception in 1892, but the reality is that Canadian statistics suggest restitution is rarely ordered. A recent study from Stats Canada confirmed that "a mere 1.6 percent of all cases tried in adult criminal courts that produced a guilty verdict resulted in restitution orders."

Bill C-238 would add process, not capability. Our justice system does not need another procedural loop; it needs the resources and efficiency to use tools it already has. When we start writing duplicate laws for things already covered, we do not make justice stronger; we make it slower and weak. Here is a case in point: Canadian courts are still suffering from lengthy delays suffered as a consequence of the pandemic.

The bill would apply only to drug offences and human trafficking offences, but if the principle is that communities deserve restitution for the cost of crime, why single out only those two categories? Moreover, if the member for Sudbury were fully concerned about the devastating impacts those two categories of offences have on this country, we would only conclude that she would be equally concerned about prosecuting and sentencing the offenders to real brick-and-mortar jails.

She cannot do this, because she and every member of her party voted in favour of Bill C-5, which repealed mandatory minimum penalties for human trafficking and for all Controlled Drugs and Substances Act offences, which now opens up the availability of conditional sentences, also known as house arrest. This is patently absurd, as the majority of those offences are often conducted in the offender's home.

Private Members' Business

Communities also absorb costs from organized theft, from gang violence and from sexual exploitation. Victim services offices, police and shelters respond to all of them. The bill draws an arbitrary line that cannot be justified in principle or in policy. If it is fairness we want, this approach would achieve the opposite.

Now let us talk about how restitution would actually work in a courtroom. To issue one of the new restitution orders, a judge would need clear proof that a specific organization suffered a measurable loss because of a particular offender. That is an extremely high bar. Let us consider an overdose, for example. Which trafficker's case caused the hospital's expense for treatment or for overtime staffing?

These are broad social costs that accumulate across dozens of incidents and multiple offenders; we cannot effectively trace them to one person's conviction. Even if we could, community organizations would have to present detailed financial records, such as expense sheets, invoices, staff hours and supply logs to show that their loss was "readily ascertainable", which is language in the member's bill. Most shelters and non-profits simply do not have the existing accounting systems to generate that kind of documentation.

Instead of helping, the provision would drag them into court, wasting scarce time and resources. Suppose a court somehow gets through all of that and issues an order for tens of thousands of dollars. Then what would happen? The reality is that most offenders in trafficking and drug cases have no money, assets or ability to pay restitution.

● (1130)

Many are already facing lengthy custodial sentences. These restitution orders would sit, uncollected, symbolic, unenforceable and meaningless to the organizations they were meant to help. It creates the illusion of accountability, justice on paper but not in practice.

Our courts are under enormous pressure. Sentencing hearings are complex enough. Judges must weigh aggravating factors, review the evidence and consider pre-sentence reports. The bill would graft a new financial hearing on to that process. Judges would have to review expense records and hear testimony about causation and costs. Prosecutors would have to gather accounting evidence and call witnesses. Defence counsel, of course, would be entitled to challenge every figure and witness. We would end up with longer hearings, more adjournments and a greater backlog. The people waiting for justice would wait even longer, all for restitution orders that, in most cases, will never be collected.

Private Members' Business

The administrative burden does not stop with the courts. Shelters, treatment centres and first-responder agencies would need to track and document every cost tied to specific offences. That means new record-keeping systems, new paperwork and, probably, new staff to manage it.

Perhaps the most concerning effect of Bill C-238 is the false expectation it would create. It suggests to communities that offenders will somehow pay back the social costs of crime. That is simply not realistic. We all want accountability, but accountability means consequences that can actually be enforced. It means restitution that can actually be paid. The bill would offer neither.

We owe it to Canadians to be honest. The way to help frontline services is not through theoretical restitution orders. It is through real, predictive funding and effective enforcement against the people who cause the harm in the first place.

What is a better approach? Conservatives believe in accountability that works. That also means real consequences. That is why every member on this side of the House voted against the repeal of Bill C-5. We believe in laws that can be enforced and that deliver real outcomes for victims and communities.

If the goal is to strengthen support for frontline organizations, there are better, proven ways to do it. These include investing directly in victim services and treatment programs instead of routing support through uncollectible court orders, as well as ensuring stronger enforcement against organized trafficking networks so that the real criminals, the ones profiting from misery, face meaningful sentences.

That is often the most difficult aspect of policing. They are always trying to get the larger fish in the pond, those who are organizing the street traffickers. It is always a give-and-take, with law enforcement trying to find those who actually organize the criminal enterprise.

We need to modernize restitution enforcement so that when courts do issue orders, they are actually collected. Right now, with a restitution order ordered by the court, victims have a process, but it is through the civil courts. It is often faced with uncertainty, lengthy delays and costs, again, trying to squeeze that orange for a drop of juice from an individual who likely has absolutely zero assets and zero means to pay. We need to support first responders and community staff with dedicated mental health funding. These are practical, targeted solutions that deliver results, not rhetoric.

The principle behind the bill is sincere, but sincerity alone does not make sound policy. At its core, it is unenforceable and burdensome. It asks courts to do the impossible, and it risks diverting energy and resources away from the very real victims and communities it seeks to help.

Justice should be swift, fair and effective. It should focus on outcomes that can be delivered, not aspirations that cannot. We owe it to Canadians to pursue policies that make communities safer and victims stronger. We should not have more paperwork, longer trials and promises we cannot keep. For all of these reasons, regrettably, I cannot support the bill.

• (1135)

[*Translation*]

Rhéal Éloi Fortin (Rivière-du-Nord, BQ): Madam Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking our colleague from Sudbury for encouraging us to reflect on the matter of compensation for victims of crime. We must, of course, fight against crime, which we already strive to do in various ways with various bills, but we also have a responsibility to look after victims.

Let us be clear that the Bloc Québécois is in agreement with holding drug traffickers and pimps accountable. Does that mean, however, that the approach proposed by our colleague is the right one? The member for Sudbury is a parliamentarian whom I greatly respect and appreciate, but with all due respect, I believe this is the wrong approach.

Firstly, the bill would in theory allow for a legal entity to be compensated. This is inconsistent with the Canadian Victims Bill of Rights, which states that “an individual who has suffered physical or emotional harm, property damage or economic loss as the result of the commission or alleged commission of an offence” can receive restitution. However, the bill tabled by our colleague from Sudbury provides that the beneficiary of such restitution could be a community organization, or in other words, a legal entity, which would conflict with the bill of rights.

In my humble opinion, we have to be careful on this point and prevent confusion. This could also lead to another outcome, as my colleague from Drummond pointed out a few minutes ago, an outcome that we would say is undesirable. Real victims, such as the victims of pimps, would be competing against community organizations that provide services to the victims of pimps to get restitution orders. Honestly, I do not think community organizations would spend much time fighting that sort of battle, but it would still be a real problem.

Real victims must be compensated. Community organizations should be funded according to their needs. Processes already exist for that funding. These include, for example, victim surcharges. As we know, anyone facing a conviction in recent years always has a fine and surcharge imposed. While we may often wonder what purpose surcharges serve, they are redistributed to the provinces to fund the various victim assistance services and programs. Organizations that help victims of crime are therefore funded through victim surcharges. The direct victims themselves may be entitled to restitution, and this is already provided for in the Criminal Code.

Private Members' Business

Moreover, victims can file a claim for a whole range of damages. The Civil Code already contains a compensation regime, a civil liability regime for damages suffered by victims. This applies equally to victims of criminal acts and victims of civil torts or unintentional torts. Victims can already initiate civil proceedings for suffering, emotional distress and material damage. If a community organization has suffered this type of damage because of a crime, it could sue the person responsible for the crime in civil court and obtain compensation. Similarly, the victim of a pimp can also sue the pimp, not only by filing a criminal complaint, but also by filing a civil suit to obtain compensation.

In light of that, it is evident that there are systems in place that allow for adequate compensation for all these individuals. There is already a system in place. The real issue is that there is a problem with this system, a recurring problem with federal government programs in general: underfunding.

• (1140)

When it comes to health care funding in Canada, which has been a recurring topic in this chamber, we know that the federal government has gradually reduced its commitment year after year. Originally, in the 1960s, the federal government was supposed to fund 50%. Today, we are fortunate if it reaches 25%.

The reduction in health care funding is reflected across many public services. We often talk about infrastructure programs, but they have slowed down, as well. We have a housing crisis, which provinces and municipalities are tackling, but the federal government appears too slow to act. Meanwhile, the situation is becoming increasingly urgent.

We talk about providing support for individuals who have fallen prey to pimps, drug traffickers, and other such criminals. Obviously, we are not insensitive to such situations, and we agree that victims should receive assistance. Nevertheless, I think we need to proceed cautiously and align our requests with current programs to ensure individuals are not left without clear avenues for support.

Right now, victims can seek help from organizations. These organizations can apply for grants, perhaps primarily through the federal victim surcharge program. Victims can also pursue restitution through the courts once a criminal is sentenced. All these individuals can still initiate civil proceedings to seek compensation for current or future harm. That strikes me as being more than sufficient.

We do agree, however, that the amounts are not sufficient. Perpetrators of these crimes are not fully held to account or made to answer for their actions. We would like to see greater accountability from them, and they should provide more compensation for their victims. There will always be an issue with debtor solvency in these cases. Is it possible to secure compensation from those responsible for these crimes? That remains to be seen, but that is another issue.

Turning to the compensation processes and the sources of compensation, I respectfully submit that the sources are there and they are working. We must avoid confusion among Canadians, as this could jeopardize fair compensation for victims.

For all these reasons, the Bloc Québécois fully supports the notion of making those who commit crimes accountable. The Bloc is

fully in favour of holding hearings within an expedited timeline to secure their conviction.

I have not talked about these time limits, but that is another flaw in our justice system. The time to trial even prompted the Supreme Court to introduce time limits in the Jordan decision. We are still unable to meet these time limits. That is a major issue and it will have to be dealt with at some point

While we agree with what has been said, unfortunately, we cannot support the bill introduced by our colleague from Sudbury.

[English]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise to speak to my colleague from Sudbury's private member's bill. I listened to her comments, and I must compliment her on her homework, consultation and identifying an opportunity to have a positive impact for our communities.

I truly appreciate that we have a member who recognizes that it would be advantageous, not only in her own constituency but in constituencies across all regions of our country, to have legislation of this nature passed into law. I compliment her for using this bill, one of the very few private members' bills that will have a chance to pass in the House of Commons, to raise such an important issue.

The Conservatives' responses to the legislation are very interesting. I must say I am a little surprised. I anticipated that they would be more inclined to see the legislation go to committee, at the very least. That is quite disappointing because if we look at what the legislation is proposing, it is about restitution and the offender paying back. I amplify how important it is that we get restitution going to the individual victim. It is our first priority.

There are crimes taking place in our communities that are very damaging, whether they be against a non-profit association or a group. We have thousands of non-profit organizations throughout the country. Many of them contribute endless volunteer hours for the purpose of making our communities safer. That is one of the reasons I do not understand the responses to the bill.

When it comes to private members' bills, limited resources are given to private members. Legislation often requires some form of an amendment to build on it or make it stronger, and we often see that at the committee stage. I believe the member for Sudbury is open to improving the legislation if it means we can make it stronger. We can take a look at restitution and the impact it can have, not only on a victim, but, going beyond a victim, on our community non-profits in particular and communities in general.

Private Members' Business

I had the opportunity during the 1990s to sit on a justice committee. Toward the tail end of that process, we were afforded the opportunity not only to punish a young offender, but also to look at restitution with the victims. Even though I did not do very many cases myself, as the chair of the justice committee, I had the opportunity to do a couple of them. Through that process, I witnessed that when the victims are sitting with the offender, it is possible to come up with a form of restitution that provides a fair disposition in which the victim has more of a direct say.

It is this principle that I am talking about today: restitution orders better reflecting the impact a particular crime has on our communities.

• (1145)

It would be obvious to state that when one is before a court and the judge is in a position to make a judicial decision, the first consideration is given to the direct victim. Even though there are certain allowances within the Criminal Code to go beyond that, we do not necessarily see them being acted on for a number of different reasons. That is where Bill C-238 would come into play. It would not only recognize the victim; it would go beyond the immediate victim to ask, "What about the community? Should a judge not give it consideration in certain situations?" I believe the answer to that is yes.

The bill would provide a sense of what a community is. It would provide some clarity on the definition of a community. It would give tangible examples, such as shelters, of what a community could be. We have warming centres in many of our major cities throughout the country, and even in smaller, rural communities.

I think of the work that many communities put into something like the Siloam Mission or the Bear Clan Patrol. There are local residents' associations and the many different community facilities we have, such as community centres, indoor ice rinks, basketball courts and the infrastructure with community supports around it.

I think of the individuals the legislation would highlight: human trafficker and drug offenders. These are serious issues that are having profoundly negative impacts on our communities. The member for Sudbury made reference to the number of people who have been negatively impacted. Tens of thousands of individuals have died. Imagine the harm drug traffickers are causing in our communities. This bill would raise the level of accountability so that there are better consequences for the crimes being committed. Ultimately, many of the crimes are against communities, and the impact they have on a community can be very severe.

• (1150)

In Winnipeg, we have some very serious issues with gangs. There are powerful drug lords, if I can put it that way, in our communities. When they go up against the courts, the judge could recognize, through this legislation, that there is a strong argument to be made for restitution to the community. The drug lords could receive additional conditions that would see them having to pay the community they have so negatively impacted.

I believe this legislation should go to committee. I hope the Conservative Party will reconsider its position on the legislation and

recognize the value of the victim, as well as the value of our communities and the thousands of people who support them.

I thank the member for bringing forward this legislation.

• (1155)

Tamara Kronis (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, CPC): Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak to Bill C-238. This bill would amend section 738 of the Criminal Code so that courts could make offenders pay back community organizations, like shelters, emergency services and victim support groups, that have faced rising costs because of human trafficking and serious drug offences under the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act. This is a worthy idea, and I applaud the member for grappling with it.

These organizations deal with the damage caused by crime every single day. They are the ones that respond to overdoses, find safe beds for victims and support survivors through trauma in my community and across Canada. When crime rises, their workload rises and costs go up. I am certain that the intent behind this bill is to recognize that reality and help these organizations be better funded as a result, but good intentions do not always make good law.

While what this bill seeks to create sounds wonderful in theory, as a former litigator and adjudicator, I can tell members that, in practice, all this law would deliver is more legal complexity, higher costs, more parties with standing to intervene in cases and, ultimately, longer delays in a criminal justice system that is already stretched well beyond its limits. I truly appreciate that this bill recognizes that the costs of crime do not stop with the direct victim. When traffickers exploit vulnerable people or drug dealers poison our streets with fentanyl, we all suffer. Our hospitals, our shelters, our police, our paramedics and our families are all left to deal with the aftermath, and this aftermath is one we see and deal with every day in Nanaimo—Ladysmith.

Under the current law, judges can already order restitution when losses are clear and can be easily proven. For example, if someone breaks a window or steals property and the offender is caught, the loss can be connected to the offender, the cost can be easily quantified and the offender can be ordered to pay it back to the victim. What Bill C-238 would do is cast a wider net, allowing community organizations and others to claim their costs, reflecting the real costs to society of those crimes. That is what it would do in theory.

In the case of a broken window or theft of property, the costs could be the expenses of the local neighbourhood watch and community associations or the costs to the municipality of increased police patrols in that neighbourhood. In the case of drug trafficking, the costs could include the increased costs of medical care, harm reduction supplies, security equipment, counselling for staff and so on. I genuinely appreciate and support these goals, but causation is a problem.

If a community organization wants to recover its costs from an offender, causation requires it to link those specific costs to the specific offender by showing that, but for the offender's crime, the organization would not have had that cost. The idea is that we should not make one person pay for another person's crime, or make one person, no matter how bad we might think they are, pay for something the organization would still have had to pay for if the crime had not been committed. Restitution works really well for direct victims, but by casting this broadly, the problems would mount until they become insurmountable.

Take a shelter that helps victims of trafficking. It has rent, utilities, salaries, security costs, food costs and counselling costs. How do we tie those costs to a single trafficker's actions? What percentage is this one responsible for, as opposed to that one? Think about a hospital that treats overdose victims. How does a judge decide how much of an emergency room's budget is related to or how many doses of naloxone were used because of one particular dealer's drugs?

The bill tries to help by listing examples of eligible costs, but that would not solve the problem. The issue is not defining what the costs are; it is proving that those costs were caused by a specific offence committed by a specific offender. That comes at the sentencing phase, which could be years after the arrest.

• (1200)

Pulling that evidence together means a mountain of paperwork that would eat at the valuable time of frontline workers and ultimately hurt the very communities the bill seeks to help. It also means more time in court. The bill would turn sentencing hearings into mini-civil trials in which defence lawyers and prosecutors bicker back and forth over spreadsheets and receipts, arguing about which costs count and which costs do not. Documents would need a witness to put them into evidence, diverting more resources from the community organizations we are trying to help. In the end, expert witnesses, consultants and lawyers will be the only ones who make any money.

This brings me to enforceability. Restitution is not meant to be a fine or a punishment. It is meant to put victims in the position they would have been in but for the offence. It is not linked to crime in general. It is linked to a specific crime and a specific offender. However, the costs that community organizations face are linked to crime in general, and most criminals do not have regular bank accounts that courts can garnishee.

What would happen if an organization successfully cleared the causation hurdle? The court would issue a restitution order that will almost certainly never be collected, as my colleagues who have also spoken to the bill have explained. The organization would look well funded on paper and may cease to be eligible for grants because, in theory, it has a judgment it can collect on. It would usually have 10 years to collect on that judgment even though it will realistically never see the money. That does not help anyone.

Unrealistic restitution orders feel great on judgment day. They sound good, and they create the kind of hope that the hon. member sponsoring the bill spoke about in her remarks. However, that hope is almost certain to be false hope, embodying the illusion of accountability without the reality of it.

Private Members' Business

What should we do? Conservatives believe strongly in victim-centred justice. We believe offenders should be held accountable for the harm they cause. We believe in supporting the people and organizations that keep our communities safe. We also believe that there are better ways to achieve this than what the bill is trying to do. We believe in mandatory minimum sentences for the offenders who traffic in drugs and create havoc in our communities. We would try fentanyl dealers as murderers.

We could strengthen our asset forfeiture laws so that the proceeds of trafficking and drug crimes are seized and directed more directly to community recovery programs. We could work with the provinces to expand funding for victim services and trauma counselling. We could provide stable, predictable funding to frontline organizations so that they can plan ahead and deliver services without worrying about whether they will get restitution from a convicted offender who may not have any money.

These solutions would make a real difference. These solutions would ensure that the money actually reached the people doing the work without having to prove direct causation related to a specific case, without the need for participation in litigation and without creating an additional burden on our already overtaxed criminal justice system.

I have no doubt that the member who brought forward the bill did so out of a genuine desire to make the system better. My colleagues and I share that desire, but, as legislators, we have a duty to pass laws that are workable. Bill C-238 is not a workable law. It creates false hope, complexity and cost without achieving its goals. Unfortunately, it would not help victims. It would not help fund community organizations. It would mostly benefit consultants, accountants and the professional expert witness class while adding cost and workload to our already overburdened courts.

For those reasons, but with real respect and appreciation for the intentions with which the bill was crafted, regrettably, we will not be supporting Bill C-238. I would be happy to sit down with the member any time and work on better solutions.

• (1205)

[*Translation*]

Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to rise today to speak to Bill C-238.

Government Orders

First of all, I want to acknowledge and congratulate the new mayors and municipal councillors who were just elected in my magnificent riding of Drummond. I also want to give a special shout-out to Drummondville's new mayor, Jean-François Houle, who is a trained lawyer. One of the challenges awaiting him is to calm public fears about community safety, a concern shared by residents in many Quebec cities. Although Drummondville is by no means a city where people feel unsafe, this concern exists nonetheless. It is going to be a challenge for all of Quebec's elected municipal officials.

We talk a lot about safety, and it is frequently covered in political news, yet little is said about victims. What I like about Bill C-238 is that it finally opens up a conversation about what victims go through after experiencing a crime. Victim compensation programs already exist in Quebec and elsewhere in Canada. These programs are generally managed by the provinces. Quebec has its CAVACs, or crime victims assistance centres, to help victims, as their name implies. These organizations are subsidized.

Bill C-238 proposes that organizations should now also receive compensation that is generally reserved for victims. I do not think that the judge, in their ruling, will double or triple the compensation intended for the victim. I think the judge will have to make a choice, if such a bill is accepted. No extra money will be put on the table by the people convicted of the acts in question. This puts victims in competition with the organizations that help and support them. It is a bit of a strange bill. It is a bit odd. We can sense the good intentions behind it. We know, of course, that there are no bad intentions behind this bill introduced by the member for Sudbury. However, this misjudged bill could ultimately cause harm to the victims.

In 2021, Quebec reviewed the law that established the crime victims assistance fund, which provides financial support to organizations such as CAVACs. A new law was passed in 2021, and it broadened the definition of “victim” to include more people who are victims of crime. While there are direct victims, there are also people around them who suffer serious consequences as a result of a criminal act. There is now no time limit for filing claims for sexual violence, domestic violence or violence suffered during childhood. Several improvements have been made to facilitate victims' access to compensation. Victims are top of mind. They are the ones who need empathy. They are the ones who need the support of the community, society and organizations.

This bill proposes that organizations also be eligible for the restitution ordered to be paid to the victims. Does this not seem like an odd situation? It is a situation where victims will be shortchanged because the funds granted in the ruling will likely be split so that both the organizations and the victims can get a little bit. This idea seems misjudged to me, even bizarre.

Earlier, I heard the Conservative member for Nanaimo—Lady-smith say, at the end of her speech, that she did not see how her party would be able to support Bill C-238. Things do not look good for the bill, because, as my colleague from Rivière-du-Nord said earlier, the Bloc Québécois does not intend to support this bill either, because it is not clear and because, once again, the federal government is trying to get involved in something that is already

working fairly well. It may need improvement, but it is not through a bill—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): I must interrupt the hon. member because the time provided for debate has expired. The hon. member will have four minutes to conclude his remarks when this bill is back before the House.

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.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1210)

[*English*]

BAIL AND SENTENCING REFORM ACT

The House resumed from October 30 consideration of the motion that Bill C-14, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Youth Criminal Justice Act and the National Defence Act (bail and sentencing), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Ziad Aboultaif (Edmonton Manning, CPC): Madam Speaker, after a decade of passing laws to make life easier for criminals, the Liberal government has suddenly realized it created a problem. From its rare attempt to face reality, we have Bill C-14, the bail and sentencing reform act.

Conservatives have been pointing out for years that the Liberal approach to crime has the opposite effect of what the Liberals intended. Criminals did not realize the error of their ways. Instead of being thankful for generous bail and sentencing reforms that returned them to the street, they took their unexpected freedom as an opportunity to commit another crime or more crimes. Liberal bail reforms brought more crime, not less, and many Canadians began to live in fear as the Liberal revolving-door policies put criminals back on the streets to reoffend, no matter how serious the alleged crime.

For years, Conservatives have been calling on the Liberal government to repeal Bill C-75, which passed in 2019. The legislation created a catch-and-release system in which repeat and violent offenders are routinely freed pending trial. To make matters worse, in 2022, Bill C-5 further weakened deterrence and denunciation by repealing numerous mandatory minimum sentences and repermitting house arrest for serious offences, including sexual assault. In 2023, when they realized that they had maybe gone too far, the Liberals introduced Bill C-48, but this was insufficient in terms of dealing with the problem they had created. The bill included only a handful of new offences to be considered in a reverse onus position. It did not do anything to make it harder for repeat offenders to get bail. That has been the problem: People accused of violent crimes are turned loose to reoffend.

I think every member here understands that this is a problem. In my home city of Edmonton, time and time again, we hear stories about people arrested for violent crimes who are released on bail and immediately reoffend. For example, on July 17, Edmonton police arrested a man and charged him with attempted murder, aggravated assault, possession of stolen property, two counts of driving while prohibited, breach of release order, possession of a weapon dangerous to the public, assault causing bodily harm, assault with a weapon, failure to stop after an accident and theft of a motor vehicle. The accused criminal had been previously arrested for other crimes and released on bail on July 4. Did he learn from the lenient bail conditions? No, he took the opportunity to go on a crime spree

That is not the first time this sort of incident took place. In 2023, an Edmonton public transit rider was attacked and killed by a man with a history of violence who was on bail at the time, supposedly under house arrest and subject to a court order to stay away from transit property. A life was snuffed out by someone who should have been in custody. A loving father was taken from his family because of a misguided belief that violent offenders could be trusted not to reoffend.

By bringing forth this legislation, the Liberals are admitting that their criminal justice reforms have failed. Since 2014, there has been a 41% rise in the violent crime severity index, along with increases in homicide, sexual assault and extortion offences. Conservatives warned everyone about the consequences of Bill C-75 and Bill C-5 for years.

Bill C-14, the bill we are dealing with today, is a clear vindication of Conservative criticisms, but it does not go far enough. The legislation amends the Criminal Code, Youth Criminal Justice Act and National Defence Act to clarify that the principle of restraint does not require release, particularly in cases in which detention is necessary to protect the public, victims or witnesses and to maintain confidence in the administration of justice.

● (1215)

It would expand reverse onus offences such as violent auto theft, break and enter, human trafficking and extortion, and would direct courts to weigh the number and gravity of outstanding charges when determining bail. The bill would add new aggravating factors, would mandate certain consecutive sentences, would restrict house arrest for sexual offences and would strengthen youth custody and disclosure powers.

Government Orders

While the bill moves closer to the Conservative approach on bail and sentencing, it would not repeal the principle of restraint or restore mandatory minimum sentences. It is essentially a half-hearted effort that the Liberals are offering, hoping that Canadians will be happy with at least some improvements to the justice system without admitting that the need for change is due to Liberal mismanagement.

Consecutive sentences and aggravating factors are useful but are still subject to judicial discretion. As Bill C-14 does not reinstate mandatory minimums, outcomes would remain uneven and uncertain. House arrest would still be a possibility for those convicted of robbery, drug trafficking and firearms offences, not that the Liberals understand anything about who is committing firearms offences. One would think that, having realized the Conservatives were right about how disastrous Liberal justice system reforms have been, they would come to understand the problems with their firearms policies. They need to admit that law-abiding gun owners are not criminals and stop persecuting them.

Instead of going after the illegal guns used by criminals and street gangs, the Liberal Prime Minister is repeating his predecessor's mistake and taking hunting rifles and shotguns from law-abiding farmers, hunters and indigenous people. After 10 years of Liberal mismanagement, it has never been easier for violent criminals to obtain a gun. The government has failed to fix the border disorder that lets in almost all of the illegal firearms used in gun crimes. Violent gun crime has increased 116% since 2015.

On May 1, 2020, Justin Trudeau announced a ban on assault-style firearms and promised to "implement a buy-back program as soon as possible to safely remove these firearms and to introduce legislation as early as possible". We all know how that has worked out.

It has been five years since that announcement, and all the government has managed to do is a pilot project. Planning to spend \$750 million on confiscating legally acquired and owned firearms will not reduce gun crime. Just so my friends opposite know, criminals do not register their guns.

Government Orders

Banning hunting rifles or target-shooting pistols does nothing to reduce crime and is virtue signalling at its best. Spending three-quarters of \$1 billion on a gun confiscation program is a waste of taxpayers' dollars. However, given the government spent \$54 million on the ArriveCAN app, which should have cost \$80,000, I guess money does not matter to it.

Violent gun crime is on the rise because of the catch-and-release bail system the Liberals created with Bill C-75, but also because they reduced penalties for at least nine gun crimes through Bill C-5. When will they realize that?

Bill C-14, which we are considering today, is a good start, but only a half measure. If they were serious about reforming our justice system and ending their catch-and-release bail policies, they would repeal Bill C-75 and Bill C-5.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I must say that I disagree with a number of things the member put on the record this morning. The bail reform legislation was an election commitment given by the Prime Minister. It was part of the platform. After the election, extensive consultations were done with mayors, premiers and many other different stakeholders and law enforcement agencies. This legislation has widespread support. It was a commitment made to Canadians.

The only thing that will prevent this legislation from becoming law is the Conservative Party. We could pass it before the end of the year. Does the member feel in any way that he owes it to his constituents to get the bail reform legislation passed before the end of the year?

• (1220)

Ziad Aboultaif: Madam Speaker, I am sure the hon. member knows well that we need Canadians to be safe, first and foremost. In order for Canadians to be safe, the government cannot be light on criminals, as it has been through Bill C-75 and Bill C-5.

I said in my speech that this bill, Bill C-14, is a good start. The Conservatives want it to be stronger. We want criminals to understand they cannot just get a freebie every time they do something stupid like attack or kill someone or commit any criminal offence against any Canadian. This is the Conservative Party's aim. We need strong legislation to make sure criminals stay behind bars and are not set free on the streets to recommit crimes again and again.

[Translation]

Marie-Hélène Gaudreau (Laurentides—Labelle, BQ): Madam Speaker, my colleague just mentioned that it is important to have strong legislation, rules and laws as long as we give judges the opportunity to make an assessment.

Think about a criminal who has stolen a car for the first time versus one who has committed acts of physical violence against other people or even caused death. I think we can agree that those are two very different things.

It would be nice if we could conduct an in-depth study of this bill in committee. I am wondering whether my colleague would be willing to accept the Bloc Québécois's amendments.

[English]

Ziad Aboultaif: Madam Speaker, if anyone should accept any amendments, it should be the government, not the Conservatives.

When it comes to the bill going to committee, it is very important for any bill of this importance to go to committee to be examined by all parties. This is the way we do things. I hope the committee will be able to study this bill well to make sure we can present to Canadians, once and for all, a strong justice system that will really protect them, their families and our streets.

Rhonda Kirkland (Oshawa, CPC): Madam Speaker, I wonder if my colleague could comment on a couple of things. I very quickly looked at a few numbers. Since Bill C-75 passed, there were 182 murders committed by people out on bail in 2019, 198 in 2020, 171 in 2021, 256 in 2022 and 267 in 2023. We do not have numbers for 2024 and 2025. This does not include intimate partner violence abuse and child abuse by criminals who were out on bail.

A member opposite said that we have all these organizations supporting this bill and asked why we cannot support it. Why does my colleague think the members opposite did not support our motion to quickly pass Bill C-242, the bail not jail bill, when all of those same organizations urged them to support it?

Ziad Aboultaif: Madam Speaker, we hear a lot in the news everywhere about how many crimes are committed every day, and the majority of them are committed by repeat offenders, people released from prison within 15 days who go out on the streets again and start attacking people. I hear about it in Edmonton every day. Toronto is also a great example.

• (1225)

Hon. Randeep Sarai (Secretary of State (International Development), Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am honoured to rise in the House today to speak in support of Bill C-14, the bail and sentencing reform act. This legislation represents a significant effort to strengthen public safety and ensure that Canada's justice system works as it should: firm, fair and focused on protecting people.

In my riding of Surrey Centre, we have seen first-hand how crime can shake a community's sense of safety. I have spoken with families, business owners and community leaders who have been directly targeted by extortion and intimidation. Some have received threatening calls demanding money. Others have seen shots fired at their homes and businesses, or had their livelihoods put at risk because they refused to pay. Some may have even been murdered for failing to pay.

These are not abstract crimes; they are real acts of fear and coercion that are leaving long-lasting damage. They rob people of their peace of mind and the freedom to live and work without intimidation, and they erode trust in the system when those responsible are seen walking the streets soon after being arrested.

Canadians want communities to be safe. When those expectations are not met, they expect their government to respond. That is why this bill matters. The bail and sentencing reform act is about restoring confidence that our justice system will protect the innocent, support victims and hold offenders fully accountable. It is also about restoring confidence that the federal government is listening to the concerns of Canadians and responding with concrete action.

Bill C-14 would introduce more than 80 clauses of targeted reforms to make bail laws stricter and sentencing tougher for repeat and violent offenders, while safeguarding the rights guaranteed under the charter. These proposed reforms reflect months of government consultation with provinces and territories, mayors, law enforcement, victims' advocates and community organizations, all united in the shared goal of keeping Canadians safe.

While this bill covers a range of reforms, I want to focus my remarks in a few areas that matter deeply to me and to the people I represent, particularly those dealing with bail, violent crime and the growing problem of extortion and organized crime. I will talk first about Bill C-14's aim to strengthen the bail system.

Across the country, too many tragic and violent crimes have been committed by individuals who were already out on bail. There is growing concern that the bail system is not working as it should when it comes to repeat and violent offenders. This bill aims to address that problem and make bail decisions more responsive to public safety.

It would offer clarity to police and courts about how to apply the principle of restraint and would make clear that it does not require release in every case. Detention is justified when it is necessary to protect public safety. The legislation would also strengthen the guidance given to courts when assessing bail, ensuring that decisions take full account of risks to public safety and the circumstances of the alleged offence. Most importantly, Bill C-14 would introduce several new reverse onus provisions for crimes such as organized auto theft, home invasion, human trafficking, sexual assault involving choking or strangulation, and, critically, extortion involving violence.

Typically, when prosecutors want to detain an accused person while they await trial, they bear the onus or burden of demonstrating to the court that the accused should not be released on bail. The reverse onus would shift this burden from the prosecution to the accused, creating a presumption in favour of keeping the accused in

Government Orders

custody unless they can show to the court that they should not be denied bail. In other words, it would be up to the accused to demonstrate why they should be released and not the other way around. By shifting the burden in these cases, the law would help ensure that individuals who repeatedly endanger others remain in custody unless it is truly safe to release them.

I will turn next to how this legislation would help address the growing threat of extortion and organized crime.

In my riding of Surrey Centre, this issue is deeply personal. The Surrey Police Service has reported 65 extortion cases so far this year, with 35 of them involving gunfire. These numbers are alarming, and behind each one are people and families living in fear and uncertainty as a result. When fear like this takes hold, it can damage livelihoods and the sense of safety that communities deserve and depend on. For example, I have heard from business owners who feel targeted simply for working hard and succeeding. No one should ever have to look over their shoulder just for building a successful business.

• (1230)

Bill C-14 would give our justice system stronger tools to respond, making it more difficult for an accused charged with extortion involving threatened or attempted violence to secure their release on bail. It would require the courts to consider the number of and seriousness of outstanding charges accumulated while out on bail, and it would expand weapons prohibitions at the bail stage to include those accused of extortion and organized crime. Importantly, it would also require courts to consider imposing tougher conditions like curfews, no-contact orders and clear geographic restrictions when bail is granted to help prevent further intimidation while cases are before the courts.

These proposals would complement other actions to tackle organized crime and extortion, most notably the recent listing of the Bishnoi gang as a terrorist entity. This equips law enforcement and prosecutors with stronger tools to investigate, disrupt and dismantle transnational criminal networks that traffic in fear and violence. Together, these measures would help ensure that my constituents in Surrey Centre, and Canadians across the country, can live and work without fear or coercion.

Government Orders

Canadians also expect that sentences will reflect the seriousness of the crime committed and the harm done to victims. I would like to highlight a few elements of this bill that would strengthen accountability once offenders are convicted. Bill C-14 would amend the Criminal Code to include significant sentencing reforms to make penalties tougher for repeat violent offenders, including extortion and crimes that endanger public safety. It would require consecutive sentences for certain combinations of offences, as when extortion is committed alongside arson or when a violent auto theft is linked with the breaking and entering of a home. Each act would be treated as a separate harm deserving of its own consequence. These measures would make sure sentences send a clear message: Those who commit acts of violence or intimidation will face consequences that reflect the seriousness of their crimes.

Bill C-14 represents a balanced and responsive path forward. It is the product of co-operation across multiple levels of government, engagement with frontline responders and listening to the concerns of Canadians, and it reflects the federal government's commitment to doing its part. For those measures to have their full effect, they must be matched with strong implementation at every level, from the provincial administration of justice to local law enforcement in communities across the country.

Keeping Canadians safe requires all partners to work together to uphold their shared responsibilities. In my riding of Surrey Centre and across the country, families, small business owners and community leaders have been clear that they want safer streets, stronger accountability and real consequences for those who commit violent crimes. This bill would help deliver exactly that.

I urge members to give it their full support.

Tamara Jansen (Cloverdale—Langley City, CPC): Madam Speaker, Canadians are tired of the spin. The government's Bill C-75 and Bill C-5 turned our justice system into a revolving door: catch, release, repeat. Since then, violent crime is up 41%. In my own riding, I sat across from small business owners this weekend who are terrified of extortion, and from families afraid to walk home at night. Add to that record-high immigration levels with no proper vetting, and our neighbours are being shot at while they sleep in their homes. We are watching communities buckle under the pressure.

Please tell me this: After years of failure, why did the Liberals not support the Conservatives' jail not bail bill when they had the chance to fix it?

Hon. Randeep Sarai: Madam Speaker, I share a lot of the same concerns as my hon. colleague, whose riding is adjacent to mine. Yes, there is a lot of concern among business owners and families, but the bill that the member opposite is speaking about was more about slogans. It was not charter-compliant and did not have the consultation of the provinces and territories, the attorneys general, the solicitors general, the municipal police forces, victims or the average Canadians and business owners who are reporting these crimes.

Bill C-14 was done with the consultation of municipal police forces, the provinces and territories, solicitors general, attorneys general and members of the public. This is a charter-compliant, victim-focused bill, and that is why we are supporting it.

• (1235)

[*Translation*]

Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ): Madam Speaker, the bill seeks to restrict the principle of restraint, or at least set guidelines for it.

I would like my colleague to tell us more about the reasons for these restrictions.

[*English*]

Hon. Randeep Sarai: Madam Speaker, this concept of restraint came from a Supreme Court ruling in 2017 showing why it should be done. What I have seen is that the concept of restraint has not been equally implemented across Canada.

Take, for example, the extortion cases I have seen. I have met victims of extortion in Ontario and Alberta as well as British Columbia. The same bail provisions via the Criminal Code are implemented in all three jurisdictions. However, I would commend the training and ability of the Alberta prosecution in terms of any of those. Nine were charged with extortion there, and nine never received bail. Out of the nine, six have been convicted and three are awaiting trial and sentencing. However, in other jurisdictions, the same restraint was not implemented in the same, effective way.

I think clarity on restraint is very important. We need to have it. It is asked for by the Supreme Court of Canada. However, how that restraint is implemented requires proper training for our prosecution offices, as well as training for those judges.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I want to pick up on the issue of extortion because it has been a very serious one.

The member made reference to arson with extortion and how serious an offence that is. Yesterday, I was at the airport. I had someone approach me and share a social media post of some individuals walking into a store, pouring gas all over the place and lighting it on fire. It was an extortion case. These are very serious.

The member made reference to the fact that it is great the bail reform law will, in good part, deal with issues like this, but we need to have the co-operation and efforts of the different jurisdictions, whether it is the provinces, municipalities or law enforcement agencies. We all need to step up to the plate. The bail reform legislation we are introducing today is one of the ways in which the federal government is stepping up to the plate.

Government Orders

Could the member provide his thoughts as to why it is important that all levels of government step up to the plate?

Hon. Randeep Sarai: Madam Speaker, it is imperative that all three levels do. We have to remember that, in Canada, it is the local, municipally governed police or the RCMP in that jurisdiction that have to do the investigation and catch the culprits. It is the provinces that have to press the charges and control the prosecution. They must make their efforts and we must make the laws.

We are doing our part. We ask that the provinces and municipalities do theirs.

Ned Kuruc (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is very clear that the Liberals have lost control of crime. Let us look at their track record. Since 2015, violent crime is up 55%. Firearms crime is up 130%. Extortion skyrocketed and is up 330%. Sexual assaults are up 76% and homicides are up 29%.

They have introduced Bill C-14. It takes in some of the Conservatives' suggestions, but I feel that the bill still falls short in some areas. It does not remove the principle of restraint, which prioritizes criminals over victims. It does not restore mandatory minimum sentences, which were repealed by Bill C-5. Conditional sentence order limits do not go far enough. For example, robbery, gun and trafficking offences can still access house arrest.

Let us start with the principle of restraint. When the Liberals introduced Bill C-75, it weakened our courts' ability to keep violent repeat offenders behind bars because it directed them to release the accused persons at the earliest reasonable opportunity and under the least onerous conditions. Bill C-14 stops short of repealing this. Although it confirms that restraint does not require release, it still leaves the door open to allow violent criminals to get bail.

Bill C-75, which introduced the principle of restraint, was the Liberals' attempt at bail reform. The fact that we are standing here talking about it means that it failed. Bill C-14 is only going halfway to removing it. The bill would still direct our courts to release criminals under the least onerous conditions necessary when they do order bail. What Canadians need are safe streets they can walk down and safe homes they can sleep in. The only way we can restore that is by completely removing this weak Liberal bail policy. Bill C-75 was the Liberals' attempt at bail reform, and we can now agree that it completely failed. We should be scrapping the principle of restraint entirely and replacing it with a clause that prioritizes public safety or just gets rid of it completely.

Bill C-14 also stops halfway to solving the issue of mandatory minimums. It would include consecutive sentences and aggravating factors, but it leaves those up to judicial discretion. Most importantly, it would not reinstate mandatory minimums. Criminals charged with firearm, sexual and repeat violent offences should be afraid of committing crimes because they would receive a mandatory minimum sentence. This creates accountability and puts fear into criminals. Instead, criminals are not deterred by weak Liberal policies.

Just to name a few, Bill C-5 repealed the following mandatory minimums. Discharging a firearm with intent had a mandatory minimum of four years. Discharging a firearm with recklessness had four years. Robbery with a firearm had four years. Extortion with a

firearm had four years. Why should those have been repealed? It makes absolutely no sense.

Here are some examples of how weak Liberal bail policies impact our communities. In the House, we heard about Bailey McCourt, a young mother of two daughters who was killed by her ex-husband just hours after he was released on bail. Recently, another young mother of four, Savannah Kulla, was killed by her former partner in Brampton while he was out on bail. Earlier this year, Hamilton police had to release a statement after a man convicted of several sexual assaults was released on bail. In 2022, this man dragged a woman into the woods, gagged her, tied her hands behind her back and proceeded to assault her. In 2023, he entered the home of a 74-year-old woman and assaulted her for over an hour. In February of this year, he was released on bail pending his trial. Hamilton police released a statement with his picture to warn people because they believed he remained a threat to the community, obviously.

Bill C-14 gives us half measures instead of complete solutions. I heard from Canadians over the course of the election that they want to be safe at home and out on the streets. However, after 10 years of Liberal government, they do not feel safe in their own neighbourhoods, and rightfully so when we have criminals like those I just described being released back on our streets within hours.

● (1240)

For 10 years, the Conservatives have been advocating for, and presenting, solutions to the weak bail system. At every turn, the Liberals have voted against us. Our plan to restore safe streets is common sense.

We want to repeal the principle of restraint and replace it with a public safety primacy clause. This would put the public and community safety as the governing principle, putting Canadians, not criminals, first. We also want to restore mandatory minimum sentences for firearms crimes, sexual assaults, kidnapping, human trafficking and other serious violent crime. It sounds very reasonable to me.

Government Orders

We want to restore CSO ineligibility, in order to exclude robbery, firearms offences, trafficking and chronic violent offenders. Conditional sentence orders allow an offender to serve their sentence in the community under strict conditions like house arrest or curfew. There is no reason someone who commits human trafficking should be able to serve their time in the comfort of their own home and in our neighbourhoods. It makes absolutely zero sense.

Conservatives already proposed extending reverse onus on major crimes and making any attack on first responders a major offence, in the jail not bail act of one of my colleagues, which the Liberals voted against.

The Liberals are starting to see what their destructive policies have done to our communities, which is why they have started taking Conservative suggestions on bail reform, but their proposed solution, Bill C-14, would not patch up all the holes they have made. The Conservatives have listened to Canadians and have already come forward with a plan that would completely patch up the holes the Liberals have made in our bail system.

Our jail not bail act covers everything I have just talked about. It would put victims first and focus on public safety instead of on how short we can make a criminal's sentence. It would create a major offences category that would trigger a detention-first posture for the following charges: firearms offences, sexual offences, kidnapping, human trafficking, home invasion, breaking and entering into dwellings, robbery, extortion, arson and assault. This sounds very good to me.

The jail not bail act would make it mandatory for judges to consider the full criminal history of the accused and would introduce the 10-year look-back rule, meaning that if someone has been convicted of a major offence in the last 10 years and is charged with another major offence while on bail, they would be barred from receiving bail again.

These all sound like common-sense policies, but under the Liberal government, common sense has disappeared and been replaced with weak policies that allow bail for violent criminals. We cannot prioritize the victim and the offender at the same time.

For too long, the government has been prioritizing the criminal, and our public safety has declined as a result. Our cities have been taken over by violent repeat criminals, released time and time again. The Liberals are admitting their prior policies have failed Canadians when it comes to safety, because they acknowledge a 41% rise in the violent crime severity index since 2014 and increases in homicide, sexual assault and extortion offences.

Bill C-14 attempts to fix the consequences of the Liberals' past Bill C-75 and Bill C-5, which weakened the bill system, but they are keeping the same language framework, the same language that puts priority on releasing the criminal. Conservatives would make sure the bill before us would actually scrap the weak Liberal policies in favour of public and community safety.

Our country hit absolute rock bottom this weekend when the Supreme Court ruled there will be no mandatory minimum sentences for criminals who access or possess child sexual abuse content, in other words, content that includes children being raped. Yes, I was heard clearly: The new Supreme Court ruling, after 10

years of the Liberal government, has removed mandatory minimum sentences for criminals who access or possess child sexual abuse content.

The Liberals have been creating the kind of culture in Canada for the past decade where even a mandatory minimum jail sentence for accessing or possessing child sexual abuse content is viewed as unconstitutional.

• (1245)

Michael Coteau (Scarborough—Woburn, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the member opposite if he will be supporting this bill that really would reform the justice act to put in place harsher sentences when it comes to bail reform. I also want to know if the Conservatives will help pass the legislation.

Ned Kuruc: Madam Speaker, the past week has been very difficult for me, as a father.

We heard something that, yes, is a Supreme Court ruling, but after 10 years of weak Liberal policy, this is what we have come to. This is a low point in the Canadian judicial system.

Will the Liberals be using the notwithstanding clause? Will the Prime Minister simply even comment on what happened on Friday? That is what I and every Canadian, especially the parents out there, would like to know.

• (1250)

[*Translation*]

Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Madam Speaker, the Liberals take a lot of flack.

I would agree that the government is quite often clumsy and imperfect. There may even be some incompetence in certain areas. However, the Conservatives are claiming that a Supreme Court ruling is due to the policies of the government that has been in power for the past 10 years. I would remind my colleague that the Supreme Court assesses the constitutional validity of legislation.

If we want to be credible when debating such a serious issue, no one should be making up ridiculous theories for partisan purposes.

My question for my colleague is this. Bill C-14 does not go nearly as far as the Conservatives would like. The Conservatives want to take a much more aggressive approach to justice and parole. Bill C-14 does move things forward somewhat. It does improve certain things. Even the Bloc Québécois can find some positive things in the bill.

Does my colleague not agree that we should start by sending this bill to committee and improving it as much as possible? Then, well, we will see what happens after that.

Government Orders

[English]

Ned Kuruc: Madam Speaker, yes, the bill proposes some things, but not enough.

We are here debating it because Liberal bail reform, in the form of Bill C-75, which the Liberals introduced many years ago, has completely failed. In my opinion, the bill before us does not even go halfway. Bill C-75 should be repealed completely.

Arpan Khanna (Oxford, CPC): Madam Speaker, my hon. colleague's intervention today was great. He has attended many events across the community and has been to town halls. I see him interacting with people in Hamilton and across the GTA.

What is the member hearing from parents and seniors when it comes to crime? What is happening on the ground? If the member could share some of those stories with us today, it would be appreciated.

Ned Kuruc: Madam Speaker, yes, I have attended a lot of town halls, and I will be having my own shortly.

People have had enough. We have heard some very sad stories. We have heard stories of things that could have been prevented. We have heard of lives lost. We are hearing that Canadians are completely fed up. Record numbers of people are coming out to town halls, which, I would like to point out, are not partisan events. People are coming looking for answers. They are asking us why these things are happening to them, to someone they know or to their child.

We keep pointing back to Bill C-75 and to the failed Liberal justice system. After 10 years, I find it hard to believe that members on the other side are absolutely not listening to Canadians when they are speaking, loud and clear, to every member of the House.

Rachael Thomas (Lethbridge, CPC): Madam Speaker, last Tuesday I was finishing up a meeting in my office when the all-too-familiar ring of an Amber Alert went through on my phone. I picked my phone up and promptly looked at it, only to find out that a one-year-old baby girl had been abducted. Members can imagine how this grasped my heart, and I continued to follow the story through its progression.

The next day, I learned the details. I learned that the mother of that child, Savannah Kulla-Davies, had been shot and killed by her ex-partner, Anthony. It was later revealed that Anthony had a record of violence and threats against Savannah, the young woman and mom whose life was taken.

The man had faced firearm-related charges in 2023 for an attack against Savannah. A court document stated that he “did discharge a firearm while being reckless as to the life or safety of Savannah Rose Kulla Davies”. He even evaded police for a month before finally being arrested by the Waterloo police. A short time later, however, he was out on bail. Sadly, while he was out on bail, he was free to continue his pattern of violence, and this time it ended in the death of Savannah.

Savannah knew that Anthony was dangerous. She had once told her mom, “If I stay with him, he’s going to end up killing me.” As a result, she had left, but unfortunately the justice system failed to protect her. Despite his record and Savannah’s repeated pleas, she

was failed by the people who were supposed to ensure her safety. Warnings were ignored, and ultimately death was her end. Far too often, this is the case.

This past summer, another woman, Bailey McCourt, was also failed by our justice system and its weak laws. The proud mother of two young girls was bludgeoned to death with a hammer. Her ex was the culprit. That same afternoon, just hours before her life was taken, James had been convicted of four counts of assault by choking and of uttering threats in a domestic violence case. Despite this, however, he was allowed to walk. He went and immediately killed Bailey.

Sadly, now two little girls are growing up without a mom, and a family is left with a big hole in their heart. Bailey had lost her faith in the judicial system and in the court's ability to protect her. Her uncle even commented on this, saying that she was “frustrated, scared and felt [altogether] unsupported”.

Both Savannah's and Bailey's stories lay bare the devastating truth: Our justice system all too often sides with the perpetrator and not with the victim. To say that our justice system is broken would be an understatement.

How did we get here? For 10 years, the Liberals have proudly stood behind two soft-on-crime policies: Bill C-75 and Bill C-5. With Bill C-5, the Liberals weakened deterrence and denunciation by repealing numerous mandatory minimum sentences and re-permitting conditional sentences like house arrest for serious offences, extending all the way up to sexual assault. Under Bill C-75, the Liberals forced judges to release offenders “at the earliest reasonable opportunity and on the least onerous conditions”.

The decisions of legislators have real consequences, and these soft-on-crime laws have now resulted in devastation after devastation. After a decade of negligence, the Liberals are finally realizing, it seems, that crime does take place when lax laws are present, but Bill C-14 unfortunately does not go to the extent that it needs to. It is like putting a band-aid on a gaping wound.

I would like to discuss a few Conservative proposals that would help bring about a right justice system. If the Liberals really do seek to address crime with real solutions, my Conservative colleagues and I have put forward a number of bills, over a dozen. They are common-sense proposals to end catch-and-release bail, restore accountability in sentencing and put the rights of victims and communities ahead of the rights of repeat violent offenders.

● (1255)

I will take my time to outline just three of those common-sense proposals.

Government Orders

One proposal is to end sentence discounts. For a decade, the Liberals have favoured criminals over victims, with light sentencing in the form of concurrent sentences. Sexual assault charges should never be served concurrently, but this is the current practice in Canada. Predators get a two-, three- or four-for-one deal when they commit a crime. It is disgusting. It allows offenders to serve a single sentence for multiple crimes, often reducing their time behind bars significantly.

In Toronto, a family doctor was convicted of nine charges of sexual assault and four counts of sexual exploitation involving three of his patients. He was handed a concurrent sentence of only three and a half years. Again, the penalties for his crimes were combined into one, thereby robbing justice from many of those victims. These patients were supposed to be able to see their family doctor and feel safe and cared for; instead, they were exploited. They were taken advantage of. Instead of their being able to walk a life of freedom, they will bear these scars for a lifetime while the man, the culprit, the perpetrator, will go free very soon.

Each offence is a distinct harm; each victim is a whole person, and each act must carry its own consequence. My private member's bill, Bill C-246, would require consecutive sentences for those who commit sexual assault rather than their being able to serve the sentences concurrently. The Liberals' Bill C-14 fails to address this practice. It fails to address the practice of giving discount sentences for the most heinous crimes. Therefore, it is lacking.

A second proposal that my Conservative colleagues have brought forward that I believe the government should consider has to do with intimate partner violence. We know that, across Canada, women are being failed by a system unable to protect them from their known abusers. In both Savannah's and Bailey's cases, as outlined, their abusers were their ex-partners, something that is all too familiar. About a quarter of all victims of violent crime are victimized by an intimate partner. My colleague, the member for Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola, introduced Bill C-225, a bill designed to strengthen the legal response to intimate partner violence. If the Liberals truly wished to address this, they would adopt the principles of that bill, and it would serve Canadians incredibly well.

The third bill that I would like to draw attention to has to do with bail. I recently heard from a grieving mother in my riding. She reached out to me from Lethbridge. Her daughter Christina Webber was brutally murdered on December 26 of last year, the day after Christmas. Three individuals were charged in this first-degree murder. One of Christina's killers had been serving an intermittent sentence, meaning that he served time in prison on the weekends, but then he was allowed out during the week, supposedly to work, although he did not have a job. It was during the time he was out of prison that he committed this murder.

Another one of Christina's killers, who was charged with first-degree murder, requested bail and received it. She now lives peacefully in her home while she awaits trial. Meanwhile, Christina's family, her two young boys and her parents, grieve the loss of this mom. It did not need to be that way.

Conservatives have pushed for a long time for changes to our bail system. Recently, my colleague, the member for Oxford, introduced Bill C-242, the jail not bail act, which would ensure that in-

dividuals charged with serious or violent offences could not easily return to the community while they are waiting for trial. It prioritizes public safety. It puts the victim and the family first. Sadly, the Liberals voted against the bill.

Conservatives welcome the Liberals' sudden recognition that bail reform is needed, but Canadians deserve so much more. They must have much more because their lives matter, their safety matters and our communities matter. Canadians deserve better. They deserve safety; they deserve accountability, and they deserve laws that protect the innocent, not the violent. Therefore, Conservatives will continue to fight for these changes to strengthen sentencing, to reform bail and to put victims first. Ultimately, people like Savannah, Bailey and Christina deserve nothing less. For crying out loud, I hope, for the sake of their families, that we would want to do better.

● (1300)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I think every member of the House would clearly state that they care passionately about the victims of crime and those who are affected by it.

Having said that, the Prime Minister made a commitment to Canadians in the last federal election, not that long ago. It was just a few months back. He said we would bring forward bail reform legislation. This is substantial legislation that stakeholders from every region of the country support. There is an opportunity for us to deliver, for Canadians, genuine and substantial bail legislation with a wide spectrum of support. We have an opportunity to pass it into law before the end of the year. The Conservatives are playing politics and putting partisan politics ahead of the interests of Canadians.

Will the member give a clear indication of whether the Conservative Party will allow for bail reform legislation to pass before the end of the year?

● (1305)

Rachael Thomas: Madam Speaker, I wish I could say I am surprised to hear these comments from the hon. member; unfortunately, he makes these comments quite often. In this instance, he is saying cases like Christina's, Savannah's and Bailey's cases are politics. In fact, they are lives. They are women who had children, who lived in their communities, who gave back to their communities and who had a vibrant future ahead of them. Unfortunately, their lives were taken. Their lives were taken by a violent offender, an ex-partner in two of those cases.

The hon. member wants to call it “politics” when I stand in this place, share their stories and advocate on behalf of them and their families. I find that shameful. The government could have gone a lot further with Bill C-14. Unfortunately, it did not. As a result, we are going to continue to see crime skyrocket in this country and more people become victims. That is sad.

[*Translation*]

Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ): Madam Speaker, the Conservatives want tougher measures to fight crime. I would like to know whether they agree that we also need to crack down on criminal organizations by, for example, creating a registry of such organizations, making it easier to seize their assets and prohibiting them from displaying their insignia and symbols.

[*English*]

Rachael Thomas: Madam Speaker, with regard to organized crime in this country, we have seen it skyrocket. A great deal of attention needs to be given to that to assess what is going on and how we can better combat that. I would invite the hon. member to bring forward a proposal to the House for us to consider in terms of creating greater laws around that. Ultimately, our goal would be to see greater protection of the public and to ensure their safety.

Rhonda Kirkland (Oshawa, CPC): Madam Speaker, I will ask my colleague a similar question to that I asked a colleague previously. It has to do with the statistics from 2019 to 2023, which state that 1,074 murders were committed by criminals who were out on bail. We do not have the numbers for 2024 and 2025 yet. The member opposite continues to ask if the Conservatives will pass the bill quickly, and he says we should pass the bill quickly because all the organizations and police associations are saying we should do it.

To my colleague, why did members opposite vote against the Conservative motion to pass Bill C-242 quickly when the same associations asked the House to do so?

Rachael Thomas: Madam Speaker, I will highlight again that I feel Bill C-14 should have gone much further. It is one thing to have buy-in on a bill, but those same people who are buying into the bill and supporting the bill would have advocated for it to go much further.

Bill C-5, a Liberal bill, weakened deterrence and denunciation by repealing numerous mandatory minimum sentences and repermitting conditional sentences such as house arrest for crimes like sexual assault. That is disgusting.

With Bill C-75, the Liberals forced judges to release offenders at the earliest possible time with the least onerous conditions. This is why we have individuals out on our streets able to commit murder within hours of being arrested. That is disgusting.

Amarjeet Gill (Brampton West, CPC): Madam Speaker, I rise in the chamber today to address Bill C-14, an act to amend the Criminal Code, the Youth Criminal Justice Act and the National Defence Act.

I will begin by saying what I have been hearing loud and clear from the people of Brampton and across Canada. Canadians are tired of living in fear in their own homes and neighbourhoods. After 10 years of the Liberal government, one thing is painfully clear: Canada has become less safe.

Government Orders

Brampton is a city of hard-working families, new Canadians and entrepreneurs. These are people who came to Canada for better opportunities and safety, but today, many tell me they no longer feel safe walking to their cars, taking public transit or letting their teenagers go out at night. Our streets are less secure, and our communities are living in fear; repeat violent offenders are being released again and again because of Liberal soft-on-crime laws.

Since 2015, violent crime is up 55%, firearms offences are up 130%, extortion is up 330%, sexual assaults are up 76% and homicides are up 29%. These are not just numbers. They represent shattered families. They represent lost lives. They represent Canadians who did nothing wrong except trust their government to keep them safe. Let us remember the names behind these numbers: Bailey McCourt, murdered by her ex-husband just hours after he was released on bail for assault; Savannah Kulla-Davies, a 29-year-old mother of four, shot and killed in Brampton by a man who was out on bail. Bailey and Savannah were both killed by a system that prioritized the rights of repeat offenders over the safety of innocent people.

These tragedies were not inevitable. They were preventable. They happened because Liberal laws made it easier for violent offenders to walk free.

It all started with Bill C-75. That bill rewrote Canada's bail system and told judges to start from a principle of restraint. In plain English, that means release first, ask questions later. The Liberals told judges to release offenders at the earliest opportunity under the least onerous conditions. The result is a revolving door, a catch-and-release system that sends criminals right back into our communities.

Then came Bill C-5. That law repealed mandatory minimum sentences for serious gun crimes, drug trafficking and repeat violent offences. Together, Bill C-5 and Bill C-75 created chaos. The people paying the price are law-abiding Canadians: seniors assaulted in their homes, store owners robbed at gunpoint, women forced to live in fear of violent partners and first responders attacked by offenders who should have been behind bars.

The National Post reported that more than half of Canadians no longer feel safe in their neighbourhoods. That is the legacy of the Liberal government: fear, violence and disorder. Now, after four years of Conservative pressure, the Liberals are finally admitting what Canadians already knew: Their bail system is broken. What did they do? They brought forward Bill C-14. Let us call it what it is: damage control.

Government Orders

Bill C-14 is an attempt to copy the Conservative plan without the courage to actually fix the problem. Yes, it makes a few changes, but it leaves the principle of restraint completely intact. It simply says that judges should consider public safety. It does not require them to put safety first. It adds a few more reverse onus provisions, but that is just procedure. The offender can still argue their way out. It gives judges more guidance, not direction; it gives more advice, not accountability. Once again, the Liberals talk tough but act very weak. Canadians are tired of that, and they want results.

Conservatives already have the real solution, Bill C-242, the jail not bail act, introduced by my colleague. The entire Conservative Party is supporting it. The bill does not tinker around the edges. It overhauls the system with one clear message: to protect Canadians first.

• (1310)

First, it would repeal the principle of restraint and replace it with a public safety primacy clause. This means that the first question in every bail hearing would be whether we can protect the public. If the answer is no, offenders would stay in jail.

Second, it would create the presumption of detention for major and repeat violent offenders. If someone is charged with a major crime, they would not get the benefit of the doubt. They would stay behind bars until a court decides otherwise.

Third, it would strengthen the risk test. Instead of asking whether there is a substantial likelihood that someone would reoffend, the law would ask if it is reasonably foreseeable. If there is a foreseeable risk, we would need to act before another tragedy happens.

Fourth, it would mandate judges to review an accused person's entire criminal history, because no one should be treated as a first-time offender when they have already proven they are a repeat threat.

Fifth, it would tighten the surety system. There would be no more convicted criminals vouching for other criminals.

This is real accountability, real reform and real public protection.

The difference between Bill C-14 and Bill C-242 is simple. Bill C-14 would tweak and Bill C-242 would fix. Bill C-14 would encourage and Bill C-242 would require. Bill C-14 would charge and Bill C-242 would enforce. The fundamental difference between our two parties is that the Liberals protect the rights of offenders and the Conservatives protect the safety of Canadians.

Let us not forget that the Liberals voted against every one of these ideas. They voted against the jail not bail act and voted against mandatory minimums. Then, when Canadians demanded action, they copied Conservative ideas into Bill C-14 and called them their own.

Canadians see through this. This is the same government whose public safety minister once said, "I'm not responsible for the hiring of the [RCMP or CBSA] officers." If he is not responsible for protecting Canadians, then who is?

This is not a partisan issue. It is a public safety issue and a public safety crisis. Every week, there is another headline of another

shooting, another stabbing or another innocent person hurt or killed by someone who should never have been out on bail.

Bailey McCourt's family will never see her again. Savannah Kulla's children will grow up without their mother. Tell those families that the principle of restraint worked. Tell them that Liberal bail laws kept them safe. We all know the truth: The Liberal system failed.

The Conservatives have a clear, practical plan to restore law and order: scrap the Liberal bail system, restore mandatory minimums for serious violent offenders, prioritize public safety over political safety and ensure police and prosecutors have the tools they need to protect our communities. Canadians deserve to feel safe in their homes, in their parks, in their neighbourhoods and in their country.

It is time to act. Canadians are tired of fear. They are tired of excuses. The Liberals have had 10 years to fix this system and have failed. The Conservatives have the courage, conviction and plan to restore safety and order. Under a Conservative government, we will end catch and release, stop repeat offenders and restore law and order in this country.

Justice delayed is justice denied, so let us fix this. Let us restore law and order. Let us bring safety back to Brampton and every community across the country. Let us put victims ahead of criminals. We will make Canada safe once again.

• (1315)

Michael Coteau (Scarborough—Woburn, Lib.): Madam Speaker, listening to Conservatives in the House today is like going back in time to the 1990s, when Republicans were talking about "three strikes and you're out", which does not work. What Conservatives are proposing does not work. That is why we have come up with a piece of legislation that is right for this moment.

It is interesting that the Conservatives say this bill copies Conservatives, yet they criticize the bill. They cannot have it both ways. Either Conservatives support the bill or they do not support the bill.

Is the member opposite going to support this bill when it is brought to the House for third reading, yes or no?

Government Orders

Amarjeet Gill: Madam Speaker, the hon. member opposite, when asking his question, said they copied us. That is true, but they did not copy our bill in its entirety. Otherwise, we would have supported their bill. We are asking them to support our bill, Bill C-242. We would love to bring in safety for Canadians.

Canadians are suffering every single day. Canadians are suffering when they walk down the street. Neighbourhoods are not safe. Kids are not safe. Every day there are shootings. I do not know which part of this not being a partisan issue the member opposite does not understand. This is an issue we have to come together on to bring in safety for Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Marie-Hélène Gaudreau (Laurentides—Labelle, BQ): Madam Speaker, let us talk about public safety. There are ways of making that work.

Bill C-14 covers six major points that the Bloc Québécois thinks are very worthwhile. The Conservatives see everything as black or white.

Quite honestly, we need to take the time to properly evaluate the weight of this bill in committee in order to legislate on public safety and appropriately modernize the law.

• (1320)

[*English*]

Amarjeet Gill: Madam Speaker, I want to bring up some numbers, for perspective. Since 2015, violent crime is up 55%, firearms offences are up 130%, extortion is up 330%, sexual assaults are up 76% and homicide is up 29%. These are clear indications that something is not working for the safety of Canadians.

I am talking with every single stakeholder and enforcement agency and the Peel police about how we can fix these problems. They keep saying that this bill is a start, but it needs to be done better.

Our bill, Bill C-242, would address the problems once and for all and bring in safety for Canadians.

Jagsharan Singh Mahal (Edmonton Southeast, CPC): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for giving such a touching speech on Bill C-14 and the loopholes within it.

There is still the principle of restraint and house arrest for traffickers and people involved in firearms crimes and serious crimes. How does that resonate with him? How does that resonate given the ongoing threats, killings and shootings throughout Canada?

Amarjeet Gill: Madam Speaker, we all know that Canadians are suffering from crime. Crime waves are up because of the Liberals' soft-on-crime laws. This is a problem we started seeing years ago. Every single day, when a shooting happens, people call us. This is a non-partisan issue. We need to provide safety to Canadians.

The principle of restraint gives judges the opportunity to give bail under the least onerous conditions at the first opportunity, which is not right. That needs to be replaced completely.

Bill C-242 would address all the major issues and would provide safety for Canadians. I am so happy to support Bill C-242. If every-

one would accept it, it would be a wonderful opportunity to provide safety for Canadians.

Branden Leslie (Portage—Lisgar, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is always a humbling privilege to rise on behalf of the residents of Portage—Lisgar, particularly on such an important issue.

Before I get into the substance of today's matter, I would like to give a little shout-out of pride to my beautiful wife Cailey. We welcomed our second daughter into the world last month. She has been an absolute rock star. Today is the 22-month birthday of our first daughter, Maeve. I just want to say how much mommy and daddy love both Morgan and Maeve.

Before I was even elected to Parliament, the need to reverse the dangerous changes the Liberals made to our bail system was front-page news for years. This issue has been raised time and time again, almost every day in the House, for years. During that time, Canadians have listened to various Liberal MPs and commentators defend the disastrous legislative changes that have directly contributed to the crime crisis that is currently plaguing our communities.

When the Liberals weakened the previous bail system, the Liberals told Canadians that they were simply following a court decision. They claimed that by passing Bill C-75, they were only honouring legal precedent, but the truth is that no court demanded the automatic principle of release to be codified into law. That was a political choice, one the Liberals engineered and that Canadians have paid the price for.

Then came Bill C-5 back in 2022. That legislation removed mandatory minimums for serious gun offences and allowed conditional sentences for many other very serious crimes. The results were entirely predictable. Repeat violent offenders cycled through the system again and again. There was little to no deterrence. Victims were left behind and ignored. Later, the Liberals introduced Bill C-48, and while it added a few reverse onus provisions, it still failed to give clear direction on detaining repeat violent criminals.

Now, once again, we find ourselves trying to fix the mess the Liberals have created over the past 10 years. The consequences of their inaction have been devastating. Countless innocent Canadians have been harmed or have even lost their lives because the government failed to act when it mattered most.

Government Orders

We are often told that the justice system must balance the presumption of innocence with public safety, and of course it must, but that balance has been broken. Under the Liberals' watch, the bail system in Canada has become a revolving door. Dangerous individuals are released back on our streets where they continue to victimize innocent Canadians. That is not justice. That is negligence, and it is literally costing lives.

Laws are only as effective as the consequences they produce, yet over the past many years, the Liberal government has prioritized procedure over protection. We were told that reform would come from court interpretations or social programs rather than through tougher laws. Meanwhile, habitual offenders with long criminal records were repeatedly released, breached their conditions and returned to the same cycle of violence and victimization. The results were entirely predictable and preventable.

In 2023, rural police-reported crime in Manitoba reached 14,846 incidents per 100,000 people, almost 1.6 times the rate of urban areas. When bail decisions fail to account for repeat violent offenders, it is small towns and rural communities that pay the highest price. Municipal policing reports across the country tell the same story time and time again: Repeat violent offenders with long histories of arrests and breaches are being released, only to commit murder or some other serious assault or crime while out on bail. This is not a theoretical debate; it is a tragedy that has been unfolding in real time across our country over the past number of years, and it must come to an end.

The Association of Manitoba Municipalities has repeatedly called for bail reform. In its public safety agenda, the AMM outlined the urgent need for federal action and greater support for local policing across the province. Municipal leaders, from those in Winnipeg to those in small rural and northern communities, have been crystal clear that public safety is their top priority. A recent AMM survey found that nearly nine in 10 Manitobans want immediate federal action on bail reform and amendments to the Criminal Code to hold repeat offenders accountable. Those voices can no longer be ignored.

Statistics confirm what Canadians already feel. The national data shows that the violent crime severity index has been climbing for years, frankly, ever since the Liberals took power back in 2015, when they began their process of breaking the bail system and the entirety of the justice system. Offences involving weapons are up. Studies on reconviction and recidivism show that offenders with multiple prior convictions are far more likely to reoffend within months of release than those with fewer convictions.

● (1325)

When someone has a documented history of violence, multiple arrests, convictions and breaches of court orders, releasing them on minimal conditions is not fairness; it is gambling with the safety of the public. Police chiefs, prosecutors and frontline officers all warned that this would happen. Many of us have talked to those frontline officers and heard directly from them. They knew this consequence was coming. For years, they asked Ottawa to provide the tools to keep the most dangerous individuals off our streets. Instead, the Liberals delayed. They deflected that there was ever a

problem and left provinces and municipalities to deal with the consequences.

I want to highlight one heartbreaking example from my riding, in my home province of Manitoba. Meechelle and Ron Best recently appeared before the justice committee. They lost their daughter, Kellie, a young woman of 28 from Portage who had her entire life ahead of her. She was engaged to Travis and was expecting to walk down the aisle this year. She worked in tourism in the community. She had started her own small business. Everybody simply loved her. The man accused of killing her had multiple outstanding warrants and a long record of breaches, yet he was repeatedly released. It was when he was out on bail that he caused the crash that killed Kellie.

Before her death, he had been released on bail three times in the two weeks leading up to the Christmas prior to Kellie's early January killing. Despite his record, he remained free time and time again. After killing her, he was transferred to a behavioural facility, from which he quickly escaped. Meechelle told the justice committee that her heart sank when she heard that news. She feared for someone else's life and that some other family was about to be destroyed, because his pattern of behaviour was so crystal clear to anybody who paid it any attention. She asked a simple but powerful question of that committee: What good are assurances when someone who shows no respect for the law, police or judges keeps getting another chance?

This is the question that every single one of us must answer. This is not about isolated failures, but about a system that has simply lost its way. If an offender has repeat violent convictions, uses weapons, has breached bail conditions and ignored warrants, we must ask ourselves what responsible jail system would still default to release. It is under the Liberal government that our system has done exactly that, and the consequences have been tragic. That is why I have been unwavering in calling for laws that protect victims, defend our public safety and restore confidence in our justice system.

Judges must begin every bail consideration with the highest safety threshold in mind, and repeat violent offenders must not be given a free runway to strike again. Governments at every level must act to support the municipalities, including those represented by the Association of Manitoba Municipalities, that are on the front lines of community safety.

To the families who have lost loved ones because of this system's failure, we hear them. To the communities of rural Manitoba, the urban core of Winnipeg and Canadians across this country, we stand with them as Conservatives. They deserve a justice system that protects them, not one that endangers them. The Liberals have had years to get this right. They promised balance, but instead delivered policies that emboldened repeat offenders and eroded the public trust.

Too many Canadians have paid the price through trauma, fear and loss, and that simply cannot continue. It is time to fix the bail system. It is time for laws that put families, victims and communities first. Meechelle and Ron Best's story reminds us why delay is not an option. Their grief is a call to action. I am so proud of them for coming to deliver their story. The lives of countless Canadians hang in the balance, and no one should have to endure what they have endured.

When this legislation reaches committee, I expect members of Parliament to strengthen it and fix the mess the Liberals have created once and for all. I will note, as the Conservative shadow minister for justice has pointed out, that this bill is entitled the "bail and sentencing reform act", yet out of the 80 paragraphs spanning 35 pages, only a single provision touches on sentencing reform, and it concerns contempt of court, not violent crimes.

In the face of rising crime across Canada, why did the government fail to use this opportunity to strengthen penalties for other serious offences? It could have used this bill to send a clear message to every would-be criminal out there that their days of terrorizing our streets without consequences are over.

● (1330)

Parliament has a moral duty to do more than just tinker around the edges. We owe it to the family of Meechelle and Ron Best and the families of countless others who have faced serious loss, because no parent should ever have to endure the death of a child thanks to a broken bail system.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, back in April, Canada elected a new Prime Minister, who made a commitment to Canadians that we would bring forward substantial bail legislation. Bill C-14 has 80 targeted clauses to make substantial changes. The consultation included law enforcement agencies, provinces, municipalities and victims of crime. There were extensive consultations.

Our new Prime Minister has brought forward substantial bail legislation. If the Conservatives are prepared to see the legislation move forward, we could have this in law before the end of the year.

Does the member agree with me and the constituents I represent that passing bail reform legislation is of critical importance and that we should achieve to get it done before the end of the year?

Branden Leslie: Madam Speaker, the easy question to ask is what took so long. The system has been broken for years.

Yes, there is a so-called new Prime Minister. The member was part of the old government that broke the system. I can assure him, having talked to victims and frontline police officers, that there

Government Orders

have not been consultations for the last 10 years. They have been ignored.

This has been an academic exercise in trying to figure out the best way to stop crime, and it has failed. The soft-on-crime, revolving-door Liberal justice system is an admonishment of the approach the Liberals have taken. It is a complete failure. It is time that we listen to victims and frontline police officers and put criminals behind bars, where they belong.

● (1335)

[*Translation*]

Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Madam Speaker, I would like my colleague to tell us more about the impact that a bill like this one would have on the Oval Office, on Donald Trump.

Some things are taking a long time, but we have come under pressure from the Americans to take swift action. Do we feel as though we are taking too long? Should we bend even further to the will of the United States?

That is exactly what the Liberals told us that they would do. They said that they were going to sort everything out really quickly and that they would appease the U.S. In the end, that is not what is happening.

What does my colleague think would be the impact on the Oval Office?

[*English*]

Branden Leslie: Madam Speaker, it is important to highlight the insane number of promises the so-called new Prime Minister of the lengthy, 10-year Liberal administration has made, how few he has kept and how few he possibly could keep.

The member mentioned my community. When Kellie died, it shook our community. My hometown has 13,000 people. Within hours, everybody knew, and then they heard what had actually happened. They were sad. They were heartbroken when Kellie died because she was such an important pillar of our community, but that sadness turned into sheer disgust knowing that her death was entirely preventable. If the Liberals had taken the bail system seriously over the last nine months or, more importantly, over the last 10 years, as we have seen a steady increase in crime rates across this country, she might still be with us. Her death did not need to happen.

Government Orders

It is so disappointing to have so many Liberal MPs stand up and forget that they defended the status quo that has caused so many tragedies to families like Kellie's and others right across this country.

Vincent Ho (Richmond Hill South, CPC): Madam Speaker, the Liberals are trying to pass their so-called bail and sentencing reform act today. However, as Canadians may recall, Conservatives tabled our jail not bail act just weeks ago. It is a piece of legislation that we thoughtfully and carefully drafted in consultation with police departments, victims groups and police associations to close all the Liberal loopholes. We worked all summer and did the homework for the Liberals, and they swiftly voted it down. The Liberals chose to keep repeat offenders on our streets and give house arrest to fentanyl traffickers, offenders of gun crime and sexual offenders. The Liberals are now tabling Bill C-14, which does not even meet us halfway.

Why do you think the Liberals are pretending to fix a problem that they caused?

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): I remind the hon. member that I do not think anything while I am in the chair.

The hon. member for Portage—Lisgar has 10 seconds.

Branden Leslie: Madam Speaker, I suppose it is par for the course. The Liberals break it, promise they can fix it and fail. It is a vicious cycle.

Bill C-242 is a solution. The Liberals stole enough Conservative ideas in the last election. They should take this one, run with it and make this country a safer place.

Jeff Kibble (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, CPC): Madam Speaker, as always, it is my honour to rise in the House on behalf of the great people of Cowichan—Malahat—Langford on Vancouver Island.

I would like to take a minute to recognize Peyton Hammond, a 17-year-old who just won the World Darts Federation World Cup youth championship. Congratulations and well done. He certainly is a rising star.

Today, I would like to speak specifically about violent repeat offenders. Let us be clear. The Liberals' soft-on-crime Bill C-75 has allowed our towns and cities to become havens for violent repeat offenders. Frankly, Bill C-14 is not much better.

Let me take members to Duncan on Vancouver Island. It is a small town with a population of around 7,000. Lewis Street is the epicentre of violent repeat offenders, drug crimes and drug overdoses. There is an overdose prevention site, people are camping everywhere and there is struggling and suffering on the streets. It is one block from two schools. An elementary school and a middle school are one block away. I have been there many times. I have witnessed drug dealing and people overdosing, fighting and camping on the street. It is out of control. The park is a public toilet. There are no toilets; it is just a park. People are living on balconies. Residents there witness this every day.

“Stick Man” takes sticks every day and goes down the street, smashing cars. He gets arrested, is released the next day and does it

again. I have seen him. The residents there have told me they have seen him doing it again and again. They witness it from their balconies and their front yards, or from behind their windows. They know the criminals. They see them again and again. They see public sexual acts and public indecency.

I am, and we are all, sympathetic to those suffering from homelessness and drug addiction. They, too, are victims of violent repeat offenders. These people are somebody's son, daughter, brother or sister. They have a family. They, too, suffer.

Seniors there are afraid to go out at night. They know who the violent repeat offenders are. They know who is going to attack them, day and night. Some of them are 90 years old. They are struggling to get property insurance because of where they live, because of the crime and because of the violent repeat offenders.

I would like to speak about Hank's Handimart, which is nearby. James Kim is a senior and a store owner. He was working in his store and was beaten nearly to death. He was put in hospital for several weeks, yet the next day, as his sons were covering shifts to keep the family business, which is helping the community, open and alive, they watched the accused walk past the store. The next day, he was out on bail.

The overall crime severity index there is 339 and the violent crime severity index is at 324. It is among the worst in British Columbia. The violent crime rate is 153% above the national average. That is not just in Duncan; it is in small and big towns and communities across Canada. People are suffering from Bill C-75 and the culture of violent repeat offenders and catch and release. Bill C-75 has failed Canada and it has failed Duncan. Is Bill C-14 any better?

Johnny was my daughter's boyfriend. He was murdered in downtown Victoria not three years ago. He was brutally stabbed to death. He was gutted with a hunting knife by a violent repeat offender who was out on bail. He had been charged multiple times. In fact, some of the charges were laid not two weeks earlier. They were violent crimes: attempted murder and attacking a police service dog. He should not have been out on bail, but he was. That is Bill C-75's failure. Will Bill C-14 solve it?

Last week, I asked the member for Etobicoke—Lakeshore, from the party opposite, if Bill C-14 would solve the issue of violent repeat offenders and if it would have saved Johnny. He said the problem was the judges. He questioned their training, how busy they were that day and their experience. He wanted to know their qualifications. He was pointing fingers and blaming our legal system for Bill C-75's failures. I think that was shameful. He then went on to challenge members who disagreed with him to take it outside.

Most importantly, the member was unable to answer, and did not answer, whether Bill C-14 would have saved the life of somebody like Johnny or the lives of so many other people across Canada who have been affected and whose lives have been shattered by violent repeat offenders. Violent repeat offences have spiked in the last 10 years.

● (1340)

Bill C-14 fails to impose automatic detention for those already on bail. This would have prevented Johnny's murder and so many other crimes. It leaves the principle of restraint in place, the very policy that forced the judges to release Johnny's murderer at the earliest opportunity under the least onerous conditions.

These are some of the examples specific to violent repeat offenders, which Bill C-14 fails to address. It fails to keep violent repeat offenders behind bars. It falls short. The principle of restraint remains. The "least onerous" language persists. It keeps the culture of release there.

House arrest limits do not go far enough for robbery, gun crimes and trafficking. The solution is clearly to bring the bill to committee and put in some hard work to fix Bill C-14. Sure, it copies some Conservative ideas, but not all of them. It certainly does not go far enough, as I outlined, specifically on the violent repeat offender problem. We need to keep these people where they belong, which is behind bars. What we have now is not working. Duncan knows it. Vancouver Island knows it. Towns across Canada know it. Victims know it. Law enforcement knows it.

Sure, Bill C-14 is a start. It also acknowledges that Bill C-75 was a failure. There is a lot of work needed to make some serious improvements to Bill C-14. We support getting it to committee in order to get it fixed and deliver good laws for Canadians with key elements like, for example, the principle of restraint, house arrest limits and restoring mandatory minimums. It needs to be responsive to the needs, requirements and advice of law enforcement officials and, indeed, all Canadians. The solution is, clearly, to work together, as a minority government should. It is not about saying, "We need to vote for their bill as it is, or we are the bad guy." We need to be collaborative and work together for the betterment of Canadians, in order to keep people safe.

Bill C-14 needs lots of work. It needs fixing. It needs improvement. Conservatives are ready to work together to keep Canadians safe. I am wondering if the Liberals are ready to work together.

● (1345)

Kristina Tesser Derksen (Milton East—Halton Hills South, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I know the member mentioned mandatory minimums. This has been brought up several times this morning. I am sure the member is aware that the Supreme Court struck down several cases based on mandatory minimums and their unconstitutionality. Our new bail and sentencing reform legislation would allow courts to use discretion in individual cases to ensure that criminals are properly punished without the risk of violating the charter.

Does the member understand the problem with mandatory minimums and their compliance with the charter, and will he support the reformatory crime legislation the government has brought forward?

Government Orders

Jeff Kibble: Madam Speaker, as I said very clearly, we need to work together so we can solve the challenges, failures and shortcomings of Bill C-14. With collaborative work to fix it, we will work to support it.

As for mandatory minimums, judges need to be working on the particulars of the cases. They have their discretion, but they need to maintain those mandatory minimums.

[*Translation*]

Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ): Madam Speaker, the Conservatives want tougher measures to fight crime. I would like to know their thoughts on the following ideas for cracking down on organized crime: creating a registry of criminal organizations and making it illegal to display symbols or insignia used by criminal organizations.

What does my colleague think about that?

[*English*]

Jeff Kibble: Madam Speaker, while I spoke specifically to violent repeat offenders and how Bill C-14 applies to them, I certainly agree that organized crime also needs to be addressed. That falls under my description of how the bill needs more work. Cracking down on organized crime would certainly be part of it.

Fred Davies (Niagara South, CPC): Madam Speaker, as members know, I have stood in this place many times over the last couple of months to talk about the brutal sexual assault and rape of a little girl in my riding of Niagara South, "Little E". Everyone is keenly aware of this case. She was assaulted by a repeat offender, somebody who had just been released and who served one year of a year-and-a-half sentence. He attacked this little girl within weeks of his release.

I am wondering if my colleague can comment on how this legislation might have dealt with the release of this offender. Would it have happened under this legislation, and what improvements does he believe need to happen so that people like Daniel Senecal have a sentence that is commensurate with the crime?

Jeff Kibble: Madam Speaker, while I do not really know how to answer that question, it is an absolutely heartbreaking story. We need Bill C-14 to be worked on so cases like that simply cannot happen. It happens too often. That one example is too much, yet we know there are so many examples.

Government Orders

As Conservatives, our goal is to work together in committee to fix this bill so that Canadians like the ones in the story the member gave us are protected, and so that violent repeat offenders stay behind bars. We made suggestions already on how to fix it with our jail not bail act. Now is the time to work together and come up with a positive solution.

• (1350)

Doug Eyolfson (Winnipeg West, Lib.): Madam Speaker, an article in last week's Winnipeg Free Press described how Manitoba has been underfunding its Crown attorneys. This has been happening in other provinces as well. We all know that, in order to be denied bail, someone needs a bail hearing, and there are not enough Crown attorneys for timely bail hearings. Under law, then, they have to be released.

Would you not agree that there is some responsibility among the provincial governments to make sure this is properly administered?

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): I give the hon. member a reminder that I cannot agree or disagree with anything.

I ask the hon. member for Cowichan—Malahat—Langford to answer the question.

Jeff Kibble: Madam Speaker, I am certainly not asking you to agree or disagree with anything, but I appreciate the guidance for the House, in general.

I am not familiar with the article in the Winnipeg Free Press mentioned by the member for Winnipeg West. Yes, there are challenges at the provincial level, but we need to set the guidance in Bill C-14 to make the conditions correct so that provinces can deal with it. The Liberals have had 10 years to work on and fix this. They have not done that. At all levels, we need to make Canadians able to feel safe on the streets so they can enjoy a safe life.

Blaine Calkins (Ponoka—Didsbury, CPC): Madam Speaker, Ponoka—Didsbury is a great riding in rural central Alberta. It is almost as close to the north end of Calgary as it is to the south end of Edmonton, with some of the finest, hardest-working and noblest people we could ever find, and honest, law-abiding citizens. There are lots of farmers, businesses and all-around good people. It is a pleasure for me to rise on their behalf today to give a speech that I am going to entitle "We told them so".

I am rising to speak to Bill C-14, a bill introduced by the Liberal government to fix a problem that it, essentially, created. When the Conservative government left power in 2015, Canada had the lowest total crime rate since 1969, and that was not simply a coincidence. Conservatives understand that the justice system is not a toy for the use of social engineering. It is, in fact, an important tool for restraining the liberties of those who threaten public safety, especially when they are likely to reoffend. In other words, Conservatives believe public safety to be the paramount consideration in whether somebody's civil liberties should be restrained.

Victims of crime deserve a voice, and the actions of criminals should have real-world consequences. Unfortunately, the last 10 years of Liberal rule have seen all the progress made under the Harper administration completely erased. During these years, the current Liberal government and the ones before it waged an ideo-

logical crusade against those who uphold Canada's laws. Of the Liberals' soft-on-crime bills, none are more egregious than Bill C-5 and Bill C-75.

Bill C-75 eased bail provisions and legislated the principle of restraint for police and courts, ensuring that criminals would be released at the earliest opportunity under the least onerous conditions. This is, essentially, the open door to the catch-and-release system we see today. I am a conservationist at heart and an angler. I know that catch and release can sometimes be a good thing. When it comes to justice, though, catch and release is poor public policy and comes at enormous costs for certain Canadians.

Bill C-5, for its part, removed the mandatory minimum sentences on 14 different Criminal Code offences, even some minimum sentences that were put in place by none other than Pierre Elliott Trudeau. These were common-sense penalties for dangerous offences and included using a firearm or an imitation firearm in the commission of an offence. It also included possession of a firearm or weapon while knowing that the possession is unauthorized. We all know criminals do not get gun licences and do not register their guns. Why on earth would we take away minimum penalties for people who knowingly do that?

Regarding possession of a prohibited or restricted firearm with ammunition, I do not know why people would not go to jail for that. Every law-abiding gun owner knows they would not have to suffer those consequences because they follow the rules, but criminals do not follow the rules. Regarding possession of a weapon obtained in the commission of an offence, if someone steals somebody's guns, they do not get to go to jail. As a matter of fact, someone would probably get in more trouble for having their guns stolen from them than the person who actually stole the guns in the first place.

• (1355)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): Could we see to the noise in the corridors, please? It is very disturbing.

Thank you.

The hon. member.

Blaine Calkins: Madam Speaker, what I was saying is very important. If the Liberals had listened over these 10 years, we would not have the problems we have right now, but it is clear they do not like to listen.

*Statements by Members***STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS**

● (1400)

[English]

When it comes to weapons trafficking, excluding firearms and some ammunition, one does not have to go to jail if one trafficks in weapons. Possession for the purpose of weapons trafficking, that is, when a person carries them across the border or sells them; and importing or exporting firearms or ammunition without a permit, all related to organized crime and the smuggling trade, are things for which the Liberals erased minimum sentences.

Discharging a firearm with intent or recklessly is a problem. If someone discharges a firearm recklessly or with the intent to hurt somebody, they should go to jail. All hunters and farmers know this, and we are very careful. Gun control means muzzle control to a law-abiding gun owner but not to a criminal. However, if someone is a Liberal, why would they let common sense get in the way of ideological agendas? Of course they would remove that provision.

Robbery with a firearm must be a lot of fun for the victim. If a person is robbing somebody at gunpoint, under the previous or current Liberal laws of this country, they do not have to fear going to jail. As a matter of fact, they are probably going to be able to serve their sentence from their couch.

Extortion with a firearm is up by over 350% in Canada. In some communities it is up by over 500%. It was not like that until Bill C-5 was passed. The bill even permitted conditional sentences, allowing house arrest for serious offences such as sexual assault. Imagine a person's sexually assaulting somebody and being able to serve their sentence from the comfort of their own home.

The Liberal government has been one of the most divisive governments in Canada's history over the last 10 years. Somehow the one thing it was able to do was unite all 13 premiers with respect to its approach on crime. The 13 premiers, one for each province and territory, wrote to the previous prime minister in 2023, saying that he had it completely wrong. The most unifying thing the Liberals have actually done is galvanize the whole country in saying that they had it wrong.

Since 2015, there has been a staggering increase of lawlessness across Canada. Violent crime is up 55%, and firearms crimes are up by over 130%. These are crimes committed with illegal guns; they are not committed by hunters like me or by sport shooters but by criminals who get guns illegally. Extortion is up by over 330%, sexual assaults are up 76% and homicides are up 29%. It is no wonder a recent Léger poll shows that over half of Canadians no longer feel safe in their own home.

I would like to know this: Will the government apologize to all the victims of crime for all the abuse and the murders, to the people who are suffering as a result of the decisions the MPs on the other side have made?

GENETIC AORTIC DISORDERS

Hon. Karina Gould (Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share the story of my constituent Kerry-Anne Hall, who suffered a tragic loss. Her daughter, Kathryn Ellen Pryla, was just 28 years old, and eight months pregnant, when she died suddenly from an aortic dissection. Her baby boy, Callum James, did not survive.

Only after Kathryn's passing did genetic testing confirm she had Marfan syndrome, a connective tissue disorder. From the age of three, she was under specialist care for scoliosis, eye complications and other related issues, yet each was treated in isolation. No one recognized the larger pattern that could have pointed to Marfan sooner.

Kathryn's story reminds us of the importance of seeing the whole picture and of ensuring that our health care systems, professionals and researchers have the awareness and tools they need to identify rare genetic conditions early. Greater collaboration, education and research can save lives.

We owe it to families like Kerry-Anne's to raise national awareness of genetic aortic disorders and to make sure no one else is lost because the signs were missed.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Terry Dowdall (Simcoe—Grey, CPC): Mr. Speaker, residents of Simcoe—Grey are proud to be the home of Canadian Forces Base Borden. They are also proud farmers, so when DND revealed it had secretly bought over 700 acres of prime farm land to build a radar site, residents were shocked. Now they are concerned, after DND started contacting residents directly, asking them to sell their land because it needs thousands more acres. They will not sell; they have been on the land for generations. Will the government expropriate their land?

Affected residents Terri Jackman and Rachel Brooks took the lead and started a petition. Others have rallied behind them. We talk every day in the House about high prices and food security in Canada. The government says it is taking action. That action should not be turning 4,000 acres of Canada's best farm land into a radar site.

Residents support investments in Canada's national security, but they call on the minister to select a radar site that does not sacrifice food security in the process.

*Statements by Members***U18 WOMEN'S NATIONAL HOCKEY CHAMPIONSHIP**

Paul Connors (Avalon, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate women's sport in Canada as we welcome the 2025 U18 women's national hockey championship to my riding in Avalon. From November 2 to November 8, my hometown of Conception Bay South is proud to host these outstanding young athletes. The event is not only a celebration of athletic excellence but also a source of pride for the community, and it is the first time our province has hosted this prestigious event.

I want to congratulate the athletes on their dedication, skill and commitment. Their commitment is paving the way for future generations of girls who dream of lacing up their skates and representing their province and their country. I ask all my colleagues to join me in cheering on these incredible athletes and celebrating the strength of women's sport in Canada.

* * *

[Translation]

QUEBEC MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS

Dominique Vien (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Quebec has been occupied with municipal elections over the past several weeks. Yesterday, voters made a choice. That choice means that many people have offered to give their time to serving the public.

I congratulate all the candidates for having the courage and generosity to embark on this adventure. Many were not elected, but they won something nonetheless: They won the gratitude of our constituents. An important task lies ahead for the successful candidates.

I want to thank the elected municipal officials of Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis for the remarkable work they have accomplished over the last term. To those whose time in office is drawing to a close, I sincerely thank them for their deep commitment to the community. Their sense of duty has helped to enhance the vitality and prosperity of our municipalities.

I congratulate the newly elected officials and wish them all the best. I want them to know that they can count on my help and that I am always available to work with them in serving the people of Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis. I wish them a very successful term.

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN LEGION

Stéphane Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as Remembrance Day approaches, it is essential to acknowledge the invaluable role that our Royal Canadian Legion branches play in supporting veterans. Across the country, members of the Royal Canadian Legion look after the well being of those who have served our country with courage and dedication.

In my riding of Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation, regions such as Lachute, Brownsburg-Chatham, Chénéville, Buckingham and Arundel, which serves the Harrington area, are pillars of solidarity and remembrance. Through their commitment, community activi-

ties, and annual poppy campaign, these branches remind each of us to always remember.

I would like to thank their dedicated volunteers who, day after day, support our most vulnerable veterans and keep the flame of remembrance alive. Lest we forget.

* * *

● (1405)

[English]

PUBLIC SAFETY

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to speak about Abbotsford, where last week there were three shootings in three days. It is devastating to have another member of our community, Mr. Darshan Sasi, killed. I want to thank the Abbotsford Police Department and our first responders for their quick action, but this should not be the norm. The pressures they face to protect our crime-ridden communities are evident.

In September, the Abbotsford police launched a dedicated task force to combat a troubling rise in extortion, with 38 reports since 2023. It is not just Abbotsford; across Canada, violent crime is up nearly 50%, homicides nearly 28% and extortion 357%. The bail and sentencing reform act before Parliament must take these devastating numbers seriously. Public safety should not be a partisan issue.

I have heard everyone who has reached out to me. They should know that the Conservative Party is fighting for the change they want to see in their communities.

* * *

YOUTH

Iqra Khalid (Mississauga—Erin Mills, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, young people matter. They are not just our future; they are our now.

I represented Canada at the Inter-Parliamentary Union's 151st assembly in Geneva, and the one thing I learned was that we need to meet young people where they are at. We need to include them in solving the challenges of our time, whether climate change; or humanitarian crises, including Gaza; or artificial intelligence. Their voices matter, and their innovation is going to help us in really solving these challenges.

I really want to challenge all of the members of the House to ensure that we are including young people in our politics and in our ridings, to ensure that they are included in and are at the forefront of what we need to do to solve our world's problems.

THE BUDGET

Philip Lawrence (Northumberland—Clarke, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals have been in power for a decade, and Canadians are feeling the results. They are struggling with the high cost of living, including rising food prices, skyrocketing housing costs, and paycheques that just do not go far enough.

This is a simple concept: The more the Liberals spend, the more things cost. Reckless Liberal spending and increasing tax increases are making life harder for Canadians. It is time to reverse course.

Conservatives have a plan for the budget. We have got great demands. We are asking to get rid of hidden taxes on Canadians' food. We want to cut taxes on work, homebuilding, investments and energy. We want the government to keep the deficit under \$42 billion.

Canadians are sick of Liberal buzzwords. We are sick and tired of the lectures. We are ready for results. Our budget demands are simple, reasonable and effective. They will help restore the promise of Canada.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUEBEC MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS

Christine Normandin (Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, democracy has spoken in more than 1,000 municipalities across Quebec.

On behalf of the Bloc Québécois, I would like to congratulate all the mayors and councillors who won last night. I want to wish those who were running for re-election as well as the first-time winners every success in fulfilling their mandate. They can count on the Bloc's friendly co-operation.

I would also like to thank all those who had the courage to run for office but were less fortunate. Their commitment to their fellow citizens and to democracy is crucial, in victory as in defeat. I would also like to thank the citizens who took the time to vote, whether yesterday or during advance polling.

Finally, on a more personal note, I want to highlight the victory of our young former colleague Raphaël Guérard, who was elected mayor of Princeville in the first contested election in over 20 years.

Congratulations, everyone. Long live democracy.

* * *

[*English*]

SELAH PANACCI-MACCALLUM

Hon. Darren Fisher (Dartmouth—Cole Harbour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last week in Nova Scotia, NHL star Brad Marchand showed us what real friendship and heart look like. In the middle of his NHL season, Brad came home to stand behind the bench for his lifelong friend JP MacCallum, head coach of Dartmouth's U18 major hockey team, who is facing every parent's worst heartbreak: the loss of his 10-year-old daughter, Selah, after a courageous battle with cancer.

More than 1,000 people filled the Halifax Forum to lift the family up. There were bake sales, jersey auctions and a whole commu-

Statements by Members

nity coming together, showing the kind of love and support that defines Nova Scotia and Nova Scotians.

I want to send all the love in the world to JP, his loved ones and the team, and I want to thank Brad Marchand for reminding us that true greatness is not measured just in goals but in heart.

* * *

● (1410)

FOOD SECURITY

Grant Jackson (Brandon—Souris, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister said Canadians should judge him by what they pay at the grocery store. Food Banks Canada did just that and gave him a D on poverty and food insecurity after both rose nearly 40%. That is not an inspiring achievement.

Food inflation remains 70% above the Bank of Canada's target. Potatoes are up 16%, beef is up 33%, grapes are up 24%, and apples are up 14%. These are not luxuries. They are the staples every Canadian family relies on. About 25% of Canadian families are struggling to afford food, and food bank visits have doubled since 2023. However, it does not have to be this way. This week, Conservatives offered a simple solution: to stop hidden Liberal taxes on food. Instead, the Liberals voted to keep punishing Canadians, refusing to scrap the fuel taxes on fertilizer and farm equipment that drive up costs and inflation.

We cannot afford more Liberal failures. Conservatives will continue fighting to deliver an affordable budget so that Canadians can have an affordable life.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BERNARD GRANDMAÎTRE

Hon. Mona Fortier (Ottawa—Vanier—Gloucester, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very honoured to rise to pay tribute to the late Hon. Bernard Grandmaître, the guardian of the French language and the father of Ontario's French Language Services Act.

This great Franco-Ontarian recently passed away at the age of 92. Born in Vanier, he dedicated over 30 years of his life to serving in public office, first as mayor and then as a provincial MPP. His greatest legacy is Bill 8, which was passed in 1986 and which gives Franco-Ontarians the right to receive government services in their own language. It is thanks to him that institutions like the Montfort Hospital were able to survive and grow.

Statements by Members

He was a pillar of quiet strength, a builder, a man of conviction. His love for the French-speaking community was evident in his actions, and he inspired generations of leaders. His unwavering commitment to Ontario's francophonie continues to inspire us and guide our actions.

My thoughts are with his family, his friends and the entire francophone community. May he rest in peace.

* * *

[English]

JUSTICE

Hon. Rob Moore (Fundy Royal, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the disgusting criminals who prey on innocent children must face consequences that reflect the evil nature of their crimes and the suffering of their victims. However, on Friday, the Supreme Court of Canada decided to strike down mandatory jail time for child sexual abuse material offences.

One of the offenders from the case had hundreds of images of young girls, some as young as three. Another had hundreds of videos of young children between the ages of five and 10. As a result of the court's ruling, these vile criminals will no longer face mandatory jail time. This is absolutely unacceptable. The court made its decision. Now it is time for parliamentarians to take action to protect innocent lives.

Conservatives are unequivocal in that children must be protected from predators, and this decision cannot be allowed to stand. By invoking the notwithstanding clause, we will restore mandatory jail time for these heinous crimes and ensure that these dangerous criminals are locked up behind bars where they belong.

* * *

VETERANS' WEEK

Tim Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this past Friday, history was made in Ottawa. For the first time, the "lest we forget" poppy flag was raised on Parliament Hill to mark the beginning of Veterans' Week and the Royal Canadian Legion's annual poppy campaign. This powerful moment was driven by the dedication of Donald Eenkooren, a proud Canadian Armed Forces veteran and member of the New Hamburg Legion in Kitchener—Conestoga.

Donald understands the importance of visibly honouring those who served, and he turned that belief into a national moment. With support from the local New Hamburg branch, Branch 532 of the Legion, and support from my office, his vision was brought to life. Standing with veterans, fellow members of Parliament and the Minister of Veterans Affairs, I was deeply moved as Donald raised the flag for the first time on Parliament Hill. That ceremony reminds us that national traditions can begin with a single determined voice.

Let the poppy flag be a promise that we will remember, we will honour and we will continue to support our veterans and their families. Lest we forget.

• (1415)

ETHICS

Dan Mazier (Riding Mountain, CPC): Mr. Speaker, new information has once again exposed the Prime Minister's company, Brookfield, as Canada's biggest tax-dodger.

Experts have revealed that Brookfield avoided paying more than \$6.5 billion in Canadian taxes over five years by funnelling profits through offshore tax havens in Bermuda and the Cayman Islands. As the chair of Brookfield, the Prime Minister personally set up three multi-billion dollar investment funds registered offshore. Let us not forget that the Prime Minister still stands to benefit from these offshore funds personally through future bonus payments.

While the Prime Minister lectures middle-class Canadians about paying their fair share, his company is dodging billions of dollars in taxes that could be supporting Canadian services such as health care. This is the height of hypocrisy. Canadians deserve a Prime Minister who puts the country first, not his personal bank account.

* * *

TORONTO BLUE JAYS

Chris Bittle (St. Catharines, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in baseball, sometimes you win, sometimes you lose and sometimes it rains. What we are feeling this week comes from caring so deeply about this incredible Blue Jays team, a team that finished last just a season ago and somehow gave us a magical run that no one expected.

Sure, the other night hurt, but this season was special. These were players who gave everything, who understood what it means to represent an entire country. For a few weeks, they united Canadians coast to coast and reminded us of why we love this game.

Even in the World Series, our American League champion Jays were called lucky, underdogs against a powerhouse Dodgers team, but we knew they belonged there. They fought hard and held their own, but a couple of bad bounces made the difference. That is baseball.

It is okay to be disappointed, but years from now, we will still be talking about this team, the one that played with heart and determination. We will have to wait a little longer for that next championship, but what a ride this was. How can we not be romantic about baseball?

ORAL QUESTIONS

[Translation]

THE ECONOMY

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow will be the 10th costly Liberal budget. For 10 years, the cost of living for Canadians has been going up. Canadians are already paying too much, but the Prime Minister is asking them to sacrifice even more. The choice for Conservatives is simple. If the budget brings down the cost of living, we will support it. If the budget brings up the cost of living, we will vote against it.

Instead of trying to provoke a costly election on a costly budget, why not present an affordable budget for an affordable life?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are of course listening attentively to what the opposition has to say. The good news is that I think I just heard the Leader of the Opposition say he is going to get all his colleagues to support the budget because it will, in fact, be an affordable budget. It will be a budget that builds Canada. It will be a budget that Canadians will be very proud of. We very much welcome the support of the Conservative Party and the Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, for 10 years, the Liberals have been making exactly the same promises. The Minister of Finance and National Revenue, who used to be the industry minister, is the one who has caused the biggest decline in investment in Canada after promising that deficits would promote investment. Ultimately, the debt, the number of people in food bank lineups and the cost of housing have all doubled.

Instead of forcing Canadians to make more sacrifices and triggering a costly election on a costly budget, why not table an affordable budget for an affordable life?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it will indeed be an affordable budget for an affordable life. Not only that, but it will be a budget that opens the door to opportunities for Canadians and young Canadians across the country, for tradespeople, for Canadian softwood lumber, steel and aluminum. We are going to build this big beautiful country in an affordable way. We are going to make history by building a better Canada.

• (1420)

[English]

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow will be the 10th costly Liberal budget. After the Liberals doubled housing costs, doubled food bank lineups and doubled the national debt, now they are making exactly the same costly promises. The Prime Minister says that Canadians who cannot afford to eat or heat or house themselves need to make more “sacrifices”.

The choice for us is simple. If the budget brings down the cost of living, we will support it. If it brings up the cost of living, just as every other Liberal budget has, we will vote no. Instead of trying to

Oral Questions

provoke a costly election on a costly budget, why not have an affordable budget for an affordable life?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, obviously we have listened attentively to what the opposition has to say, and I think I just heard good news, with the Leader of the Opposition saying that he is going to order his troops, and himself, to walk in here and support this great, affordable Liberal budget that is coming tomorrow.

It is a budget that brings down taxes for Canadians, a budget that brings down taxes and GST for first-time homebuyers, a budget that makes life more affordable and a budget that creates opportunities for young people all over this country. It is a generational budget, and a budget that I know will be glad to have the support of the Leader of the Opposition—

The Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

* * *

CARBON PRICING

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals have been making those promises for the last nine Liberal budgets, which doubled housing costs and drove 2.2 million people to the food bank because of higher grocery prices.

If the member wants ideas for an affordable budget and an affordable life, here is one: There is the Liberal industrial carbon tax, which applies to the steel, cement and other inputs to build homes, and it applies to the farmers and their fertilizer and equipment. Will the Prime Minister, instead of provoking an unnecessary election, get rid of the industrial carbon tax so that we can bring down food and housing costs?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it was going so well up until now. We still have hope, though, that the Leader of the Opposition will not want to send Canadians, including our great farmers, to the polls over the Christmas season.

The Conservative leader continues to bring up these imaginary taxes. We would be happy to explain, once again, that farmers in this country are mostly exempt from any of those industrial carbon taxes.

The budget will be affordable. The budget will be great. The budget will build this country and build opportunities for farmers, young people and all Canadians.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member has to get his story straight. First, he started his answer by saying that there is no industrial carbon tax, and then he finished it by saying that the industrial carbon tax is great and does not cost anybody any money. He has to decide which it is.

Oral Questions

Here is how it works, for a prime minister who does not understand that Canadians need steel: The industrial carbon tax on steel, cement, plastic and other inputs raises the cost of building homes. The tax on farm equipment and fertilizer raises the cost of food.

If the Liberals want an affordable budget for an affordable life, why not scrap the industrial carbon tax on food and homes?

Hon. Wayne Long (Secretary of State (Canada Revenue Agency and Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, Canadians elected a new government with a strong mandate to build the strongest economy in the G7. Tomorrow we will table a generational budget. We will invest less in government operations so we can invest more in Canada. We will build Canada. We will invest in Canadians. We will invest across this country, from coast to coast to coast, and build the strongest economy in the G7.

It is time for the leader and his party to stop the rhetoric, join us and support this budget.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member has been in the Liberal government for 10 years. He says that he is new but he is making the same promises that deficits will result in investment. The last time the current finance minister promised that, we saw that investment dropped more than in any time in Canadian history and more than in any other G7 country. What went up? The cost of housing doubled. Food went up, doubling the number of people in food bank lineups. They doubled the national debt.

Why not have an affordable budget for an affordable life by getting rid of the industrial carbon tax on food and homes for a change?

• (1425)

Hon. Wayne Long (Secretary of State (Canada Revenue Agency and Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we cannot make this up: The member has been in the House for 20 years, has sat in opposition now for 10 years and has not supported one affordability measure the government has put forward.

We have cut taxes for 22 million Canadians. We have cut the tax for first-time homebuyers. We are moving forward on automatic federal benefits, getting benefits to 5.5 million Canadians.

Conservatives do nothing but vote against affordability measures. The member has been in the House for 20 years and has produced nothing.

* * *

[Translation]

THE ECONOMY

Christine Normandin (Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we are just 24 hours from the budget being tabled and the government is still threatening an election. Quite frankly, the public is not impressed because it voted for a minority government. A minority government is supposed to work with the other parties to get its budget passed. The government can take its pick of potential supporters. There are three to choose from, so it is ridiculous that, with just 24 hours to go before the budget, the Liberals are still not negotiating and are content to make threats about a Christmas election.

Will they finally respect the will of the people and get to work?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday was municipal election day in Quebec. I do not think the member will mind if I congratulate all of the candidates, the winners and all those who ran.

As for our talks, the member is well aware that we have had some good discussions with her leader, with her and with other members of her team. As for listening, we are listening to the 44 Liberal members from Quebec, who do a great job of representing their ridings. We are listening to the opposition parties, including the Bloc Québécois. I hope that they will all see what they are hoping for in the budget.

Christine Normandin (Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the government is talking, but it is not negotiating. The government is listening, but it is not hearing. Canadians do not want an election. What they did want, however, was a minority government. Had they wanted the Liberals to behave like a monarchy, they would have given them full control. For three elections in a row now, voters have been telling them to work with the opposition and negotiate.

In 2019, 2021 and 2025, the results were the same; yet here the Liberals go again with threats of an election instead of getting down to work. After three elections and with only 24 hours to go before the budget, is it not time that the Liberals got the message?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, six months ago, this government was elected to develop a budget that will build Quebec and create opportunities for Quebeckers and Canadians across the country, from coast to coast to coast. The projects and the investments in tomorrow's budget will create opportunities for young people, for the people of Quebec and everywhere else. I think that the Bloc Québécois, like all members of the House, will see their hopes and aspirations for Canada reflected in a document that will build Canada.

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot—Acton, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the dispute with Washington is far from over. The Liberals have even gone so far as to apologize on bended knee when we are the ones who are being negatively affected by the tariffs. Since this dispute is far from over, the priority in tomorrow's budget must be to support the people.

We made six demands based on the needs of Quebeckers: funding for health care, fair pensions for seniors, housing and infrastructure transfers, loans for home ownership and \$814 million to pay back Quebeckers.

Tomorrow, the Liberals will have a choice. Will they respond to Quebeckers' needs?

Oral Questions

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the answer is simple. I could just say yes and sit down.

However, since my colleague also made reference to the fact that we are still in talks with the U.S. government, I would like to reassure him. Yes, we are at the negotiating table. Of course we expect the Americans to meet us there.

Until then, we will continue to help the industry. I know that, in his riding, the forestry industry is affected. The auto industry is also affected, as are the steel, aluminum and softwood lumber industries. We will be there for our workers with an appropriate budget.

[English]

Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is another day and another grim headline confirming what Canadians already know: Ten years of Liberal economics have driven this country to the brink. In the GTA, 85% say that, now, it is too expensive to live and work in their own communities, and they are right. The Liberals doubled the debt, maxed out the national credit card and handed Canadians a bill through inflation and crushing taxes. Their carbon tax, fuel standard and plastic ban make it more expensive to grow, move and buy food.

Will they finally admit that their policies punish the very people they are trying to help, and will they use tomorrow's budget to scrap these hidden food taxes once and for all?

• (1430)

Ryan Turnbull (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance and National Revenue and to the Secretary of State (Canada Revenue Agency and Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the new government will deliver its first budget tomorrow, focused on making generational investments to unlock jobs and opportunities, boost productivity and growth, build housing infrastructure and defence, attract \$500 billion in new private investment, double trade with non-U.S. countries and move from reliance to resilience. We are making responsible investments while reducing operational spending. This is how we build the strongest economy in the G7.

Tomorrow's budget will empower Canadians because this is their country and we decide what comes next.

Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member talks as if the government's money belongs to him.

Every dollar the Liberals spend comes right out of the pockets of Canadians. To the 85% in the GTA who cannot afford life, the Liberals call these taxes imaginary. They are not imaginary when people are staring at their own credit card bill. The government's job is to listen to Canadians, not lecture them, gaslight them or threaten them with an election to distract them from the failures.

Instead of trying to cause a costly election on a costly budget, why not have an affordable budget for an affordable life here?

Ryan Turnbull (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance and National Revenue and to the Secretary of State (Canada Revenue Agency and Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr.

Speaker, an affordable budget for an affordable life is exactly what we will deliver tomorrow on budget day.

Conservatives have referenced the need to address productivity and GDP per capita for years. Well, there is good news: The head of the IMF has said that diversifying trade and investing in infrastructure, housing and defence will, in fact, boost productivity. The Bank of Canada's governor has said that this is the only way to make life more affordable.

Conservatives do not seem to want to make life more affordable now. Will they vote to support our budget or vote for a Christmas election?

Rosemarie Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake, CPC): Mr. Speaker, a costly budget means a costly life for Canadians. Every dollar the Liberal government spends comes out of Canadians' pockets through higher taxes and inflation. Hidden taxes like the Liberals' industrial carbon tax, fuel standard and food packaging tax are all driving up the cost of groceries. The packaging tax alone will cost the food industry \$5.6 billion and drive up the price of produce by 34%.

Will the Prime Minister stop trying to engineer a costly election and instead scrap the food packaging tax?

Hon. Wayne Long (Secretary of State (Canada Revenue Agency and Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, here we go again with the imaginary taxes that the party opposite makes up.

On this side of the House, we are focused on affordability for Canadians. We are going to cut taxes for 22 million Canadians. We are cutting the GST for first-time homebuyers. We are cutting the consumer carbon tax. We are going to build housing at a scale not seen since the Second World War. We are going to have automatic federal benefits for 5.5 million Canadians.

Will the party opposite stop with the rhetoric? It is time for all of us in the House to come together, support a generational—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake.

Rosemarie Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Ottawa Public Health is now reporting that one in four families are food insecure, and even baby formula is out of reach for many parents. That is the reality after 10 years of costly Liberal deficits and taxes. Food banks are overwhelmed, and Canadians are struggling to put food on the table. Instead of cutting costs, the Liberals keep raising food prices with hidden taxes.

Oral Questions

I will ask again, will the Prime Minister stop trying to engineer a costly election and finally scrap the food packaging tax?

Hon. Anna Gainey (Secretary of State (Children and Youth), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again, we find members opposite worried about imaginary taxes while, on this side of the House, we are focused on solutions.

The budget will make permanent the national school food program, which represents \$800 in savings for families each year. This is one of the many investments we are making on this side of the House to ensure that kids have the best start in life and that families can get ahead.

We hope they will join us and support the budget.

Carol Anstey (Long Range Mountains, CPC): Mr. Speaker, every dollar the government spends comes out of the pockets of Canadians through higher taxes and inflation. The Liberals are taxing food at every stage, from farm to fork, with their industrial carbon tax, their fuel regulations and their plastics ban. The Liberals' fuel regulations alone will raise the cost of gas and diesel by up to 17¢ a litre and cost the economy \$9 billion. Newfoundland and Labrador families are already feeling it and saying that getting ahead feels impossible.

Will the Prime Minister stop trying to engineer a costly election on a costly budget, and instead scrap the fuel tax?

• (1435)

Hon. Julie Dabrusin (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is time we really set the record straight.

Members from the party opposite are getting up, time and again, and talking about taxes that simply do not exist.

Let us be very clear: There is no plastics-wrapping tax. It does not exist. They should be honest with their citizens and their voters about how it does not exist.

Carol Anstey (Long Range Mountains, CPC): Mr. Speaker, while the Liberals make excuses, food bank use in Canada has exploded. The new HungerCount report shows over 2.2 million monthly visits, a 5% increase from last year and double since 2019. One in five food bank clients has a job, but they still cannot afford to feed their family. In Newfoundland and Labrador, local food banks are overwhelmed. Families are lining up earlier and leaving with less because the shelves are bare.

Once again, will the Prime Minister stop trying to engineer a costly election on a costly budget and, instead, scrap the fuel tax?

Hon. Joanne Thompson (Minister of Fisheries, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to say this to the opposition colleague from Newfoundland and Labrador: There is no fuel tax. It is an imaginary tax on food.

What I want to say clearly is that the measures we have in place in our province, including \$10-a-day child care, are allowing moms and dads to stay in the workforce.

I was in my riding this weekend and spoke about the importance of the new program in the budget for training workers in construc-

tion and health care, getting our young people to work. This is affordability.

[*Translation*]

Gabriel Hardy (Montmorency—Charlevoix, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in Quebec, families are struggling to pay for groceries. In Montmorency—Charlevoix, workers and pensioners have to choose between food, transportation or housing.

Every dollar spent by this Liberal government comes directly out of taxpayers' pockets. What is more, the government is adding to their burden with hidden ideological food taxes, the industrial carbon tax, the plastic packaging tax and the clean fuel regulations.

Can the Prime Minister stop trying to provoke a costly election with a costly budget and get rid of the ideological food taxes once and for all?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what I call ideology is when people come up with new imaginary taxes in an attempt to spread falsehoods in the public sphere. As my colleague is well aware, there are no taxes on groceries.

One thing is clear: We in the government are working on affordability. That is what we are here for, to protect the Canadian social safety net. What does that mean? It means child care, support for pharmacare and for health.

One thing is clear, and it is something our colleagues across the way are not doing: We are going to build Canada because, aside from affordability, what people want is jobs, and we are going to provide them with jobs.

Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette—Manawan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance has manufactured more than just his own new shoes. He also manufactured an entire election crisis on the eve of the budget.

His government did not hold any consultations. No witnesses appeared before the committee. It did not respond to any of the opposition's requests. There has still been no real negotiations between the parties. The budget is coming down roughly 24 hours from now, and the only thing the government has done is threaten an election.

Instead of making his shoes today, why is the minister not working on a deal to get his budget passed?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to correct what my hon. colleague just said.

Oral Questions

More than 28,000 people participated in the pre-budget consultations. We have had many conversations with the opposition parties, including the Bloc Québécois. I had some of those conversations myself. Several of my colleagues, including the Minister of Finance, have had them as well. We have worked with all parties in the House. There will be significant investments in a number of areas in tomorrow's budget.

The question is what the Bloc Québécois will do. Will that party vote to support Quebecers and all Canadians, or will it vote against them?

• (1440)

Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette—Manawan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, here we have the story of the ant and the grasshopper. The Liberals have been busy singing all summer long, and with 24 hours to go before the budget, they are completely unprepared. They threaten an election, fudge the numbers and make partisan attacks.

However, they knew that the Bloc Québécois would be asking for money for health care. That is Quebecers' number one priority. They knew that we would be calling for an increase in pensions for seniors. We have been asking for this for four years. The Liberals have been aware of all our costed demands for ages.

With 24 hours to go before the budget, do they want our support, yes or no?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow's budget will include major investments in infrastructure and technology that will create jobs across the country, including all across Quebec.

The question is what the Bloc Québécois wants to do. Does the Bloc want to help the people of Quebec? Is the Bloc willing to work with us in these hard times, or will the Bloc choose to force us into an election? That is the question for the Bloc Québécois.

[*English*]

Jasraj Hallan (Calgary East, CPC): Mr. Speaker, every dollar the Liberal government spends comes out of the pockets of hard-working Canadians through higher taxes and inflation. Meanwhile, the Prime Minister is forcing young Canadians to sacrifice more so he can spend more. A costly budget leads to a costly life for Canadians.

The Liberals promised a \$42-billion deficit. If the Prime Minister really is spending less, the deficit will be lowered.

Instead of trying to cause a costly election on a costly budget, why not an affordable budget for an affordable life?

Hon. Eleanor Olszewski (Minister of Emergency Management and Community Resilience and Minister responsible for Prairies Economic Development Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as a fellow Albertan, I know families want more than just to get by; they want good jobs, stable incomes and a fair shot at building a better life. That is exactly what we are focused on.

Last year, the Prairies development agency helped create more than 9,000 jobs in Alberta. Budget 2025 will keep that momentum going. The Conservatives can support it and help grow Alberta's

economy, or keep voting against the opportunities that Albertans and Canadians deserve.

Jasraj Hallan (Calgary East, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I can promise that Albertans will not be happy with that answer, because nine costly, inflationary Liberal budgets have given Canadians double deficits, double debt, double food bank usage, double rents, double mortgages and double inflation. What Canadians do not want is for the Prime Minister to double down on the same failed policies that send 2.2 million Canadians into a food bank every single month.

Instead of trying to cause a costly election on a costly budget, why not an affordable budget for an affordable life?

Hon. Eleanor Olszewski (Minister of Emergency Management and Community Resilience and Minister responsible for Prairies Economic Development Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives keep talking and talking about affordability, but when it comes voting, they oppose the very measures that create jobs and strengthen local economies.

We are delivering real results: thousands of new jobs, real investments in prairie communities and stronger paycheques for Alberta families. If the Conservatives actually care about helping families make ends meet, they should support budget 2025 and the jobs it would create for Albertans and all Canadians.

Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, every dollar the government spends comes out of the pockets of Canadians in higher taxes and higher inflation.

The Prime Minister is giving billions of dollars to Liberal-connected insiders and consultants, yet at the same time, he is telling young Canadians they have to sacrifice more. He has promised to cap spending at a 2% increase, but he is actually growing it by 8%. Who is paying for this inflationary spending? It is the two million Canadians lining up at food banks every month.

Instead of trying to cause a costly election on a costly budget, why not deliver an affordable budget for an affordable life?

Hon. Stephanie McLean (Secretary of State (Seniors), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what will make a real difference in fighting food insecurity is seniors being able to access the benefits they are entitled to. That is why we are going to make it easier for one million lower-income Canadians to access the benefits they worked so hard for, with automatic tax filing. We are going to make sure Canadians, especially older Canadians, keep their hard-earned money, with the first national anti-fraud strategy. What does Alma from Marathon, Ontario, say about this strategy? "Great news yet again by our amazing government! Thanks for always taking care of the things that matter to Canadians!!"

Oral Questions

We will continue to protect and empower Canadians like Alma.

[English]

[Translation]

Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after more than a year's delay, the Liberal government is finally going to table its budget tomorrow. We know that since this Prime Minister came to power, the deficit has doubled and \$48 billion in investments have poured out of Canada.

My question for the Prime Minister is simple: Will his budget contain concrete measures for eliminating the indirect taxes on food products? Does he realize that, instead of provoking a costly election, the better course would be to present an affordable budget for an affordable life?

• (1445)

Hon. Joël Lightbound (Minister of Government Transformation, Public Works and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, while the Conservatives fritter away every question period with talk of imaginary taxes, we on this side of the House are working on real programs with tangible effects on the lives of Canadians and Quebecers. Take, for example, the national school food program. It is a school for all.

The Breakfast Club of Quebec says that this program is having a major impact on the lives of thousands of Quebecers living in the most disadvantaged areas. The Conservatives are incapable of supporting it. They are incapable of supporting a real plan for housing.

They can keep talking about imaginary taxes all they want, but we, on this side, are going to keep on building.

Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, one thing that is not imaginary is the C.D. Howe Institute report, which gave the Liberal Party an F, as in fail. What is even more embarrassing is that the Prime Minister promised a maximum deficit of \$42 billion. Now we see that the Liberals are going to more than double that number.

Given the Prime Minister's experience in finance, does he recognize that he needs to put an immediate stop to this inflationary spending, as our party has repeatedly proposed, and present an affordable budget?

Hon. Joël Lightbound (Minister of Government Transformation, Public Works and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am really looking forward to my colleague hearing tomorrow's budget. The Minister of Finance will be presenting a generational budget for Canada. It will enable us to build the strongest economy among G7 countries, so that we can afford to have social programs that support Canadians.

Here is the big difference between us on this side of the House and the Conservatives. They do not care about the Canada child benefit, the Canadian dental care plan or the national school food program.

We believe in the economy. We are building the economy so that we can help Canadians from coast to coast to coast.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Salma Zahid (Scarborough Centre—Don Valley East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent a riding with a vibrant Filipino-Canadian community that has contributed so much to Canada. Across the board, Canadians overwhelmingly support our government's work to help businesses grow and reach new customers around the world. That is why the Prime Minister and his government's efforts to be out there expanding trade ties are so important for building a strong, secure economy for the future.

Could the Minister of International Trade please share how our government is strengthening Canada's foothold in the Indo-Pacific and what is at stake ahead of tomorrow's budget?

Hon. Maninder Sidhu (Minister of International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for her important work on Filipino Heritage Month.

Last week, I joined the Prime Minister in the Indo-Pacific, one of the fastest-growing regions in the world, to expand trade and investment opportunities for Canadians. We announced the launch of the Filipino and Thailand free trade agreement and led forward on the Canada-ASEAN FTA.

The numbers typically show that within six years of signing an FTA, trade doubles. That means more opportunities for Canadian workers here in Canada.

This new government is laser-focused on opening markets, creating opportunities across the country and expanding trade by double for non-U.S. exports.

* * *

JUSTICE

Larry Brock (Brantford—Brant South—Six Nations, CPC): Mr. Speaker, on Friday, the Supreme Court struck down mandatory jail time for predators convicted of possessing child sexual abuse material. That decision is disgusting. These offenders were not caught with a few files; they had hundreds of images and videos of children as young as three being tortured and abused, yet instead of standing up for victims, the Liberal government stays silent.

Why is the Prime Minister more interested in protecting pedophiles than protecting Canada's children from monsters?

Oral Questions

Hon. Ruby Sahota (Secretary of State (Combatting Crime), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, plain and simple, child abusers should face the toughest penalties under Canadian law. Child abusers are among the most reprehensible in our society. That is why we have introduced sweeping reforms, through Bill C-14, that would make bail stricter and sentences tougher and would make child sexual offenders serve time behind bars. However, let us not forget Bill C-63. A Liberal government introduced that bill to protect kids online, but the Conservatives refused to support it, and a few months ago—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Brantford—Brant South—Six Nations.

• (1450)

Larry Brock (Brantford—Brant South—Six Nations, CPC): Mr. Speaker, with the Liberals, why do the charter rights of pedophiles come before the charter rights of children? Shamefully, every single member of that party, including the Minister of Justice, remains silent. There are crickets. This ruling means pedophiles with hundreds of videos of children being sexually assaulted can escape mandatory jail.

They cannot claim to stand for victims while they defend a system that shields the predators. Why will the Prime Minister not call the ruling what it is, disgusting, and commit to restoring mandatory jail time for pedophiles?

Hon. Ruby Sahota (Secretary of State (Combatting Crime), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are not silent on this issue. That is why we introduced sweeping reforms under Bill C-14 to make bail stricter and sentences tougher. We are making sure that child sexual offenders serve time behind bars, but let us not forget the conduct of the Conservatives. They refused to support Bill C-63, which would have helped protect our children against online crime and online predators, and a few months ago, they refused to support lawful access to help police catch pedophiles.

[*Translation*]

Dominique Vien (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC): Mr. Speaker, on the same topic, the Supreme Court ruled that sentencing pedophiles to minimum sentences could be cruel. However, one of the offenders had 317 images of children in his possession, 90% of which were images of girls aged three to six. Canadians are shocked by this decision to protect these child abusers. There are certain crimes for which mandatory minimum sentences, particularly for pedophiles, are necessary. I hear the members across the way saying, “Come on, honestly.”

How can the Liberal government minimize this and be more inclined to protect these criminals than—

The Speaker: The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada.

Patricia Lattanzio (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, criminals who exploit or abuse children are among the most serious and despicable offenders in our society. It is simple: Child molesters should face the harshest penalties under Canadian law. In the coming weeks, our government will introduce a new measure from our election platform to better protect children from horrific crimes.

Bill C-242 will be introduced this Friday, but there is nothing in the bill about eliminating those sentences.

Dominique Vien (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the heavy responsibility of protecting Canadians, especially the most vulnerable among us, our children, falls to the government. The government introduced Bill C-14, which could have brought back minimum sentences and done something useful. But no, that is not what it did. Instead, criminals are being let off the hook. The Supreme Court confirmed it just last week.

Why is this government more inclined to protect the charter rights of pedophiles than the charter rights of children?

Patricia Lattanzio (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, every child in Canada deserves to grow up free from fear, abuse and exploitation.

Our government will always stand up for children through stricter laws, better protection and unwavering support for victims. In the coming weeks, our government will be introducing a bill to protect children.

Again, Bill C-242 is scheduled for debate this Friday, yet it makes no mention at all of mandatory sentences.

* * *

• (1455)

[*English*]

THE ECONOMY

Kelly Block (Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek, CPC): Mr. Speaker, every dollar the Liberal government spends comes out of the pockets of Canadians, in the form of higher taxes and inflation. A costly budget will lead to a costly life. While Canadians are lining up at food banks, the Liberal government is using its money to hand out bonuses. The Business Development Bank got \$60 million, EDC got \$45 million, and CMHC got \$30 million.

Instead of trying to cause a costly election on a costly budget, why not have an affordable budget for an affordable life?

Oral Questions

Hon. Buckley Belanger (Secretary of State (Rural Development), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in the last number of weeks, I have been trying to learn French. I want to say to the people of Canada, when we see a lot of measures that we are undertaking as a government to make life more affordable, we see opposition from the opposition on really good measures. I have learned, in English, to say that they are the problem. In my native language of Cree,

[*Member spoke in Cree*]

[*English*]

I have now learned, in French, *tu es le problème*.

The bottom line is—

The Speaker: In the past, members have invoked references to languages in different contexts. It can sometimes be a sensitive issue. We should leave out references to different languages and how some people who understand one do not understand the other.

The hon. member for Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek.

Kelly Block (Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek, CPC): Mr. Speaker, giving hundreds of millions of dollars in excessive bonuses to failed Liberal insiders drives up inflation, and Canadians are paying the price. In the 2.2 million food bank visits, 700,000 visitors are children. Rent has doubled. The food bank in Saskatoon is moving locations to keep up with the rising demand, as it is “bursting at the seams”.

Canadians cannot afford homes. They cannot afford food.

Instead of trying to cause a costly election on a costly budget, why not have an affordable budget for an affordable life?

Hon. Buckley Belanger (Secretary of State (Rural Development), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, for 10 long years, we sent 14 Conservative MPs to Ottawa. That is 140 years—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: We will have to start from the top. There was nothing provocative in the secretary of state's answer. I do not know why it was generating so much reaction.

The hon. secretary of state can start from the top, please.

Hon. Buckley Belanger: Mr. Speaker, for 10 long years, we sent 14 Conservative MPs to Ottawa. That is 140 collective years over which they have not stood up for Saskatchewan or voted for any positive measures to help with the affordability issue across the country.

They can help today by voting for the budget. If they want a Christmas election, they should remember that Santa Claus wears red.

Hon. Mike Lake (Leduc—Wetaskiwin, CPC): Mr. Speaker, let us remember that Santa Claus is not spending taxpayer dollars.

Every single dollar the Liberal government brags about spending comes from the pockets of hard-working Canadians, in the form of higher taxes and inflation. While Canadians line up at food banks in record numbers, their own money is being used by the Liberal government to hand out hundreds of millions of dollars in executive bonuses.

Here is a case in point: Last year, 100% of Via Rail executives got bonuses, averaging \$110,000. This is incomprehensible and irresponsible.

Instead of trying to provoke a costly election with another costly Liberal budget, why not have an affordable budget for an affordable life, for all Canadians?

● (1500)

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what Canadians expect of us is to invest in them, to invest in their families, to invest in the futures of their children. That is exactly what the budget will do. It will make sure we are creating not only the jobs of today but also the jobs of tomorrow, and we are ensuring that young people have the skills to get those jobs in partnership with unions, with the Canadian Building Trades, to make sure everybody has a fair chance. This is what Canadians expect, and that is why they trust us.

Hon. Mike Lake (Leduc—Wetaskiwin, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in 2015, The New York Times reported that Canada had the richest middle class in the world. Just a decade later, our country is in an economic tailspin. What happened in 2015 was that the Liberal government took power, and many of its current ministers, including the finance minister, were elected. Here is where we are today: During an epic housing crisis, 99% of CMHC executives got bonuses, averaging \$43,000.

How is that okay? How is it that Canada, under their watch, went from the richest middle class in the world to a country where many middle-class Canadians cannot afford housing?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what else happened since 2015 is that 400,000 children have been lifted out of poverty through the Canada child benefit. This year, 22 million Canadians will receive a tax credit. We are working with Canadians on the things they have told us are a priority. This is why Canadians trust the Liberal government. This is why they deeply distrust the Conservative Party of Canada.

Brad Redekopp (Saskatoon West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, every dollar the Liberal government spends comes out of the pockets of Canadians in the form of higher taxes and inflation. At CMHC, executives each received bonuses of \$43,000. Even more ridiculously, Via Rail executives got \$110,000 each. While the Liberals reward insiders, they are asking young Canadians to sacrifice more, driving many of them to food banks. In Saskatoon, food bank usage is up 49% over pre-COVID levels, with children accounting for 38% of those users.

Oral Questions

Instead of trying to cause a costly election on a costly budget, why not have an affordable budget for an affordable life?

Hon. Julie Dabrusin (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is just so tiring to hear from the members opposite how they are against everything, including anything that includes fighting climate change. What they should be for, and I hope they will support when they are looking at our budget, is the national school food program, which helps support young people when they are in schools. They should be there to help support Canadians. This is what we do on this side of the House. We should not always be hearing from them about how they are against everything. Let us hear something positive. Let us hear a positive vote on the budget.

[Translation]

Anju Dhillon (Dorval—Lachine—LaSalle, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada recently hosted our G7 partners in Toronto to advance the G7 alliance.

Can the minister explain how the alliance will help stabilize critical mineral prices, protect us from forced supply disruptions and translate into good jobs and cleaner, more affordable, climate-competitive energy technologies for Canadians and Quebecers?

Hon. Julie Dabrusin (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for her question. It was an honour for me and for the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources to welcome the environment and energy ministers from the G7 to Toronto.

We made progress on important issues such as water security, the circular economy and critical minerals. Canada also secured 25 new investments, including several in Quebec, by collaborating with nine allied countries, which enabled us to unlock \$6.4 billion for projects related to critical minerals. We also agreed on tools—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes.

[English]

Jamie Schmale (Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes, CPC): Mr. Speaker, for 10 years, the Liberals have promised their massive deficit will lead to more jobs and investment in Canada; it has not. Tomorrow, we will see another budget packed with more inflationary spending. The result is that Holsag Canada announced the closure of its Lindsay plant, putting 130 people out of work. After 10 years of the Liberal government, manufacturers are closing, costs are soaring and investment is fleeing. Just the other week, the Prime Minister told Canadians they need to be prepared to make sacrifices.

For those families dealing with job loss, high grocery prices and a housing market that is out of reach, what other sacrifices should Canadians be prepared to make?

• (1505)

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the budget will be about protecting jobs and making sure that we protect our communities.

The budget will be about building, building Canada and creating new jobs across the country as we have never seen before.

The budget will be about empowering Canadians, making sure they have trust and confidence in their future and in the prosperity of this country.

That is why the Conservatives should vote for it.

Jamie Schmale (Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we have 130 people out of work in Lindsay, Ontario. That combined with the latest HungerCount report shows that Canadians are struggling as they never have before. Food bank visits hit 2.2 million in March, nearly double prepandemic levels. One-third of clients are children. Almost one in five has a job but cannot make ends meet. The government continues to impose hidden taxes, including the industrial carbon tax on fertilizer and farm equipment, which drives food prices even higher.

Instead of the government trying to cause a costly election on a costly budget, why not table an affordable budget for an affordable life?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we know there are trade tensions right now. We know that some tariff industries are particularly affected. It would be my pleasure to work with my colleague to make sure we are able to bring support to his community, particularly Holsag and Holsag workers.

That being said, the budget will be doing just that, making sure we protect jobs, making sure we build the country and making sure that we also empower Canadians, who are looking forward to his support.

Jacob Mantle (York—Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, every dollar the Liberal government spends comes out of the pockets of hard-working Canadians in the form of higher taxes and higher inflation. Let us take the hidden fuel standards tax, which will raise the price of gasoline by 17¢ a litre and diesel by 16¢ a litre. A tax on the trucker who delivers the food is a tax on the mom or dad buying that food in the grocery store aisle. It is a tax on young Canadians. It is one more sacrifice the Prime Minister is asking the next generation to make.

Instead of a costly budget and a costly election, why does the government not eliminate the fuel standards tax and bring forward an affordable budget for an affordable life?

Hon. Julie Dabrusin (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is so tiring to hear about these imaginary taxes. Let us focus on reality. In reality, the budget we will be presenting tomorrow is going to provide the positive supports for Canadians that they are looking for. They want us to build Canada. They want us to build it well.

If we want to talk about a cost to future generations, it is hearing from the opposite side on how they will do nothing to fight climate change.

Government Orders

We are going to keep on standing up for Canada. We are going to keep on building Canada, and we are going to build it well.

* * *

DISASTER ASSISTANCE

Hon. Greg Fergus (Hull—Aylmer, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last week Canadians watched in horror as hurricane Melissa, which was the strongest hurricane in the Caribbean's history, tore through the region, leaving widespread destruction in its wake. Hundreds of thousands of people were affected, lives were lost, homes and infrastructure were damaged and destroyed, and families were affected by the flooding and landslides.

As the people of Jamaica, Cuba, Haiti and across the region begin the difficult work of reconstruction and recovery, can the Secretary of State for International Development talk about what Canada is doing?

Hon. Randeep Sarai (Secretary of State (International Development), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, hurricane Melissa has left heartbreaking devastation in its wake. We stand with the people of the Caribbean in this moment of crisis.

Last week, we announced \$7 million in emergency relief, allowing partners to scale up the delivery of food, water, health services and other essential aid. This builds on long-standing work to strengthen disaster preparedness in the Caribbean and support for the United Nations Central Emergency Response Fund, which released an additional \$8 million in assistance. This weekend a Canadian team was on the ground in the Caribbean and assessing what more Canada can do.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Tamara Jansen (Cloverdale—Langley City, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Cloverdale's Maurizio Zinetti runs a Canadian-owned company that is doing everything right: feeding families, employing Canadians and doing whatever he can to keep affordable food on our tables. However, thanks to the Liberals' new front-of-package labelling rules, regulations that have nothing to do with food safety, he is now facing a \$2.2-million compliance bill.

Across the industry, the cost will top \$100 million. Prices are going to rise and contracts are being cancelled, all because of red tape politics.

Will the Prime Minister stop trying to engineer a costly election on a costly budget and instead scrap the costly labelling tax?

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 imaginary tax after imaginary tax. Conservatives had the chance to stand up for families, whether to vote for a school food program, whether to vote for tax cuts for Canadians or whether to vote for the skills trade training that provides those great-paying jobs. I sure hope they are not going to vote against personal support workers' tax credits, but that is what it is looking like. They are lining up to vote against the things Canadians need. They are driving for a Christmas election. It is so obvious.

When are Conservatives going to stand with Canadians?

* * *

● (1510)

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the NDP secured \$4.3 billion in funding to address urgent unmet housing needs for first nations, Inuit and Métis people living away from their home community, and NICHU, a national indigenous-led organization, helped deliver that interim funding without a hitch. Many shovel-ready projects are desperate for the \$4 billion in long-term funding to flow, and with winter fast approaching, another construction season will be missed.

Will the Prime Minister just let Indigenous Services task NICHU to get the funding out the door, or are the Liberals are going to re-announce the \$4 billion in budget 2025 and pretend it is new funding?

Jennifer McKelvie (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, generations of underinvestment and systemic discrimination have created a serious shortage of safe, affordable housing and of supports for indigenous peoples across Canada. Build Canada Homes will help address this by financing affordable housing at scale across the housing continuum, in collaboration with provinces, territories and indigenous partners.

The program offers flexible incentives to support non-market and indigenous housing providers to build the affordable housing people need. Build Canada Homes is actively engaged with indigenous governments, provinces, territories and builders to identify early investment and shovel-ready projects.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[Translation]

CITIZENSHIP ACT

The House resumed from October 31 consideration of Bill C-3, An Act to amend the Citizenship Act (2025), as reported (with amendments) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

The Speaker: It being 3:12 p.m., the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motions at the report stage of Bill C-3.

Call in the members.

And the bells having rung:

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 2.

A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 3, 4, and 6 to 11.

[*English*]

May I dispense?

Some hon. members: No.

[*Chair read text of motion to House*]

• (1525)

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 2, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 44*)

YEAS

Members

Acan	Al Soud
Ali	Alty
Anand	Anandasangaree
Auguste	Bains
Baker	Bardeesy
Battiste	Beech
Belanger (Desnethé—Mississippi—Churchill Riv- er)	Bendayan
Bittle	Blair
Blois	Boulerice
Brière	Carney
Carr	Casey
Chagger	Champagne
Chang	Chartrand
Chatel	Chen
Chenette	Chi
Church	Clark
Connors	Cormier
Coteau	Dabrusin
Dandurand	Danko
Deschênes-Thériault	Desrochers
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Duclos
Duguid	Dzerowicz
Earle	El-Khoury
Eyolfson	Fancy
Fanjoy	Fergus
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Fry	Fuhr
Gaheer	Gainey
Gasparro	Gazan
Gerretsen	Gould
Grant	Greaves
Guay	Guilbeault
Gull-Masty	Hajdu
Hanley	Harrison
Hepfner	Hirtle
Hodgson	Hogan
Housefather	Hussen
Iacono	Idlout
Jaczek	Johns
Joly	Joseph
Kayabaga	Kelloway
Khalid	Klassen
Koutrakis	Kwan
Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Lamoureux	Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles)
Lapointe (Sudbury)	Lattanzio
Lauzon	Lavack
Lavoie	LeBlanc

Leitão
Long
MacDonald (Cardigan)
Malette (Bay of Quinte)
May
McKelvie
McKnight
McPherson
Mendès
Miedema
Mingarelli
Myles
Nathan
Noormohamed
Oliphant
O'Rourke
Petitpas Taylor
Provost
Rana
Romanado
Sahota
Sarai
Sawatzky
Sgro
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Solomon
St-Pierre
Tesser Derksen
Turnbull
van Koeverden
Villeneuve
Weiler
Yip
Zerucelli

Government Orders

Lightbound
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLean (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke)
Ménard
Michel
Miller
Morrissey
Naqvi
Nguyen
Ntumba
Olszewski
Osborne
Powlowski
Ramsay
Rocheffort
Royer
Saini
Sari
Schieffe
Sheehan
Sodhi
Sousa
Sudds
Thompson
Valdez
Vandenbeld
Watchorn
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi — 170

NAYS

Members

Aboultarif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Anderson	Anstey
Arnold	Au
Baber	Bailey
Baldinelli	Barrett
Barsalou-Duval	Beaulieu
Bélanger (Sudbury East—Manitoulin—Nickel Belt)	Berthold
Bexte	Bezan
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Block	Bonin
Bonk	Borrelli
Bragdon	Brassard
Brock	Brunelle-Duceppe
Calkins	Caputo
Chambers	Champoux
Chong	Cobena
Cody	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho
Davidson	Davies (Niagara South)
Dawson	DeBellefeuille
Deltell	d'Entremont
DeRidder	Deschênes
Diotte	Doherty
Dowdall	Duncan
Epp	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)
Falk (Provencher)	Fortin
Gallant	Garon
Gaudreau	Généreux
Genius	Gill (Calgary Skyview)
Gill (Brampton West)	Gill (Calgary McKnight)
Gill (Windsor West)	Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan)
Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)	Gladu
Godin	Gourde

Government Orders

Groleau	Guglielmin
Gunn	Hallan
Hardy	Ho
Hoback	Holman
Jackson	Jansen
Jeneroux	Jivani
Kelly	Khanna
Kibble	Kirkland
Kmiec	Konanz
Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Kronis	Kuruc
Kusie	Lake
Lantsman	Larouche
Lawrence	Lawton
Lefebvre	Lemire
Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Lloyd
Lobb	Ma
Mahal	Majumdar
Malette (Kapusking—Timmins—Mushkegowuk)	Mantle
Martel	Mazier
McCauley	McKenzie
McLean (Calgary Centre)	Melillo
Menegakis	Moore
Morin	Morrison
Motz	Muys
Nater	Normandin
Patzer	Paul-Hus
Perron	Plamondon
Poillievre	Redekopp
Reid	Rempel Garner
Reynolds	Richards
Roberts	Rood
Ross	Rowe
Ruff	Savard-Tremblay
Scheer	Schmale
Seeback	Shipley
Simard	Small
Steinley	Ste-Marie
Stevenson	Strahl
Strauss	Thériault
Thomas	Tochor
Tolmie	Uppal
Van Popta	Vien
Viersen	Vis
Wagantall	Warkentin
Waugh	Williamson
Zimmer — 163	

PAIRED

Members

Barlow MacDonald (Malpeque) — 2

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 2 carried. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 3, 4, and 6 to 11 carried.

[*English*]

Hon. Lena Metlege Diab (Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.) moved that the bill, as amended, be concurred in with further amendments.

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

Hon. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, I would ask for a recorded vote.

I believe if you seek it, you will find consent to apply the results of the last vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting yes.

Chris Warkentin: Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives agree to apply the vote, with the Conservatives voting against.

[*Translation*]

Yves Perron: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting against the motion.

[*English*]

Jenny Kwan: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote and the NDP votes yes.

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 45*)

YEAS

Members

Acan	Al Soud
Ali	Alty
Anand	Anandasangaree
Auguste	Bains
Baker	Bardeesy
Battiste	Beech
Belanger (Desnethé—Mississippi—Churchill Riv- er)	Bendayan
Bittle	Blair
Blois	Boulerice
Brière	Carney
Carr	Casey
Chagger	Champagne
Chang	Chartrand
Chatel	Chen
Chenette	Chi
Church	Clark
Connors	Cormier
Coteau	Dabrusin
Dandurand	Danko
Deschênes-Thériault	Desrochers
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Diab	Duclos
Duguid	Dzerowicz
Earle	El-Khoury
Eyolfson	Fancy
Fanjoy	Fergus
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Fry	Fuhr
Gaheer	Gainey
Gasparro	Gazan
Gerretsen	Gould
Grant	Greaves
Guay	Guilbeault
Gull-Masty	Hajdu
Hanley	Harrison
Hepfner	Hirtle
Hodgson	Hogan
Housefather	Hussen
Iacono	Idlout
Jaczek	Johns
Joly	Joseph
Kayabaga	Kelloway
Khalid	Klassen
Koutrakis	Kwan
Lalonde	Lambropoulos
Lamoureux	Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles)
Lapointe (Sudbury)	Lattanzio

Government Orders

Lauzon
Lavoie
Leitão
Long
MacDonald (Cardigan)
Malette (Bay of Quinte)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLean (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke)
Ménard
Michel
Miller
Morrissey
Naqvi
Nguyen
Ntumba
Olszewski
Osborne
Powlowski
Ramsay
Rocheffort
Royer
Saini
Sari
Schieffe
Sheehan
Sodhi
Sousa
Sudds
Thompson
Valdez
Vandenbeld
Watchorn
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi— 169

Lavack
LeBlanc
Lightbound
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
McKelvie
McKnight
McPherson
Mendès
Miedema
Mingarelli
Myles
Nathan
Noormohamed
Oliphant
O'Rourke
Petitpas Taylor
Provost
Rana
Romanado
Sahota
Sarai
Sawatzky
Sgro
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Solomon
St-Pierre
Tesser Derksen
Turnbull
van Koeverden
Villeneuve
Weiler
Yip
Zerucelli

Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)
Godin
Groleau
Gunn
Hardy
Hoback
Jackson
Jeneroux
Kelly
Kibble
Kmiec
Kram
Kronis
Kusie
Lantsman
Lawrence
Lefebvre
Leslie
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lobb
Mahal
Malette (Kapuskasing—Timmins—Mushkegowuk)
Martel
McCaughey
McLean (Calgary Centre)
Menegakis
Morin
Motz
Nater
Patzner
Perron
Poilievre
Reid
Reynolds
Roberts
Ross
Ruff
Scheer
Seeback
Simard
Steinley
Stevenson
Strauss
Thomas
Tolmie
Van Popta
Viersen
Wagantall
Waugh
Zimmer— 163

Glady
Gourde
Guglielmin
Hallan
Ho
Holman
Jansen
Jivani
Khanna
Kirkland
Konanz
Kram-Neuman
Kuruc
Lake
Larouche
Lawton
Lemire
Lewis (Essex)
Lloyd
Ma
Majumdar
Mantle
Mazier
McKenzie
Melillo
Moore
Morrison
Muys
Normandin
Paul-Hus
Plamondon
Redekopp
Rempel Garner
Richards
Rood
Rowe
Savard-Tremblay
Schmale
Shiple
Small
Ste-Marie
Strahl
Thériault
Tochor
Uppal
Vien
Vis
Warkentin
Williamson

NAYS

Members

Aboultatif
Albas
Anderson
Arnold
Baber
Baldinelli
Barsalou-Duval
Bélanger (Sudbury East—Manitoulin—Nickel Belt)
Bexte
Blanchet
Block
Bonk
Bragdon
Brock
Calkins
Chambers
Chong
Cody
Dalton
Davidson
Dawson
Deltell
DeRidder
Diotte
Dowdall
Epp
Falk (Provencher)
Gallant
Gaudreau
Genius
Gill (Brampton West)
Gill (Windsor West)

Aitchison
Allison
Anstey
Au
Bailey
Barrett
Beaulieu
Berthold
Bezan
Blanchette-Joncas
Bonin
Borrelli
Brassard
Brunelle-Duceppe
Caputo
Champoux
Cobena
Cooper
Dancho
Davies (Niagara South)
DeBellefeuille
d'Entremont
Deschênes
Doherty
Duncan
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)
Fortin
Garon
Généreux
Gill (Calgary Skyview)
Gill (Calgary McKnight)
Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan)

PAIRED

Members

Barlow

MacDonald (Malpeque)— 2

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.*[Translation]*

I wish to inform the House that because of the deferred recorded division, the time provided for Government Orders will now be extended by 14 minutes.

*Routine Proceedings***ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS***[English]***GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS**

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8)(a), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 12 petitions. These returns will be tabled in an electronic format.

* * *

VETERANS' WEEK

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): Following discussion among representatives of all parties in the House, I understand there is an agreement to observe a moment of silence to commemorate our war veterans.

[Translation]

I invite hon. members to rise.

[A moment of silence observed]

• (1530)

[English]

Hon. Jill McKnight (Minister of Veterans Affairs and Associate Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Madam Speaker and colleagues, as Veterans' Week approaches, I rise to share a heartfelt message with Canada's veterans and their families. To every veteran, past, present and future, and to the families who stand with them, we see them, we thank them and we honour them.

In the week ahead, leading to Remembrance Day on November 11, Canadians from coast to coast to coast will gather in communities large and small to reflect on the courage and sacrifice of those who have served in uniform.

Canada's veterans and Canadian Armed Forces members have selflessly stood on the front lines in times of war and peace, at home and around the world, to protect what matters most: our safety, our freedoms and our way of life. It is because of their service that Canadians live in peace, our sovereignty is protected and our communities are secure.

We must never forget that these freedoms have come at a cost, a cost carried not only by those who serve but by their families, their friends and the communities that support them. Some made the ultimate sacrifice and gave their lives in defence of our freedoms. Their absence reminds us of the true price of service. Those who returned continued to bear the weight of that commitment in ways both visible and invisible.

It is our solemn duty as Canadians, as a government and as a nation to honour their courage and to stand steadfastly beside them as they continue their lives beyond service. This is not only our responsibility; it is our promise. All Canadians owe them a debt that can never be fully repaid, but we can and must show our gratitude through action, support and remembrance.

Those who came before laid the foundation upon which our country stands, and they continue to inspire us to build a better Canada and a better world. However, remembrance is not only about honouring history; it is also about recognizing the contributions of modern-day veterans. Many continue to serve their communities in new ways, as first responders, volunteers, mentors and leaders. Their legacy endures not only in what they have achieved in uniform, but in the ways they continue to make a difference every day.

My time in the role as Minister of Veterans Affairs has broadened my understanding of the exceptional people who protect our country. While there are too many to mention individually, the stories I have heard of resilience, breaking barriers, dedication and commitment will inspire me always.

To those listening today in communities from St. John's to Victoria, from Windsor to Iqaluit, who will gather in remembrance of family, friends and neighbours, we thank them for keeping the stories of our service members alive.

To my fellow parliamentarians who have worn the uniform and served, we thank them for their service and for bringing the spirit of duty into this House.

To the veterans of tomorrow, those who are just beginning their service or nearing its end, we recognize their sacrifices and the example they carry forward.

Canada remembers and stands with them, today, tomorrow and always.

I close by encouraging all members in the House and those listening to join in a moment of pause and quiet reflection in the coming days. I invite them to honour those who have served and continue to serve on behalf of Canada, our veterans. Lest we forget.

• (1535)

Blake Richards (Airdrie—Cochrane, CPC): Madam Speaker, today is about freedom and remembrance. As we approach Remembrance Day, I will speak about the commitment we all must make as Canadians, the commitment to uphold our freedoms and the commitment to remembrance of all those who served and sacrificed for those freedoms.

[Translation]

Those two commitments are closely linked. Without the service of our military personnel, we would have no freedom, so that service deserves to be remembered.

[English]

Without the 118,000 Canadian men and women who have laid down their lives for our freedom, without the thousands more who have come back forever changed and without all of the more than two million soldiers, sailors and aircrew who have served our country in uniform, we would not have the freedom, democracy or liberty we enjoy today. It is the same freedom and democracy that I would argue we take far too much for granted here in Canada.

That speaks to our need to show a much deeper commitment to remembrance. It cannot be about just one day or week, not for our government or for all Canadians, because it must be reflected in our actions.

[*Translation*]

Of course, most of us wear a poppy for two weeks in November, and many folks even attend a ceremony in their community on November 11 to honour our fallen soldiers.

[*English*]

How many of us pause each year on April 9, Vimy Ridge Day, to reflect on the sacrifices of the 66,349 Canadians who made the ultimate sacrifice during World War I? How many of us pay our respects on VE Day, May 8, for the 42,042 who laid down their lives during World War II? Remember that these are not just numbers or statistics. They represent someone's brother, sister, mother, father, aunt, uncle or cousin, people with hopes, dreams and aspirations that will never be realized, all so we could live freely today.

How many of us pause in remembrance on July 27 for our Korean War veterans or on March 31 each year to reflect on the commitment of the over 40,000 who served our nation in Afghanistan? How many attend a ceremony on the Sunday closest to August 9 to honour National Peacekeepers' Day, offer discounts to veterans at their businesses, or, when they see a veteran's licence plate at the grocery store, stop to shake their hand and say a simple thanks for their service? How many even give a passing thought for those who have served and sacrificed as they drive down the Highway of Heroes, Memorial Drive, Veterans Boulevard, Veterans Memorial Highway or other Canadian roads like them? How many know the stories of our Canadian heroes, like Billy Bishop, Billy Barker, Tommy Prince, Smokey Smith, Léo Major, Jeremiah Jones, Mark Isfeld, Nichola Goddard, Ashley Collette and Jess Larochelle?

Let me take a moment to paint a picture of what a true hero looks like. On October 14, 2006, Private Jess Larochelle was knocked unconscious when the forward observation post that he was manning was hit directly by the Taliban. When he came to, two soldiers were dead and three others were wounded. He fought on alone, firing rockets and machine guns despite a broken back, broken neck, detached retina, blown eardrum and a severe concussion. He fought on for hours against overwhelming Taliban forces, single-handedly forcing the retreat of a Taliban attack and saving lives in the process.

It is heroes like Jess, who should have received the Victoria Cross for his actions, as well as the others I have mentioned and so many more, to whom we owe our freedom. It is a debt that we owe to the families of those who serve our country as well. It is that freedom that we must pledge to uphold at all costs.

[*Translation*]

It is the least we can do to honour their service and their sacrifices.

[*English*]

The freedom for which they spilled their blood is not the property of this generation to surrender, so please join me and my colleagues in Canada's Conservative Party in making that commitment

Routine Proceedings

today. We pledge to uphold those freedoms. It is how we will honour their memories, thank them for their service and show our respect for their sacrifice. Freedom came at all costs, and at all costs we must ensure it is maintained.

At the going down of the sun and in the morning
We will remember them.

• (1540)

[*Translation*]

Marie-Hélène Gaudreau (Laurentides—Labelle, BQ): Madam Speaker, November 11 is an opportunity to remember the sacrifices made by our veterans. The symbol we wear, the poppy, represents the fields of Flanders, in Belgium, where so many battles of the First World War took place. This moment of remembrance is important.

Symbols are important, yes. What really matters, however, is that we take care of our own. It might come as a surprise that a member of the Bloc Québécois is interested in veterans. However, it is in our DNA to take care of our own, to want the best for them. Anyone who truly wants the best for the people who matter to them will make an effort. It is important to listen, to support and to act in the best interest of those who need it, not in one's own interest, obviously.

I note that we have had 10 veterans affairs ministers since 2015. I hope that we have reached the point where we are not only taking note of what we offer our veterans, but also taking action. Remembering is important, but November 11 is also an opportunity to talk about the present and the future. The present is about recognizing what is not going well, but it is also about apologizing and rolling up our sleeves to say that we will do better. Of course, we have heard from many people who have told us how proud they are to have served. However, they are suffering at the moment. The future lies in ensuring that these men and women are respected. They have the right to dignity, not just for one day, but 365 days a year.

As members of Parliament we need to grasp the true meaning of Remembrance Day. Let our concerns not be fleeting, but let us always keep in mind the living conditions and survival of those who have committed to defending the values that are so dear to us. November 11 and supporting our veterans is not just about attending ceremonies. It is about truly listening to veterans. People have to be at the heart of decision-making.

I want veterans to know that I see them, I hear them, I listen to them and I will always be an ally.

*Routine Proceedings**[English]*

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Madam Speaker, I request unanimous consent to respond to the ministerial statement on remembrance, on behalf of the federal NDP. I am hoping that consent will be granted by this House.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): Does the hon. member have unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Gord Johns: Madam Speaker, this week, as Canadians gather in communities across the country to mark Veterans Week and Remembrance Day, it is a great privilege to rise on behalf of the federal NDP and to join all colleagues and Canadians to honour those who have served and sacrificed in the name of peace, freedom and justice.

From the battlefields of the First World War and Second World War to Korea, Afghanistan and peacekeeping missions around the globe, Canadians have stood up for what is right, often at great personal cost. On November 11, we remember them all: those who did not come home and those who did, but continue to carry the weight of their service.

This year marks the 80th anniversary of the Italian campaign of the Second World War, one of the most challenging and costly campaigns our country has ever undertaken. More than 93,000 Canadians served in Italy and over 5,000 made the ultimate sacrifice. Among those who helped liberate Europe was my friend and constituent, Jack Rossiter, who turned 100 years old this year, as a proud member of the Royal Canadian Legion, Mount Arrowsmith, Branch 49 in Parksville, British Columbia. Mr. Rossiter served as an infantryman with the Seaforth Highlanders of Canada fighting with courage through the Italian campaign and later in the Netherlands. His service stands as a living reminder of the extraordinary contributions made by his generation and of the debt of gratitude we will forever owe them.

Remembrance is not only about looking back but about how we act today. We honour our veterans not only with words but with the deeds that ensure they receive the care, respect and dignity that they deserve. That means making sure no one who has served this country is left behind when their uniform comes off.

Too many military and RCMP veterans and their families struggle to get timely health care and mental health supports when they transition to civilian life, including access to a family physician. The trauma of service can take many forms, some visible and others not, but every veteran should have access to the help they need when they need it. Expanding health services through telemedicine is one important step. Veterans and their families, especially those in rural or remote communities, should not have to fight another battle just to get an appointment with a doctor, counsellor or psychiatrist. Technology can bridge that gap, but it needs to be properly funded and supported by Veterans Affairs with seamless coordination between federal and provincial health care systems.

We also need to recognize that healing takes many forms. For some veterans, that partnership they build with a service animal can make an extraordinary difference, but right now, the lack of national standards for service animals leaves too many veterans navigat-

ing a patchwork of rules and uncertainty. It is time for Canada to establish clear national guidelines for training, certification and support so every veteran can count on high-quality assistance and consistent service no matter where they live.

As we work to strengthen care for all those who serve, we must also acknowledge and support the growing number of women veterans in Canada. They have served with courage and distinction, yet too often their experiences and needs have been overlooked. I want to thank my former colleague, the NDP Veterans Affairs critic, Rachel Blaney, who fought to change that to ensure women veterans receive equitable recognition and tailored supports for health, family and transition. We must carry that work forward, building on the excellent recommendations in the report stemming from the study Rachel initiated in the previous Parliament, making sure Veterans Affairs Canada continues to listen, adapt and lead by example.

On this Remembrance Day, we remember the fallen. We also recommit ourselves to those still with us, to making sure that the promise we make to our veterans is one we keep because remembrance is not only about a moment of silence; it's about a lifetime of action and gratitude. To every veteran, every family member and every Canadian who stands in support, we thank them. Their service, their resilience and their hope continue to inspire us all.

Lest we forget.

* * *

● (1545)

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

HUMAN RESOURCES, SKILLS AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT AND THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, I move that the first report of the Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities presented on Monday, September 22, be concurred in.

This afternoon we are seized with debate on the first report of the human resources committee, a report that unanimously expresses the committee's alarm about the catastrophic youth employment rate. That rate is in fact the worst it has been in more than a quarter century.

Routine Proceedings

• (1550)

[*Translation*]

Since the government blocked natural resource projects, disparaged a critical sector of our economy, wreaked havoc on our immigration system and failed to align skills training with actual labour market needs, we are now facing an alarming reality: Almost half a million young people are unemployed. The current youth unemployment rate is 14.7%. It is continuing to rise and is approaching 15%.

[*English*]

Over the last month, I have been visiting university campuses and asking students a very simple question: “Are you better or worse off than your parents’ generation?” Sadly, but overwhelmingly, students have been telling me they are worse off, and it is not difficult to see why. Young people are concerned about whether they will be able to get a job when they graduate. Some are pursuing further studies just to compete for positions that actually do not require those additional qualifications. Young people across this country from a broad range of backgrounds recognize they face brutal and near impossible competition for entry-level jobs due to Liberal immigration and economic policy failure.

Even for those hopeful about stepping onto that first rung of employment, earning enough for a down payment on a home still feels impossibly out of reach. In response to my question, “Are you better or worse off than your parents’ generation?”, one student put it to me this way. She said that they are supposed to have more things because of technology, access to information and innovation, but that in reality they have more access to what is not essential and the things that are essential in life are moving completely out of reach. This is the alarming reality for many young people. Despite their best efforts and all the sacrifices they have already made, the basic essentials, a job and a home, are out of reach.

Quite simply, what young people today need is three things: jobs, homes and hope. They need a job so they work hard, earn income and experience the joy, connection and meaning that comes through work. They need a home so they can live independently and start a family on their own. They need hope that all these things are still possible and that a country at least as good as the one their parents grew up in is still possible in 2025.

In these conversations with young people, the significant barriers to family formation caused by a bad economy are also top of mind. Canadian women report that, on average, they would like to have 2.2 children over the course of their lives, yet the actual fertility rate has dropped to 1.26 children per woman, which is a gap between desire and outcome of almost one child per woman. It is not hard to see why desires in this regard are not being met. When people form families and have children, it reflects their economic position, their ability to provide for that next generation, or the sense of their own readiness to do that. It also is an expression of hope for the future that they can provide for their children. However, when they cannot find a job or afford a home, it is hope that dies last. Young people need jobs, homes and hope.

We also need to think about the wider social effects of youth unemployment. Some may hear this discussion about the great challenges facing young people and ask if that really matters to them.

Our country faces a brutal cost of living crisis that affects everyone: the old, the young and those in between. Bad Liberal economic and immigration policies are not just affecting the young, they are in fact affecting everybody.

However, when young people cannot afford to get started in life, cannot afford homes, cannot afford to start families and, in many cases, are forced to leave their communities because they cannot afford to stay, then we see a kind of demographic distortion, where older people are left without a proportionate number of younger people in their community to pay into the systems they rely on and to be with them in living, breathing, continuing and growing communities. We must recognize the natural complementarity that exists between generations. The increasing disconnection in our society between generations is why younger people are increasingly overwhelmed while many older people face a crisis of loneliness.

I will be sharing my time.

Living, breathing, vibrant communities are ones in which young people have jobs, homes and hope so that they can stay with, live among, learn from and support those who are aging. Youth unemployment is driving young people out of communities and preventing them from forming new families of their own. This affects everybody. We all need to worry about youth unemployment because we are all in this together. We cannot allow Liberal economic failures that make life less affordable for everyone to drive intergenerational conflict.

Young people being forced to leave communities when they cannot form families of their own creates significant problems for their parents and grandparents. For those who have not read the dystopian novel *The Children of Men* by P.D. James, I certainly recommend picking it up. We are not there yet, but it is clear that the author understands something profound about the wider social effects that come from losing the next generation.

We can end this Liberal dystopia and bring back jobs, homes and hope. The government should choose tomorrow to release an affordable budget and start to confront these challenges.

Recognizing the acuteness of the crisis facing young people, Conservatives have taken a very constructive approach. We have initiated a youth unemployment study. In fact, we were pushing for this study back in the spring. The Liberals blocked that from happening, and we were not able to start that work until the fall, but here we are. We have heard witness after witness highlight the failures of the government when it comes to economic and immigration policy. We have put forward the study and we have put forward a Conservative youth jobs plan.

Routine Proceedings

The government does not have a plan. Its policies have created this crisis and are making this crisis worse, but we have offered constructive solutions. We have put forward the Conservative youth jobs plan, which would confront this challenge. Our plan has four simple parts. I hope the government will respond to these proposals constructively in the budget tomorrow. I hope we will see an affordable budget that includes elements of the Conservative youth jobs plan. The plan is simple: number one, unleash the economy; number two, fix immigration; number three, fix training; and number four, build homes where the jobs are.

Unleashing the economy means repealing Liberal bills that block development and energy development, making it more difficult to construct a home and more difficult for major projects to move forward. It means implementing a genuinely pro-development agenda that does not involve picking and choosing a small number of preferred projects or preferred companies for subsidies. As we have sometimes seen, some preferred companies that have gotten subsidies move jobs out of the country anyway. Unleashing the economy means removing the barriers the Liberals have put in place to allow all companies working on developing major projects to see a runway absent aggressive regulation and taxation and see their projects move forward.

Fixing immigration means putting the immigration system back in line with the needs and interests of this country, especially when it comes to employment and opportunity. Part of fixing immigration is fixing credential recognition. We have people coming here who could be working in areas where there is significant demand for those skills, but instead, when their credentials are not recognized, they are forced to compete against young people for entry-level jobs. Let us get skilled professionals who have come from abroad out of those entry-level jobs by recognizing their credentials. Let us address programs, like the temporary foreign worker program, that are driving aggressive competition for entry-level jobs and shutting out our young people.

To fix training, we have put forward a substantial, rigorous proposal to make training more available to young people in areas that align with the needs of the labour market. We propose that students pursuing in-demand studies receive relatively more generous financial support. Sadly, the Liberals have already dismissed this proposal. We say that when we have skills gaps in this country, rather than focusing on bringing in people from abroad, we need to focus on training Canadian young people to fill the skill gaps that exist.

Finally, we propose substantial new incentives to make it easier for employers to build homes where jobs exist. We proposed a 100% accelerated capital cost write-off for companies that build employee housing to address the challenges employers in remote areas sometimes have in attracting employees to those areas.

• (1555)

This is our Conservative jobs plan: unleash the economy, fix immigration, fix training and build homes where the jobs are. It responds to the youth jobs crisis, which is approaching half a million unemployed young people.

It is time for action. This report calls for that, and I hope we see action from the government on this unemployment crisis.

• (1600)

Dominique O'Rourke (Guelph, Lib.): Madam Speaker, there is good news, because tomorrow, the federal budget will tell us more about investments in major projects in this country.

The strategic response fund is helping to sustain important industries in Canada in the face of U.S. tariffs. We have ambitious trades and re-skilling funds, as well as the foreign credentials recognition fund. With respect to homes, I am looking forward to the member opposite supporting Build Canada Homes. There is good news on housing, because the rental market in Canada is experiencing a decline in average rent.

These things do not happen overnight, and there is more work to be done, but I hope the member opposite is going to encourage young people and point them in the right direction, and stop talking down Canada. Will he do that?

Garnett Genuis: Madam Speaker, that was a uniquely ridiculous question, even from a Liberal member.

I have never talked down Canada. I am proud to live in this country and fight for this country. I am fighting for this country for my children and grandchildren, and all of our children. However, we have to recognize the reality of what the member's government has done to this country over the last 10 years. The realities are unmistakable.

If the member talks to young people, she will hear about the challenges they are facing. The fact is that we are approaching half a million unemployed young people. The unemployment rate for youth is at almost 15%, and we are going to see new numbers coming out on Friday. Young people are deeply concerned about this reality, which is getting worse.

Rather than throw out slogans like “talking down” and “more spending on the same thing”, let us talk about the real numbers and solutions. We have put forward a plan. Where is their plan?

[*Translation*]

Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette—Manawan, BQ): Madam Speaker, the issues surrounding youth employment are very worrisome. However, I would like to talk instead about the jobs of tomorrow for young people, with the artificial intelligence revolution replacing more traditional jobs, especially in the service sector.

Should the government not be implementing economic strategies to ensure that we have jobs for the future?

Garnett Genuis: Madam Speaker, the implications of artificial intelligence demand careful consideration. That being said, the unemployment rate in Canada is much higher than unemployment rates in other countries facing the same realities created by the development of artificial intelligence.

Routine Proceedings

We are in a similar situation in the technology field. The unemployment rate is much higher. The problem here stems from the immigration system and government policies, and that is limiting the economic response.

[English]

Pat Kelly (Calgary Crowfoot, CPC): Madam Speaker, the employment rate and the unemployment rate can be measured separately. They are not the same thing. It has been remarked upon that Canada has the worst employment rate in more than 25 years. I wonder if the member could comment on the employment rate.

Garnett Genuis: Madam Speaker, the employment rate is the percentage of young people in total who are employed. It is different from the unemployment rate, which measures the percentage of young people in the workforce who are not working. We are seeing historic lows in the employment rate. The percentage of young people in the 15 to 24 age bracket who are working is at its lowest level in more than 25 years. This indicates that unemployment is at about a 15-year high. It also indicates that many young people are, in many cases, giving up.

There is a lot of frustration with what they are facing and there is an increasing sense of hopelessness, so we are trying to offer young people hope. We are trying to say that a better future, with jobs, homes and hope, is possible. This is why we put forward the Conservative youth jobs plan, which would deliver hope and create opportunities if it were implemented.

• (1605)

Eric Melillo (Kenora—Kiiwetinoong, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise in debate and speak to this very important topic. I want to thank the member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan for being so gracious as to share some of his time with me and for his important work on this issue throughout the course of this Parliament so far. I know that young Canadians from coast to coast are thankful for the work he has been doing to shine light on this very important issue of youth employment.

I want to start by looking at the economy as a whole after 10 long years of the Liberal government. The labour market is bad overall, especially for young Canadians. As it has been mentioned in debate, Canada presently has the worst employment rate in more than 25 years. As an extension of that, in the short period since the Prime Minister took office, nearly 48,000 more Canadians have had to turn to EI to make ends meet.

We are here talking about the impact on youth and young Canadians. I am still in my twenties. There are a few of us here in our twenties across all parties in the chamber. As an aside, it is great to see more young people getting involved in politics. Given my age, I bring a personal perspective to this.

Many friends and folks my age, not just where I live in Kenora but right across northwestern Ontario and across Canada, have shared their concerns with me about struggling to make ends meet and struggling to find a job. In the region I represent in northwestern Ontario, there are a lot of seasonal businesses, tourism businesses and industries that are driven by youth employment and seasonal employment, which are becoming harder and harder for young people to find. It is also harder for employers to fill those jobs.

The youth unemployment rate is nearly 15%. This is the highest it has been since 2010, outside the COVID-19 pandemic years. Over 460,000 young Canadians are out of work in Canada today. These levels are typical of a recession. Young Canadians are facing quite stark numbers. If we look at Ontario alone, more than 17,000 youth lost their jobs in the last month. These are just some of the numbers that paint a very clear picture of what young Canadians are facing.

Underemployment is also a concern as folks get their schooling and their training. We know that one in six people with post-secondary credentials is not working in a job related to their field. They are doing everything right. They are working hard, getting a good education and getting some job training, and they are unable to find work in the profession they chose.

We have said many times that the promise of Canada is that people work hard, play by the rules and go to school and get an education or an apprenticeship, and at the end of it, they can expect a well-paying job, a good home and a safe neighbourhood. That is the Canadian promise that so many people have come to expect. That is the promise that has been broken after 10 years of the Liberal government.

I was recently in Toronto with the Leader of the Opposition and many other members of our caucus. We had a great turnout, with hundreds of students and young people from around the GTA coming out to share with us their concerns and what they are facing. Many people are struggling to afford the cost of living, find housing, pay their rent or move to home ownership, which many people have given up on after 10 years. We heard time and time again that more and more often, the fact is that people cannot find a job.

I think back to when I was in school in Thunder Bay. I worked two or three jobs at a time and I paid my way through school. It was relatively easy. My friends and everyone we knew would get a new haircut and walk into an establishment with a smile and a good attitude, and we pretty much expected to come away with a job. It was very easy for young people to get a job at that time.

• (1610)

As I mentioned, I was only 27 years old. It was not that long ago that one was able to do that in this country. After the Liberals' economic record, that story is one that is foreign to most young Canadians across the country.

Routine Proceedings

I spoke about those conversations in Toronto with the Leader of the Opposition, when we heard from students. Of course, this is impacting youth. It is not just about the fact that they are unable to get jobs. I mentioned housing. The economic record of the Liberal government has led to the doubling of housing costs, and so many young people are struggling to afford rent. They are living with their parents and trapped in their basement, so to speak, and so many of them are facing the consequences as a result of that. They are worried that they will never be able to save enough for a down payment. They have given up on their dream of home ownership. People are putting off starting a family.

I know many people who live in Kenora who have good jobs, couples who live in one of their parents' houses, because they cannot find an affordable place to live with two good incomes. That is having an impact on their life decisions, including starting a family.

Of course, grocery costs are up 4%. Food inflation is up 4% year over year in September. That is something that everyone is facing but it is something that, in particular, young Canadians are facing. They do not have a lot saved up. They do not have a lot of time to work when they are going to school. On the weekends and in the summer months and in the time that they do have, and this is what we are talking about here today, they are unable to find those jobs.

This is the Liberal track record. The Liberals have driven investment away. They have smothered small business with higher taxes and red tape. They have refused to align training and immigration with labour market realities, and now the Prime Minister, after all that, is telling young Canadians that they need to make more sacrifices.

I can assure members that the Leader of the Opposition and I heard this past weekend in Toronto, from hundreds of students, that young Canadians are not going to make any more sacrifices for the Liberal government. They have sacrificed enough. They have sacrificed the dream of ownership. They have sacrificed a healthy diet. They have sacrificed starting a family. They are now sacrificing jobs. They are saying that enough is enough. They are looking for the government to finally deliver an affordable budget that can give them an affordable life.

That is why Conservatives are bringing forward our plan to help, to unleash the economy by repealing anti-resource laws, cutting taxes to drive reinvestment and eliminating red tape.

We also need to fix immigration by fixing credentialed recognition, by realigning immigration with labour and housing market realities, and by fixing training. Federal student aid should no longer treat all studies the same. That is why Conservatives are proposing that the Canada student finance assistance program provide more support to students pursuing in-demand fields. We believe that taxpayer investment in education should prepare youth for jobs, very simply.

We have to build homes where the jobs are, a very simple concept. Housing is an obstacle to hiring in northwestern Ontario. That is why Conservatives are proposing a 100% writeoff for companies that build workforce housing. This is happening all over the place, such as with the hospital in Kenora and the A&W. There are so many businesses, across all sectors, that are looking to have their

own housing to house employees, because otherwise they are not able to get anyone to work.

People would move to northwestern Ontario. Why not? It is a beautiful region. There are lots of lake life and outdoor activities. There are good jobs but no houses. I know people who have nowhere to live but who could fill those jobs.

In conclusion, Conservatives are the only ones who are standing with a plan to deliver jobs, homes and hope for the future generation. We are going to continue fighting so that young Canadians, and everyone across our great country, can have an affordable life, so that we can restore that promise of Canada for all Canadians.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, this afternoon, we were supposed to be debating Bill C-4, which talks about giving a tax break to Canadians, 22 million Canadians, many of them, obviously, youth. It would also provide a GST exemption for first-time homebuyers. In many ways, that is for youth.

Rather, the Conservatives have made the decision to filibuster here on the floor of the House, preventing debate on important pieces of legislation that would literally put money in the pockets of young people today.

Why was there that political decision to put youth off today?

• (1615)

Eric Melillo: Madam Speaker, only the Liberals can look at an important discussion such as this as a filibuster. We are here talking about youth unemployment, something that is reaching record highs, because of 10 years of Liberal economic mismanagement.

The member speaks of all these policies. It is the Liberal policies that have caused this crisis in the first place, that have doubled housing costs and that have made it so that young Canadians cannot find work and are struggling just to afford healthy groceries.

Conservatives are going to continue fighting for Canadian youth, so that we can restore the promise of Canada for all Canadians.

Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, as I said earlier, I am hearing from young people that many of them feel they are worse off than their parents' generation were in this country, especially after 10 years of the Liberals. We see continuing policies that limit economic growth and that have messed up our immigration system; we see misalignments in training and other areas. That is why we need jobs, homes and hope for youth. That is why we put forth our constructive Conservative youth jobs plan.

Routine Proceedings

I wonder if the member can share what he is hearing from the young people he talks to, especially in his region in northern Ontario. I know he is very active in and around his constituency. What is the dynamic there in terms of young people's perceptions of the opportunities they have and will have relative to the opportunities that their parents had?

Eric Melillo: Madam Speaker, there is no question that young Canadians know they are worse off than their parents were and their grandparents were. I hear from youth, and I hear from their parents as well, that life has become so unaffordable. It is almost impossible to find a house in northwestern Ontario at an affordable price. Houses are being sold before they even make it to the market, because of this housing crisis that the Liberals have caused. There is the cost of groceries and gas, everything is more expensive, and now so many young people are unable to find work and pay for all of this. It has gotten to the point that so many are just fed up. They want to give up, quite frankly. They just want to concede that they are going to live in their parents' basement forever and that they are never going to achieve their dreams: start a family and have the career they want. That is why it is so important that we fight for them here in the House, that we ensure we can lower taxes on food, work, homebuilding and investment, and make sure that we are doing everything we can to support the economy and get young people that opportunity and that hope once again.

Caroline Desrochers (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure, Lib.): Madam Speaker, this is an issue that we have been studying in committee. I am curious as to why the Conservatives are using the issue of youth unemployment. It is a serious issue, and there are things we can do about it, but instead they are focusing the gist of their comments on immigration, linking that with youth unemployment, and blaming immigration for it. I would like to hear the member's take on this.

Eric Melillo: Madam Speaker, I do not know if the member heard my comments properly, but I am actually blaming the Liberals, after 10 years of their economic mismanagement, for the youth unemployment crisis, and that is exactly what has happened. It is the Liberals who have mismanaged the housing crisis, our economy and, yes, immigration. All of these things are impacting the economic foundations of our country. They are pushing young Canadians to the point that they are now out of work, unable to find a place to live and struggling to afford basic necessities. That is why Conservatives are going to fight so hard to restore the promise of Canada for young Canadians.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, to say that I am disappointed in the Conservatives is an understatement. I really cannot believe the destructive path they want to continue on. I thought things would have changed since the last election, and for a little while they did, when the former leader of the Conservative Party, who then represented Carleton, was defeated. He was not in the House as a direct result and I do not believe we had any concurrence motions. In fact, we actually had progress on substantial pieces of legislation.

Then we had the leader of the Conservative Party's return to Parliament and what has happened? It has gone back to the old days. We are seeing from the Conservatives today what we witnessed

from them this time last year. Nothing has changed with them. Seriously, one would think they would have learned something.

Conservatives want to talk about youth unemployment. The first thing that came to mind was the year they alluded to, which was 2010. What happened in 2009? We saw probably one of the highest youth unemployment rates that Canada has seen in the last 25 or 30 years. Who was the prime minister back then? Of course, it was Stephen Harper, and the leader of the Conservative Party was one of the individuals who sat around the Conservative caucus. What was the difference in the arguments they were using back then compared what they are saying today? Back then, in 2009, when we had that high youth unemployment rate, they no doubt tried to defend it the best way they could. I remember in 2011, I believe it was, or maybe 2010, when we were sitting in opposition, talking about young people not being able to leave their homes because of Conservative mismanagement of the economy. Was it any wonder back then?

The most devastating time period for Ontario's manufacturing industry was when Stephen Harper was in government, when the leader of the Conservative Party sat in the Conservative majority and minority governments that devastated Ontario's manufacturing industry. There was higher youth unemployment back in 2009 than we have witnessed in the last decade.

I noticed that a couple of the Conservatives are likely doing a Google search to make sure that my number was right. I am sure they will stand up and let me know if it was wrong.

I can say this. Members should listen to what Conservatives are arguing today. I did not know; I thank my colleague from Trois-Rivières, who told me what had taken place at committee. It is part of their leader's desire to make the immigrant community the bad guys. They are targeting immigration and trying to give a false impression that the national government is the one to blame when in fact it is a whole lot more complicated than that. We set the number for permanent residents. If only the Conservatives truly understood.

Let us talk about Ontario. What took place in Ontario was an explosion of private post-secondary facilities and a massive recruitment of international students. That was being driven at the provincial level through post-secondary facilities. The colleges and the provinces did not have any problem whatsoever collecting the double tuition fees being charged for international students. Many international students were in fact exploited and given false commitments with respect to what would eventually happen with their applications and coming to Canada.

Routine Proceedings

• (1620)

It is a much more difficult situation than the Conservatives try to portray. To say that Ottawa is totally to blame here is false. We have to factor in such things as funding to post-secondary institutions, recruitment measures that were taken by post-secondary institutions and the way in which international students were brought into Canada over the last number of years. Yes, there are things that Ottawa could have done. We have recognized, under a new Prime Minister, a commitment to stabilizing the immigration file.

I raise this issue only because I do not like what I am hearing from Conservative Party members and their far-right, anti-immigrant views that they want to express in order to generate support. That is something we have been witnessing more and more from the Conservative Party.

If someone wants to be genuine, to talk and contribute to a healthier debate in regard to youth unemployment, or unemployment in general, we have a perfect opportunity. We are actually going to be debating Bill C-4 this afternoon. Bill C-4 deals specifically, in part, with aspects of supporting young people here in Canada, increasing their disposable income. Bill C-4 will give a tax break if the Conservative Party of Canada will allow it to pass. It will give a tax break to 22 million Canadians. In the minds of the Conservatives, they might see that as imaginary. I can tell members opposite it is a real, tangible tax break that will put millions and millions into the pockets of Canadians in every region of the nation, including young Canadians. The Conservative Party has been filibustering the bill.

It also provides a tax break for first-time homebuyers. Who do colleagues think will get the primary attention in terms of a tax break on the GST? There will be no GST for first-time homebuyers on new homes. Who is going to be the biggest benefactor of that? I would ultimately argue it will be young people. That piece of legislation is something I would be very much interested in hearing from members of the Conservative Party. What is their position on it? We are seeing it today, in part. Tomorrow is budget day, and then there is going to be debate on the budget.

We need to deal with important issues like the tax breaks for 22 million Canadians and first-time homebuyers, not to mention putting into law the disposal of the carbon tax. Here, again, the biggest benefactors would be young people. Instead of debating the legislation and, heaven forbid, maybe even allowing it to pass, they chose not to allow that debate. Can colleagues imagine the Conservatives not filibustering and actually allowing an important piece of legislation such as this to pass? If they would do that, they would actually be helping young Canadians.

Last week they brought in another concurrence report. Every time they bring in a concurrence report, they say it is a super-duper important issue, and it has to be concurred in on the floor of the House. I agree that youth unemployment is a serious issue. We have a Prime Minister, a cabinet and a Liberal caucus that are committed to working for young people.

• (1625)

We will continue to look at ways to help young people, but of all the evidence that I have seen on the floor of the House of Com-

mons, I have yet to see something positive coming from the Conservatives with respect to supporting our young people. We can highlight the contrast between the Conservative Party and the Liberal Party on the national school food program.

An hon. member: It costs more money.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Again, it supports young people. As the member across the way says, "It costs more money." Well, Madam Speaker, some money is worth spending, and this is one program that is worth spending on.

Here is the contrast. The Conservatives will talk about young people, but when it comes time to actually vote to support young people, they are found wanting all the time. The national school food program is an excellent example of that. We and the Prime Minister made a commitment that it will become a permanent policy of the government, a permanent program. That means we are going to be supplying financial support for a nationwide food program so that young children are not going to have to learn on an empty stomach, as they do in many cases. That is a positive.

On the other hand, number one, the Conservatives say that the idea is garbage and it is a garbage program. Number two, we often hear them say that there is no child benefiting from the program and no administration of the program. I do not understand how they come up with that. How can they intentionally, I would suggest, misguide Canadians? We know that it is feeding children.

An hon. member: How is feeding children misguided?

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: People get upset if I say "lie" or "mislead" or something of that nature, so I cannot say that.

Madam Speaker, take a look at the program. This is a program that was talked about when I was first elected, back in 1988. I remember Sharon Carstairs, leader of the Liberal Party at the time, saying that we have to have a school program to feed children because we cannot expect all children to be able to learn on an empty stomach. We know for a fact that many children who attend public schools are going to school, and they have not had breakfast.

It is something that has been a need for decades. The government proposes it and does a pilot project. We have a new Prime Minister and the commitment that we are making it a national program, and the Conservatives say "absolutely not". They do not like the program.

They are denying the opportunity of many young people to be able to capture the type of education that will help them in later years. They do not support the many children who go to school on an empty stomach. It is awfully hard to learn something from a teacher when one is hungry.

Routine Proceedings

I used to be the education critic in the province of Manitoba. I understand the importance of the program that we have brought forward, and I am very proud that we have a Prime Minister who is now making it a permanent program. I suspect and hope that there are some progressives left in the Conservative right who will see the true value of the program and ultimately support it.

Do members remember the summer youth program? This is a program that is in every constituency and community across the nation. Again, when the leader of the Conservative Party was around the Conservative caucus, we saw a cut to that program. Not only did they have the highest stat, in 2009, for youth unemployment, but they also cut a valuable program that often contributes to a young person's being able to carry over that summer youth experience into a full-time job.

• (1630)

I would challenge members opposite to look at some of the details that will be coming out in the budget. They will see a number of initiatives, whether it is apprenticeship training, the promotion of the Red Seal program or ongoing support for things like our summer youth program. There are some programs in there to support young people, let alone programs like the food nutrition program or the dental program, which have really benefited young people.

Instead of having healthy debates on these types of issues that Canadians are concerned about and that the government is concerned about, we constantly have the Conservative Party of Canada on the floor wanting to play partisan political games at a great expense. A good example is that, over the last week, we have heard a lot from the government House leader, challenging the Conservatives to make a commitment to Canadians. If there is an election in December, it will be because of the Conservative Party of Canada. That is the reality.

If we are not able to pass legislation, such as bail reform or Bill C-4, which would give a tax break to 22 million Canadians and give that first-time homebuyer a GST rebate, it will be because the Conservative Party of Canada continues to put their own partisan political priorities over the interest of Canadians. I find that very upsetting.

I can tell members that not only my constituents but also, I would suggest, Canadians as a whole want more co-operation on the floor of the House of Commons. This means that if we are going to have debates, we have to recognize that at some point, legislation has to be allowed to go to committee so that it can come back and the debate continues. Ultimately, members need to work in co-operation, as we are, as a government, working in co-operation with opposition members. That is the mandate we were given.

• (1635)

We are going to see a budget come out tomorrow that is going to reflect the needs of Canadians. The budget is going to be a reflection of the times we are in. The Prime Minister often talks about transformative changes that are on our horizon, whether it is on the trade file or the many other economic indicators. This budget is going to assist us, as a nation, to move forward.

One of the stats I really appreciate is the stat on trade, in which 2.5% of world trade is contributed through Canada, yet we have

0.5% of the world population. We are a trading nation, and that is why we see the Prime Minister, different ministers and caucus as a whole looking at trade opportunities that go beyond the United States.

I move:

That this question be now put.

• (1640)

Pat Kelly (Calgary Crowfoot, CPC): Madam Speaker, in the member's speech, he repeatedly asserted that it was somehow because we had moved a concurrence motion, at the appropriate time, to give the House the opportunity to debate the business of a parliamentary committee and allow members to vote on it, that this was filibustering Bill C-4.

Is he aware that his own caucus colleagues spent last week filibustering Bill C-4 at the parliamentary committee, where they refused to even allow amendments to go to a vote? They did not cooperate with other parties, as this member has said they should. His own colleagues refused every amendment and filibustered an entire day to prevent even the first amendment from coming to a vote. They tried to get each amendment struck. The Speaker wisely ruled that the amendments that did pass were in order.

When it comes to machinations around the delay of Bill C-4, is the member aware that his own caucus colleagues have delayed the reporting of the bill to the House?

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, would it not have been wonderful if we could have actually had that debate on Bill C-4? Hopefully we might still be able to get there because of the motion I just moved.

When we think of a committee versus the chamber, the biggest difference is that a committee can sit indefinitely. It can sit around the clock if it wants, but there is a finite amount of time here on the floor of the House of Commons. As we witnessed last year, the Conservatives used that finite amount of time to play a very destructive role on the floor of the House.

I was kind of hopeful that the Conservatives, in particular the leader of the Conservative Party, would have learned something coming out of the last election, which is that Canadians have a higher expectation of more political co-operation on the floor of the House of Commons, especially when we are talking about an important bill that would give 22 million people a tax break.

We have a finite amount of time here, and the Conservatives need to stop playing their political partisan game, because it is at great cost to Canadians.

Caroline Desrochers (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure, Lib.): Madam Speaker, we are hearing the Conservatives blame youth unemployment on temporary residents and blame the government for the increase in temporary residents.

I am wondering whether the member, who was in the House in 2014, remembers when the Harper government launched the international education strategy with the goal of doubling the number of international students to 450,000. Do you remember that?

Routine Proceedings

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): I do not, but I expect the hon. member does.

The hon. parliamentary secretary has the floor.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I do remember that there was an explosion of international students coming into Canada, but it was not because of the actions the Liberal government had taken. We have to take into consideration things such as what the leader of the Conservative Party did in 2014. We also have to take into consideration what provinces like Ontario and B.C. did in terms of the expansion of private post-secondary schools.

The demand for international students exploded. Yes, it would have been nice to have recognized it a couple of years earlier, but we also have to put it in the perspective of the pandemic.

There is a lot of blame to share, but as opposed to blaming, we should do what the Prime Minister is talking about and look at ways we can stabilize immigration into the future. That is what we are going to do.

• (1645)

Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, Liberals get really frustrated, it seems, when Conservatives raise the link between the Liberals' immigration failures and unemployment. We have highlighted a number of areas of failure that contribute to youth unemployment: their failures on the economy, on training and in many other areas, but I think Canadians and young people I talk to in urban centres, from diverse backgrounds, understand how the Liberal failures on immigration policy have contributed to youth unemployment. That is because the Liberals have not aligned our immigration policy with the needs of our economy in terms of skills and numbers.

Liberals have created an immigration policy that experts have said at committee is leading to intensifying competition for entry-level jobs. Previous governments had immigration policies that emphasized bringing in people who could fill skill gaps, while minimizing competition. It is the Liberals' failures that have led to these problems, and they have to be accountable for them.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, the member is being very selective. Let me point out a couple of things that will amplify the incompetence of the leaders of the Conservative Party, in particular Stephen Harper. When Stephen Harper was in government, the Conservatives created just under a million jobs. We almost doubled that number. That is a whole lot more jobs being created under the Liberal government than under the Conservative government.

When we talk about youth unemployment, we have to go back to the days when the leader of the Conservative Party sat in the Conservative caucus and there was over 15% youth unemployment in Canada. I do not believe Conservatives blamed immigrants for that. In fact, as has been pointed out, in 2014 they looked to have more temporary students come to Canada. They cannot have it both ways.

The biggest difference is that the current leader of the Conservative Party has gone far right. That is the reality.

Rhonda Kirkland (Oshawa, CPC): Madam Speaker, let us get back to the truth, which is that the Liberals have no credible jobs

plan for young Canadians. My son happens to be with me this week. He is a fourth-year economics student at the University of Western Ontario. This past summer it took him until August to find a summer job, and now he is unemployed again and looking for something else.

What does the member have to say to my son? Let me add that we do not blame immigrants; we blame the Liberal government for failed immigration policies.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I am very sympathetic to anyone who is unemployed and in search of a job, no matter their age, and I wish them nothing but the best in being successful in getting a job, but if we look at the history of the Conservative Party of Canada versus that of the Liberal Party of Canada, we see that it has consistently been the Liberal Party that has come up with the programs necessary to create more jobs than the Conservatives have. This has been clearly demonstrated over the last 20 years.

I would tell the member's son to never give up and to have hope. There is going to be a budget tomorrow. The government is very sensitive to people who are unemployed and is striving, in the best way it can, to create as many jobs as it can.

Dominique O'Rourke (Guelph, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the federal government has announced it is going to bring in automatic tax filing. It has programs for trades and significant investments for young people in trades. There is the Canada summer jobs program. We would lower the basic income tax level by 1%, and waive the GST for first-time homebuyers if we could get to the debate on Bill C-4.

I wonder if my colleague wants to talk a bit more about how these initiatives, which were all announced in the last six months by the new government, will help young people, and whether there is anything else he would include on that list.

• (1650)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, my friend and colleague has amplified many different actions the government has taken since the last federal election, because we have a Prime Minister who, as the former governor of the Bank of Canada and of the Bank of England, an economist and someone who understands how the economy has worked, is focused on making Canada strong. We are going to continue to work to make Canada the strongest and healthiest in the G7. That is the goal, and with the current Prime Minister and caucus, I believe we are going to be able to achieve it.

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): 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 Regina—Lewvan, The Economy; the hon. member for Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge, The Economy; the hon. member for Elgin—St. Thomas—London South, Automotive Industry.

[*English*]

Tamara Jansen (Cloverdale—Langley City, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am going to be sharing my time with my colleague from Elgin—St. Thomas—London South.

Routine Proceedings

Do members remember their first job: the smell of the uniform, the feel of depositing their first paycheque and the pride of earning something that was truly theirs? For my generation, that first job was more than just work; it was a rite of passage. It taught us responsibility, discipline and independence. We could not wait to start. We wanted to earn money for our first car or first date, or maybe save for school.

Back then, businesses were eager to take on young people. They saw potential, not risk. Small shops, farms and restaurants hired kids and trained them, and I still remember watching those young faces light up when they realized they were being trusted to do real work.

That is how it used to be. That is how we built strong communities where every young person had a chance to learn, to grow and to start building their future. Unfortunately things have changed drastically over the last 10 years, and unless we act now, it is going to worse before it gets better.

There was a time when every business in town saw hiring young people as part of their duty and their joy. I remember summers when high school kids would line up outside the greenhouse, eager to work. We would give them a chance. We would teach them how to handle tools, how to talk to customers and how to show up on time. It was not glamorous, but it built character and grit. I would see teenagers working at diners, mowing lawns and running deliveries. They were learning the habits that make a society strong: hard work, pride in a job well done, teamwork and respect.

For many small business owners, it was rewarding. They were not just hiring someone; they were mentoring the next generation. Watching a young worker grow into confidence and seeing them save for their first car or their first apartment gave hope for the future, and that is how we built a sense of purpose: one job, one handshake and one lesson at a time. Back then our economy worked in harmony. At the local store, the farm, the trade school and the credit union, everyone played a part.

When young people thrived, the community thrived. When one generation moved up, the next one stepped in, but today these opportunities are drying up, and the next generation is paying the price.

Today our young people are doing everything right but getting nowhere. They are a generation on hold. According to StatsCan, more than 460,000 youth are unemployed. That is nearly 15% of everyone aged 15 to 24, the highest rate we have seen in over a decade, outside the pandemic. For students trying to balance school and work, it is even worse; 17% cannot find a job. In Ontario, over 17,000 young people lost work just last month. Across the country, the youth employment rate has dropped to its lowest level in 25 years.

These numbers represent actual lives on hold: kids moving back home because they cannot afford rent, graduates working jobs that do not use their skills, or young couples putting off marriage or kids because they cannot build stability. Even among young people with post-secondary degrees, one in six is working outside their field. They studied, they borrowed and they worked hard, but still they cannot find a place to belong in this economy.

The Liberal government's economic failure has made life harder at every turn, with higher taxes, higher rent, higher prices and fewer opportunities. While they pat themselves on the back for resilience, families see the truth: Our young people are struggling, not because they lack talent or ambition but because government policies have shut the door on opportunity.

This is not a blip. It is not just a tough year. This is a crisis, and it is one the Liberal government's bad policies have created. If we do not act and act fast, we are not just losing jobs; we are losing an entire generation. When young people cannot find their first foothold, they start falling behind, not just financially but also emotionally. They lose confidence. They start to believe the system is not built for them. We are already seeing record mental health struggles, delayed families, lost skills and an economy that is missing out on the potential of young people.

It is not just their problem; it is also ours. A country that does not make room for its young people is a country losing its future. If we allow this to continue, we will face a generation that is less secure, less optimistic and less connected to the Canada we grew up in. That is not a legacy any of us wants to pass on.

● (1655)

We cannot build tomorrow on unemployment lines. We cannot build families on debt. We cannot even build dreams when the path to success has been blocked by bureaucracy and bad policies. We need to turn this around now.

That is why the Conservatives are putting forward a serious plan, one rooted in common sense, hard work and fairness. I would like to touch on two pillars: unleashing the economy and fixing the broken immigration system.

When I was younger, the local mechanic always had a student sweeping the floors and learning the trade. The diner had teenagers busing tables and saving up for their first car. Every small business in town was proud to give a kid their first start. Today, those jobs are disappearing, not because Canadians do not want to hire, but because it is too expensive to hire. It is too complicated and too uncertain to grown a business in this country anymore.

Under the Liberals, we have seen investment flee overseas, projects get cancelled and small businesses squeezed dry. Red tape has become a growth industry all its own. We need to turn that around.

Routine Proceedings

The Conservatives will repeal the anti-resource laws that have scared away billions of dollars in private investment and shut down entire communities, because the best way to help young Canadians find work is to let our economy work. We will cut taxes to drive reinvestment and job creation, letting employers keep more of what they earn so they can hire again, expand again and believe again. We will slash the mountains of red tape that make it easier to start a business in Texas than in Toronto.

When businesses are free to grow, jobs follow. It is not complicated; it is common sense. We do not need more government transformation strategies or glossy reports written by consultants who have never run a payroll in their lives. We need shovels in the ground, paycheques in pockets and opportunity back on main street. Every new shop that opens, every truck that rolls off the lot and every mine that reopens is a door opening for a young Canadian who just wants a chance. That is what unleashing the economy really means: believing in Canada again.

Let us talk about another piece of the puzzle, immigration. Canada has always been a nation built by newcomers. It is part of who we are. However, immigration has to work for everyone: for those arriving and for those already here trying to build a life. The Liberals have lost control of the system. They have flooded the labour market with no plan for housing and no plan for matching skills to real jobs.

While hundreds of thousands of young Canadians cannot find work, the government is on track to issuing among the highest number on record of temporary foreign worker permits. How can that be possible? It is not fair to the Canadians struggling to find a job, and it is not fair to the newcomers who come here expecting opportunity, only to find chaos. The Conservatives will realign immigration with labour market realities by bringing in the people we actually need to fill genuine shortages, not paper quotas designed to hit political talking points.

We will fix credential recognition so that newcomers trained as doctors, engineers and nurses can work in their professions instead of driving taxis, while our hospitals and job sites go short-staffed. When we match skills with need, everybody wins. Young Canadians get a fair chance to start their careers, and new Canadians get the respect and opportunity they came here for. That is the Canadian bargain, or at least it used to be. We intend to bring it back.

This is how we restore confidence in our economy. It is by trusting Canadians again, by giving business owners the freedom to grow and by treating workers, both new and born and raised here, with fairness and respect. If we unleash the economy and fix immigration, we will open the floodgates of opportunity. Young Canadians will not have to leave their hometowns or move back in with their parents just to survive. They will finally have that first chance to work, to save, to build and to start living.

This country was never meant to hold its young people back; it was built to lift them up. Every young person deserves to believe that their hard work still pays off and that the future still belongs to them. We can fix this. We can rebuild an economy where every teenager, every student and every young graduate gets that first chance, and where our kids can save for their first car, their first

home and their own family someday. That is the Canada we grew up in and that is the Canada we owe them.

• (1700)

I have to ask this of the government: When will it stop making excuses, stop burying our youth under red tape and debt, and start giving them the same shot at success that built this country in the first place? The next generation is not asking for a handout; it is asking for a fair chance.

Caroline Desrochers (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I wonder if the member opposite understands how the temporary foreign worker program works.

[*Translation*]

I will ask my question in French, since it is my first language.

The last time the program was reviewed was under the Harper government, and we are still following the same procedures. Does the member know how the program works? Is she aware, for example, that employers have to pay a lot of money, and that the process for bringing people in is very rigorous? Or is she suggesting that business people and businesses are actually choosing to pay more to individuals who are less qualified in order to avoid giving jobs to young Canadians? It seems to me that that is what I am hearing.

I am also wondering whether the member had a chance to speak with business owners in her riding over the summer. We visited businesses in our ridings, and I can say that temporary foreign workers are here to fill the gaps in our industries. They are not here to steal jobs from young Canadian workers.

[*English*]

Tamara Jansen: Madam Speaker, the Conservatives believe that immigration is a blessing, but it needs to be managed responsibly. Right now, the Liberals have lost control. They have flooded the labour market without any plan for housing or credential recognition. We have young Canadians out of work and newcomers with engineering degrees who are driving taxis. It is chaos.

The Conservatives will fix immigration so that skills match jobs, housing matches people and both new and born-and-raised Canadians can thrive again. That is the Canada we promised the world and the one we will rebuild.

*Routine Proceedings**[Translation]*

Rhéal Éloi Fortin (Rivière-du-Nord, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am hoping my colleague can explain something to me. Obviously, I understand that an unemployment rate of 14.7% is concerning.

When I made the rounds of my riding, employers told me that if temporary workers do not come back, they will be forced to shut down some of their operations. In the city where I live, I have noticed that some restaurants have closed their doors permanently because they cannot find the workers they need. Business people say that they do not want to be working 12-hour days, seven days a week.

It seems like everyone is looking for work, but this statistic shows that there is a high unemployment rate among young people. I am trying to understand. Can my colleague explain this situation, which appears to be a dichotomy?

[English]

Tamara Jansen: Madam Speaker, the challenge we have is that jobs are not matched to needs in all the different ridings, so we will have to work to make sure that we have a balanced immigration system that meets needs and matches them to the jobs out there.

- (1705)

Kurt Holman (London—Fanshawe, CPC): Madam Speaker, with regard to youth unemployment, currently Canada has the highest rate of youth unemployment in 30 years, since 1995, when we also had a Liberal government. It appears that history may be repeating itself.

Could my colleague expand on how the Conservatives would resolve the crisis that Canadian youth are currently going through?

Tamara Jansen: Madam Speaker, what our young Canadians are facing is a made-in-Ottawa problem. It is not that our young people stopped working hard; it is that the government stopped letting the economy work for them. When it taxes small business owners into the ground, when it buries job creators in red tape and when it makes it easier to open a shop in Texas than in Toronto, the government drives opportunity out of reach.

The Conservatives will fix that. We will unleash the economy so businesses can hire again and young Canadians can finally get that first paycheque, that first start and that first shot at independence.

Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Madam Speaker, members have raised the issue of the regional differences in unemployment, with regions of high unemployment and low unemployment. That is why our plan includes measures to make it easier for employers to provide employer housing, make it easier to build homes where the jobs are and make it easier for young people who are living in regions of high unemployment to move to regions of lower unemployment. It should not just be about bringing in workers from outside the country; it should be about creating opportunities for relocation within Canada in regions where there is low unemployment.

I wonder if the member could comment on that part of our plan: building homes where the jobs are.

Tamara Jansen: Madam Speaker, we are going to reward practical skills, expand apprenticeships and make sure taxpayer-funded education leads to real-world paycheques.

Andrew Lawton (Elgin—St. Thomas—London South, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is a great privilege, as always, to rise on behalf of the people of Elgin—St. Thomas—London South.

I remember so fondly the first real job I ever had. I was 14 years old. I did not get a glamorous job. I was busing tables in a hotel restaurant in south London. I was occasionally doing room service if they needed someone to pitch in. When they opened a new café, I got to try my barista skills, which were so subpar that I have ended up now as a member of Parliament and did not take my work pro.

I developed some incredible skills through that first job. I had a sense of purpose. I had a bit of money in my pocket at the age of 14. I made connections there that helped me get other jobs. I worked for years in a variety of restaurant jobs, doing things that, again, were not glamorous, but gave me a bit of money and gave me responsibility. That helped me on the path so that when I applied for my first job with a higher barrier to entry, I had a résumé that had on it years of work experience that I only got because there were jobs available to me when starting out.

To go back to the very first job I had at the hotel, years later, that hotel started filing labour market impact assessment requests and hiring temporary foreigners. There are youth that could not now do, at the very same place, what I did to start out on my vocational path when I was a teenager. This is something I am hearing about from youth all across my riding. They are sending out résumé after résumé and cannot get a job. Then they are finding out the place that would not hire them has temporary foreign workers working for it.

I know the Liberal government will say that is not the way the system works, but there is a wide chasm between how the system is designed and how it is unfolding in real time, right now, not just in my riding but in communities across the country. The reason we are having this debate in the House of Commons right now is that there is a youth jobs crisis. Over 460,000 young Canadians are out of work. The unemployment rate for Canadian youth is nearing 15%. Youth employment is at its lowest point in over 25 years outside of the pandemic.

This is, in fact, a crisis. It is one we do not learn about as members of Parliament simply because Statistics Canada has released the data. This has been, in my inbox anyway, a story I have been hearing since I was elected. If I am not hearing from the youth, I am hearing from their parents, saying their son or daughter cannot find a job.

Routine Proceedings

To be clear, there are two seemingly contradictory trends happening in the workforce right now. I also hear from a number of employers who say they cannot find people to fill the job postings they have. There are some regional variations, most certainly, and there are some differences when it comes to sector. Employers are having a difficult time finding people to fill certain skilled roles. For entry-level jobs, which we would traditionally refer to as jobs in the service sector or hospitality sector, young people cannot get a foothold. They will send out dozens or hundreds of résumés even and not get a single interview, let alone a job offer.

The abundance of jobs that employers cannot find people to fill in certain skilled trades is a consequence of government policy from the Liberal government, and so too is the shortage of jobs for young people. These are both a direct consequence of Liberal government policy. It has stifled growth, has stifled mobility for workers, has made it more difficult for immigrants who come to Canada with credentials to be recognized and work, and has made it more difficult for young people to get a first job. This is because of unskilled temporary residents filling jobs that have Canadian workers lining up to take them.

In my riding, I represent a lot of farmers. The temporary foreign worker program has been a crucial part of the agricultural sector, but that is not the portion of the temporary foreign worker problem that we are seeing now drive young people out of having employment opportunities. The widespread expansion and abuse of the TFW program has become so bad that coveted first jobs are simply not available for Canadian youth.

• (1710)

Temporary foreign workers have ballooned now to nearly 2% of the total private workforce in Canada over the last decade. Three-quarters of temporary residents in the workforce earn less than the median income for Canadians, which means that we know temporary foreign labour drives down wages. It depresses wages and makes it more difficult for anyone commanding a market rate in Canada to get a job at a fair wage, because employers can find a temporary resident who is so grateful to have a foothold into Canada that they will work for the bare minimum.

We have also heard of examples of abuse of the program where even the stated dollar value, the stated wage of a position for a temporary resident, is not the take-home pay. There are schemes and kickbacks. We have heard of this happening. This is not to impugn all employers who use temporary labour, but it is to point out that there is a problem in the system that the Liberal government has allowed to fester.

It is not just an immigration problem, but we cannot separate what is happening to drive young people out of the workforce from what the Liberal government has done on temporary foreign workers. It is a problem that has become so big that the Conservatives came out with a very bold, but very necessary, position to scrap the temporary foreign worker program while keeping a stand-alone program for the agricultural sector for jobs that genuinely cannot be filled by domestic labour. We have seen this for decades; it is not just a trend in the last 10 years.

We do have a jobs plan for youth in this country. It is a plan that will open up the economy and eliminate the red tape and regula-

tions that are making it difficult for employers, especially small and medium-sized businesses, to hire. It is a fix on the immigration system, which the Liberals have allowed to get so broken that only a Conservative government is capable of repairing it, making sure that Canadian jobs go to Canadian workers. This is not a radical proposition, but the Liberals treat it as though it is.

We need to fix training. Right now, one in six workers with post-secondary credentials is unable to find a job in the field in which they have been trained. We need to make sure that federal student training and funding programs are going towards employment-centred training, education and training that directly will help young people get into the workforce.

Last, we need to do more to bolster mobility and do what we can to harmonize credential recognition from one part of the country to the other. We need to make sure that an eager, keen, young person with a credential in Ontario can go to Manitoba, someone from Alberta can go to Ontario and vice versa so that they can go where the jobs are. Also, we need to make sure that housing is built where there is a need for labour so that housing prices, another consequence of 10 years of Liberal reign, are not making it so that a person is unable to live where they want to work.

This is the legitimate, concrete plan; a plan that I am begging the Liberal government to adopt. The Liberals have enjoyed many of our other policies, whether on crime or taxes. Let them take this as well, because I want Canadian youth to have a future. I want them to have the same future that I had from the time I was 14. By the way, it was at that hotel job where I first met Stephen Harper who was staying as a guest at that hotel. Perhaps that first job set me up on the path I took in several other ways as well.

I will close with an email I got from a constituent a couple of months back. It is from a man named Zain who said:

I've spent the last four years actively searching for employment in fields such as administration.... I hold postsecondary credentials from Conestoga College, and I've volunteered for three years to gain additional experience. Yet, despite my ongoing effort, I—like many Canadians—remain unemployed.

The federal government promotes employment support programs and encourages workforce participation, but the real experience of job seekers tells a different story.

Will the Liberal government listen to the countless youth, like Zain and many others across my riding and across the country, and secure a future for young Canadians to get jobs and know that they have a future in this country?

Routine Proceedings

• (1715)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I could spend a great deal of time talking about what the member has been talking about in regards to the whole immigration file. There are a lot of fundamental flaws in the comments he has put on the record.

I would suggest that the real issue before us is the obstruction being caused by the Conservative Party of Canada, led by their leader. It is causing issues that affect Canadians. A tax break for 22 million Canadians, a tax break for first-time homebuyers, getting rid of the carbon tax in law; Bill C-4 is important to all Canadians.

When will the Conservative Party stop the abuse with the things they bring forward to prevent the type of debate that Canadians deserve for the breaks that they need?

Andrew Lawton: Madam Speaker, I am relatively new to this chamber, but I sense a trend, which is that there is no shortage of words from the member for Winnipeg North on any issue imaginable. Not all of us in this chamber, especially new members, have had the opportunities this member has had to engage on issues in this place.

I am here speaking about an issue that has been tremendously relevant to youth and their families across my riding. This is not something I will just dismiss because it is inconvenient to the Liberal government's narrative; I will continue to talk about this and demand action from the government on this file because our youth deserve a future.

Dean Allison (Niagara West, CPC): Madam Speaker, I think what my colleague has noticed probably in a very short time is that the Liberals are the greatest gaslighters on earth. They talk about things to fix that they run around actually breaking. This is just another great example. They break the immigration system and then come up with a plan to try and fix it. They break the system when it comes to red tape and regulations and then say they will find a way to fix it.

Has the member noticed similar things since he has been here?

Andrew Lawton: Madam Speaker, I will say no to my hon. colleague; I noticed it before I got here. It is one of the reasons I wanted to come here, because we do see from the Liberal government a sense of breaking something, then showing up and all of a sudden it is the one we are supposed to trust with the solutions.

Again, on the immigration file, I would be remiss to not point out the Liberal government promised it would cap temporary foreign worker permits this year at 82,000. In the first six months of this year, it issued 105,000. That is not even including what is going to come in the third and fourth quarters of the year. It already broke its promise in the first half of the year and is telling us it has the situation under control.

Madam Speaker, through you, I would tell it to "get real".

• (1720)

[*Translation*]

Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ): Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for his speech, which was rather nuanced. I

wonder if he agrees with his leader's statement from September when he said that Ottawa must scrap the temporary foreign worker program if it really wants to help young Canadians find jobs.

Can my colleague explain his leader's comments? Or does he agree with these comments?

[*English*]

Andrew Lawton: Madam Speaker, I believe the temporary foreign worker program has been so destroyed by the Liberal government that the only way forward is to abolish it. I am very clear, especially as the member of Parliament for a lot of rural constituents and farmers, there needs to be a stand-alone stream for temporary labour for the agricultural sector. That is important and it is part of a long-standing initiative in Canada that has been working. However, having temporary foreign workers fill jobs in fast food and hospitality, which is forcing youth out of the job market, is not what the program is for and it has to stop immediately.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, would the member then suggest that temporary work permit extensions should not be issued to the individuals who came from Ukraine and settled in Canada, who are estimated to be anywhere from let us say 250,000 to 300,000, who have temporary work permits? Should they be renewed?

Andrew Lawton: Madam Speaker, with respect, the member is obfuscating. That is not the cause of the problems we are seeing in the TFW program. It is the fast food and hospitality sector and some unscrupulous immigration consultants, not all of them, who have abused the system to the point where our plan is very clear.

Caroline Desrochers (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure, Lib.): Madam Speaker, more than ever before, the Government of Canada is stepping up our efforts to help young people in Canada find employment and it is working. We offer a wide range of programs and initiatives. The first one that comes to mind is, without a doubt, Canada summer jobs. Every year, thanks to Canada summer jobs, thousands of young people gain meaningful work experience that helps prepare them for their future careers.

Routine Proceedings

The Canada summer jobs program helps employers in the not-for-profit, public and private sectors create quality summer jobs for young people aged 15 to 30. It supports private sector companies with 50 or fewer full-time employees. It takes into account local and national priorities as well as labour market needs. Through wage subsidies, quality employment opportunities and mentorships, Canada summer jobs, CSJ, helps employers fill job vacancies and young people gain experience that will inform their career choices. For some, it provides their first work experience. Everybody wins, and it works. Let us look at the latest numbers. Since 2019, Canada summer jobs has generated over 530,000 job opportunities. This year, for summer 2025, we have created up to 6,000 additional opportunities. That is on top of the already 70,000 jobs announced, for a total of 76,000 jobs for young people across the country.

In 2024, the Office of the Auditor General of Canada conducted an independent audit of the program. It found that youth participating in CSJ have better long-term earnings than those who do not. This program works and it is an integral part of a larger whole. It is important to understand that this program is part of a much wider suite of programs that the government offers through the year to help young people find work. It is part of the youth employment and skills strategy, a horizontal Government of Canada initiative led by Employment and Social Development Canada with strategies delivered in partnership with 11 other departments, agencies and Crown corporations. For example, the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation delivers a housing internship for indigenous youth program, Environment and Climate Change Canada delivers the science horizons youth internship program, Canadian Heritage delivers Young Canada Works, in both official languages, and ES-DC delivers Canada summer jobs, as previously mentioned.

ESDC's youth employment and skills strategy program provides funding to organizations to help them deliver a range of activities to help youth overcome barriers to employment. It is a very flexible program that supports services tailored to the needs of each individual. Services include mentorship, skills development opportunities, training and wraparound supports such as dependant care support and mental health counselling. There are also job opportunities in various sectors such as IT, transportation, hospitality and social services. This program also works. Seventy-three per cent of its participants were either employed or returned to school.

Through the programs under the broader youth employment and skills strategy, not including Canada summer jobs, we are helping more than 20,000 youth in 2025-26 with employment supports tailored to their needs. This includes internships and skills development opportunities, which help the next generation shape Canada's future. Like Canada summer jobs, the youth employment and skills strategy program complements the wide range of government programs under the youth employment and skills strategy.

Let us not forget the student work placement program, which accomplishes two things. On the one hand it helps post-secondary students develop professional skills. On the other hand, it helps employers recruit and develop talent. It does this through paid work-integrated learning opportunities. Last year, the program enabled more than 51,000 post-secondary students to obtain paid work experience with employers. Since 2017, more than 300,000 internships have been created, thanks to an investment of \$207 mil-

lion. More than 34,000 employers and 420 post-secondary institutions participate in the program and three out of four employers have indicated that they would be likely to hire students after their internship.

● (1725)

This year, the Government of Canada is supporting approximately 159,000 employment opportunities for young people and students through the youth employment and skills strategy, Canada summer jobs and all of these other programs I have mentioned. Our actions are getting results, but our efforts to help young people in Canada find jobs do not stop there. There is more.

There is the Canadian apprenticeship strategy, which provides programs, services and financial support for apprentices to help them train and obtain certification in the skilled trades. Apprentices can access EI benefits during their technical training and obtain up to \$4,000 in interest-free Canada apprentice loans for each period of technical training, up to a maximum of \$20,000. To round out these supports, the Canada Revenue Agency provides tax credits and deductions. On top of all of this, apprentices may be eligible for additional supports offered by their province or territory.

As if that was not enough, we have extended temporary increases to student grants and loans through the Canada student financial assistance program. We are making post-secondary education more affordable. This includes maintaining the 40% increase to grants for full-time students, part-time students, students with disabilities and students with dependants. It also includes an increase in the Canada student loan limit from \$210 to \$300 per week of study. Nearly 600,000 Canadian students are expected to benefit from the 40% increase in the amount of non-repayable grants, and 367,000 students could benefit from the increase in the weekly loan limit. All of these enable us to provide additional funding in the form of interest-free loans to students with unmet financial needs who need it the most.

I could go on and on, but I will put my notes aside for a moment and go back to what brought us to this very important conversation we are having this afternoon. We agreed at committee to study youth unemployment. We approached this in good faith because we know this is an important issue affecting our youth. We invited witnesses and we had genuine questions for them about all of these programs that I have mentioned. We tried to understand what works well, what we could do better, where we could do more and how we could do things differently. Those were the lines of questioning we brought to committee.

In contrast, we saw the opposition at committee constantly blaming temporary residents for youth unemployment. All of the meetings were in public. I invite everyone to watch those committee hearings. The opposition completely dismissed all of the programs that are providing youth with what they need in order to enter the job market, like re-skilling, training and the innovative work-integrated learning program. Everything we have put in place to help young people gain their first job, keep it and learn on the job is being dismissed in the name of making a point about the work of the Liberal government.

We heard across the board at committee about the mismatch between the skills young people graduate with and what the market needs. We heard that from everyone. This needs to be addressed, and we were hoping that through the work of that committee, we could get to some real, concrete solutions, not just slogans and pandering and all of that. This is a real issue. Why are young people not studying the things that society needs them to?

We also asked a witness whether the government is currently sending the right signals to youth across Canada about standing up the office for major projects, signalling that we will build infrastructure all across the country, launching Build Canada Homes and committing to building up to 500,000 homes across the country. Those are the signals we are sending when we put together tools and programs for re-skilling, to invest in our trades and to tell young people that we will need more tradespeople in order to build Canada strong. They are the right signals. We asked the witnesses who came to the committee if they thought these measures would help shift the market and what young people decide to do, and they were hopeful.

● (1730)

The truth is that the Conservatives across the aisle are not really there for youth and affordability. They claim to care about them, but every time we put a measure forward to support affordability and youth, they vote it down. They voted against the national housing strategy, the first home savings account and expanding mortgage criteria. They will not commit to cutting the GST for first-time homebuyers, cutting taxes for 22 million Canadians or implementing the national school food program, which has been discussed at length today.

When we say we are there for young people and want an affordable life for young people, we have to put our actions where our mouth is. The issue is too serious to not have a real conversation about it. The kind of work happening today and at the committee that is supposed to be studying this does not do the importance of this issue justice. It is very disheartening.

In conclusion, we have demonstrated that we are willing to sit down and look at what is and is not working with the program. We are willing to change things and take ideas on board, but we are not seeing authentic and genuine engagement from the other side.

Philip Lawrence (Northumberland—Clarke, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is odd to me that the Liberals do a great job of talking about how they are giving money to people, but they do not ever state where that money comes from, which is also the people. They go out to our communities and our ridings and take that money, take a chunk of it to Ottawa and give out the shells to the rest of us.

Routine Proceedings

Does the member not realize they are actually impoverishing Canadians with their high rates of taxation and even higher rates of spending?

● (1735)

Caroline Desrochers: Mr. Speaker, I want to read something out. We will double the number of international students in Canada, which will create 86,500 net new jobs. We are going to invest \$5 million in this. We will create 173,000 jobs. International student expenditures in Canada will rise to over \$16 billion, generating economic growth and prosperity in every region of Canada. This will provide an annual boost of approximately \$10 billion to the Canadian economy.

That was written by the Conservative government in 2014 about investing in international students and the same kinds of programs we are currently investing in, because they create growth and jobs.

[*Translation*]

Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette—Manawan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, youth unemployment is indeed a major concern, and we need to address it. I thank the hon. parliamentary secretary for her speech on this. However, I have two questions for her.

My first question has to do with the drastic changes made to the approach to the temporary foreign worker program. In my riding, many small and medium-sized businesses in the steel industry, the insurance industry and others are saying that these radical changes are jeopardizing their survival. I would like to hear my colleague's comments on that.

My second question is this. The hon. parliamentary secretary is also the member for Trois-Rivières. In her view, is it a good idea to have chosen to give a speech in the House in English only?

Caroline Desrochers: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for the question, and I also thank him for asking it in French and acknowledging the importance of French. I apologize to him and I will endeavour to add French to my speeches in the future.

There is no one solution to the issue of temporary foreign workers. We really need to take a measured approach by region and by sector. Yes, there has been a pause, but we need to look into this and be smart about it. It is true that businesses need labour, but it is probably also true that there is undoubtedly abuse in certain sectors. We need to find a way to manage this better.

*Routine Proceedings**[English]*

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Waterloo, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciated the perspective the member shared. Even within the riding of Waterloo, there is a diversity of views and perspectives. Constituents recognize that the government is trying to take measures to advance the country and ensure that Canadians do well, but they are frustrated by the official opposition refusing to move forward even in inches and take concrete measures or help be constructive in that approach. The member referred to comments about important things. Constituents in the riding of Waterloo recognize that Conservatives voted against the national food program, dental care and early learning and child care, and the list goes on.

I would love to hear from the member what she believes the opposition can do to help Canadians have a better outcome and make sure that they benefit from the purpose the government is here to serve.

Caroline Desrochers: Mr. Speaker, the opposition should really consider supporting us in our budget next week, which will contain all of these affordability measures for Canadians across the country. In addition to that, members can engage genuinely at committee in order to bring real solutions. That means not bringing a solution that starts with, “Oh, because the government failed so epically, this is the solution.” The debate cannot start there.

• (1740)

Kurt Holman (London—Fanshawe, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as I stand in the chamber, I am proud to represent the people of London—Fanshawe.

During the campaign earlier this year, I heard from many parents about the struggles young people have to go through just to find their first job. Many parents were on the edge of tears telling me about the struggles their children repeatedly have to go through in applying for their first job.

I got my first job at the age of 16. It was unique for a person of my age. I was a systems administrator for an Internet service provider in the 1990s, when accessing the Internet was done via dial-up modem and we surfed the Internet with the Netscape Navigator browser. I wonder if that kind of unique job opportunity would be available for a young person today under the current Liberal government.

With so many young people frustrated by looking for work, what is the average number of applications a young person has to submit before getting their first job? Is it 500, 1,000 or 2,000 applications?

Caroline Desrochers: Mr. Speaker, we heard at committee that a lot of employers are looking for people with experience, and this is stopping young people from getting jobs. This is why we have the programs I listed in my speech earlier, like the innovative work-integrated learning program, FSWEP, the co-op program and Canada summer jobs.

Again, employers are looking to hire people with previous experience, and this is why we are investing in giving youth those first experiences.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I know the member has been listening to the debate today.

I have expressed a great deal of disappointment that we are debating this issue when we should be talking about Bill C-4, which would give first-time homebuyers and 22 million Canadians a substantial tax break. The budget is coming tomorrow. We are witnessing a filibuster by the Conservative Party when we should be talking about the interests of Canadians.

I would ask the member for her thoughts on her constituents' need for the tax break and the many other things being brought forward by the government.

[Translation]

Caroline Desrochers: Mr. Speaker, yes, we should be debating Bill C-4 today. In addition to lowering taxes for the middle class, which affects 22 million Canadians, and eliminating the goods and services tax on new homes for first-time buyers, Bill C-4 also aims to end the consumer carbon tax, something that my Conservative colleagues have been calling for for a very long time. Now we are doing it, but they choose not to debate it.

This brings me back to what I was saying earlier: Questions get asked, but there is no real willingness to find a solution.

[English]

Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, very simply, the parliamentary secretary began her speech by saying that the Liberals' plan is working. Objectively, it is not.

Youth unemployment numbers continue to go up, and members who disagree should simply access the Statistics Canada reports, which show the numbers going up. The member can identify the continuing existence of programs that have existed since the 1990s, such as the Canada summer jobs program and youth employment strategy, but the Liberals' approach on a range of policy areas is clearly not working. It is in the numbers.

Does the member not believe the numbers, or does she hope we are not aware of them?

Caroline Desrochers: Mr. Speaker, I take offence at the comment because I did not deny that there is youth unemployment. I explained the programs we have, and I linked all these programs. The member knows them, because we have been studying them at committee. We have been going over them and over the numbers.

Yes, youth unemployment exists and it is an issue. We have programs to give students their first job so that they can continue—

The Deputy Speaker: Resuming debate, the hon. member for Richmond Hill South.

Routine Proceedings

Vincent Ho (Richmond Hill South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in the midst of a generational youth unemployment crisis, the Prime Minister has a message for young Canadians: to keep sacrificing. After 10 long years of Liberal failure, he is asking young people, the very generation crushed under the weight of his economic mismanagement, to make even more sacrifices.

What more is there left to give? Young Canadians have already sacrificed the dream of home ownership; they have sacrificed with a summer of no jobs, and they have sacrificed at the grocery store with skyrocketing food costs. Now the same out-of-touch Liberal Prime Minister is asking them to dig even deeper to pay for his record-breaking deficits, his anti-growth ideology and his out-of-touch experiments in economic policy. Let us be clear: Young Canadians do not need another lecture from an out-of-touch Goldman Sachs investment banker, the Prime Minister, about sacrifice. They need jobs, homes and a future filled with hope.

Statistics Canada has confirmed what every young Canadian already knows and feels on the ground: The Liberals' economic failure has created a deepening youth unemployment crisis. Let us look at the numbers. In September, youth unemployment climbed from 14.5% to 14.7%, as if it was not bad enough. That is the highest level since 2010, coming out of the great recession, outside the pandemic years. Over 460,000 young Canadians aged 15 to 24 are unemployed today. Nearly 15% are unemployed nationally, and this is climbing.

For students trying to balance school and work, it is even worse: 17% of students cannot find jobs, and it is getting worse—

• (1745)

The Deputy Speaker: I am going to have to interrupt the hon. member. There seems to be a device on his desk that is causing a sound. I will ask him to move it away from the microphone. It interferes with the interpreters' work.

The hon. member can resume.

Vincent Ho: Mr. Speaker, it is getting worse every single day. In Ontario alone, over 17,000 young people lost their jobs just last month. Ontario's unemployment has now topped 700,000, up 83,000 in a single year. In Windsor, unemployment has soared past 10%. In Toronto, joblessness is up 46,000 year over year, a record high. This past summer, it was the worst in a generation, with returning full-time students facing an average unemployment rate of 17.9%, the highest since the great recession, outside the pandemic. This is not just a crisis. It is a generational collapse.

I will be splitting my time with another member.

Young Canadians trying to pay tuition, gain experience and start their lives have been completely abandoned by the Liberal government. Even educated workers, those who did everything right, who went to school, studied hard and followed the rules, are struggling. One in six workers with post-secondary credentials is in a job unrelated to their training. New graduates are unable to build careers in their fields. I ask the Liberal government how it can call it opportunity when no opportunity even exists.

How can a young person believe in the Canadian promise when the path to success has been blocked by Liberal red tape, reckless

spending and endless taxes? This is not a temporary setback. This is a metastasizing crisis that threatens Canada's long-term economic future. A government that loses faith in its young people is a government that loses faith in Canada.

What caused this crisis? It was the Liberal Prime Minister and his decision to double down on the very same Trudeau-era policies that failed. It begins with their disastrous economic policy, a policy that drives away investment, kills small businesses and punishes personal ambition. For 10 years, the Liberals have pushed anti-growth laws that sabotage the very sectors that built the country: energy, manufacturing, resource development and more. They refuse to repeal their "no new pipelines" law, the same law that killed billions in private investment and forced companies to flee south. They maintain the production cap, which throttles Canada's ability to compete globally. They enforce a tanker ban that effectively blocks our provinces from exporting responsibly produced Canadian energy while our allies depend on the exports of dirty dictator oil.

Is that fair to young Canadians who could be building careers in engineering, trades or innovation, or is that just failure dressed up as virtue?

Investment is fleeing the country at a record level. Business investment for workers collapsed by more than 10% per worker under the Liberals' watch. Canada now ranks dead last in the G7 for GDP growth, experiencing negative growth and the fastest-shrinking economy as measured by real GDP per capita.

What does the Liberal Prime Minister tell Canadians? He says that we need to sacrifice. What do we need to sacrifice exactly? Is it our prosperity, our jobs, our expectations, our standards or our hope?

Let us remember what these numbers mean. Behind every statistic is a story, a young person whose dream has been delayed or destroyed, a recent graduate in Toronto forced to move back in with their parents because rent costs more than their entire paycheque, a student in Windsor who is working two part-time jobs just to cover groceries but is still unable to find meaningful summer employment in their field or a young couple in Richmond Hill who gave up on ever owning a home and starting a family because the down payment they saved up five years ago is now worth much less. This is the reality for millions. Is this the Canada our parents and grandparents built? Is this the country that once promised that hard work would be rewarded, not punished by Liberal policies?

Routine Proceedings

Conservatives have a plan, not more words such as the Liberals like to use, but real action. There is an opportunity to work with Conservatives on a youth jobs plan that is built on four key pillars to restore opportunity and rebuild hope.

First, we will unleash the economy. We will repeal antiresource laws, cut taxes to drive reinvestment and eliminate the red tape that is choking homebuilding and business growth.

Second, we will fix the immigration system. We all know that the Liberals have broken the immigration system, flooding the market with labour and destroying long-held social bargains. We must fix credential recognition and realign immigration with labour and housing market realities.

Third, we will fix the training system. Federal student aid should no longer treat all studies the same. We are proposing that the Canada student financial assistance program provide relatively more support to students pursuing in-demand fields, determined based on objective labour market data. Taxpayer investments in education should prepare youth for jobs that are out there.

• (1750)

Fourth, we will build homes where the jobs are. Employers trying to hire in regions with labour shortages face major obstacles because workers cannot find nearby housing. To fix this, we are proposing a 100% capital cost write-off for companies that build workforce housing. This powerful incentive would help small businesses and large employers alike to attract workers while expanding the housing supply overall.

That is the Conservative plan, a plan rooted in common sense and action, not bureaucracy and excuses.

What is the Liberal plan? It is nothing but recycled announcements, photo ops and programs older than the young people today. The Liberals point to jobs funds from the 1990s, duplicate old programs and then claim victory while the crisis worsens every single day. They have spent billions on bureaucracy and have nothing to show for it, no new pipelines, no housing affordability and no youth employment gains.

Meanwhile, young Canadians line up at food banks, delay starting a family and lose faith in a system that no longer works for them. How can the Prime Minister claim to care about young people when every one of his policies makes their lives worse? How can a government that cannot permit a single project claim to support jobs? How can a government that taxes groceries claim to fight for affordability? How can a Prime Minister who has never missed a meal lecture struggling students about sacrifice?

The truth is simple: The Liberals broke Canada's promise. Conservatives will restore it.

The Liberals are saying that they are making so-called generational investments; instead, we are witnessing a generational betrayal. The Liberal government inherited one of the most prosperous, stable and opportunity-rich nations in the world and squandered it.

The Liberals hollowed out our industries, demonized our workers and replaced production and innovation with ideology and bu-

reaucracy. They built a bloated bureaucracy and called it progress. Now the bill has come due, and they look to young Canadians and the next generation to pay the bill. That is not leadership; that is abdication.

Our Conservative plan will be different. We will unleash the power of young Canadians, not bury them under debt. We will cut taxes so that hard work pays off. We will scrap the industrial carbon tax and cut taxes on homebuilding, so farmers, truckers and builders can make life affordable again.

We will repeal the “no new pipelines” law, lift the tanker ban and scrap the production cap so that Canada can once again be an energy superpower that provides well-paying jobs to young people from coast to coast. We will reward hard work again, so we are not sacrificing to survive but working to thrive for a better tomorrow.

Canada's best days are not behind us, although that is what the Liberal Prime Minister wants Canadians to believe. They are ahead of us.

• (1755)

[*Translation*]

Natilien Joseph (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am a little confused. The Conservatives spend 50% of their time voting against the government's youth employability programs, safety programs and more, and the other 50% of their time advocating for young people and youth employability.

My question is this: Can my colleague across the way look into the camera and claim that the Conservatives are being sincere?

[*English*]

Vincent Ho: Mr. Speaker, I will look directly into the camera.

I know the Liberal member is a little perplexed, but so are young Canadians. The Liberal Prime Minister went into a room full of students and told them they needed to sacrifice more, to lower their expectation and to be content with less, because the Liberals robbed them of their future. Those students and young Canadians all across the country who are watching are the ones who are perplexed.

They want to know why their government is working against them when it should be supporting them and uplifting the next generation.

Routine Proceedings

[Translation]

Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I see "help wanted" signs all over my riding. I have met with business leaders, entrepreneurs and workers at various companies. Of course, I am obviously not talking here about temporary foreign workers in the agriculture sector. The people I meet are concerned about applying a 20% standard, so reducing it to 10% would be a really big deal for them. The fact is that they cannot hire enough staff without temporary foreign workers. Without them, business owners would have to shut down. They would not be able to process orders.

Is the situation in my colleague's riding really that much different from mine?

[English]

Vincent Ho: Mr. Speaker, I have some advice for that member. He should maybe stop parroting the talking points of the corporate lobbyists who are courting his office, because that is what it sounds like he is repeating right now. Although that story sounds rich, the numbers from StatsCan do not lie. This is a government agency that provides these unbiased statistics: Youth unemployment is up to 14.7% and it keeps going up. It is the highest level since 2010 coming out of the great recession. There are 460,000 young Canadians, aged 15 to 24, nearly 15%, unemployed nationally; 17% of students cannot find jobs; and 17,000 young people lost their jobs just last month. Ontario's unemployment now tops 700,000, which is up 83,000 in a single year.

If that member has the guts, maybe he should go back to his riding, talk to some students and repeat that story while these statistics, this reality, is happening all across the country.

Helena Konanz (Similkameen—South Okanagan—West Kootenay, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I think that everyone in the House agrees, or should agree, that there is a deepening youth unemployment crisis. Since September, it climbed from 14.5% to 14.7%, the highest since 2010. Conservatives have been sounding the alarm for years now and the Liberals have ignored the warnings.

Can the member explain again what he believes is the root cause of this youth unemployment crisis?

Vincent Ho: Mr. Speaker, the root cause of this youth unemployment crisis is one person. It is this Liberal Prime Minister, because he calls himself a new Liberal prime minister, but he has just proven that he is just another bait and switch. He chose to double down on the same failed Trudeau-era policies of the last 10 years instead of turning the page and trying something new.

Our Conservative plan would be different. We would unleash the economy. We would repeal anti-resource laws. We would fix the immigration system that the Liberals broke. We would fix the training system. We would tie student aid to programs that are reflective of the job market. We would build homes where the jobs are.

• (1800)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions among the parties and I believe you will get unanimous consent to go to Questions Passed as Orders for Return so that I can make a very brief statement and then return to the debate we are currently having.

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURN

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the government's response to Questions Nos. 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337 and 338 could be made orders for return, these returns would be tabled in an electronic format immediately.

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[For text of questions and responses, see *Written Questions website*]

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

HUMAN RESOURCES, SKILLS AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT AND THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Jamil Jivani (Bowmanville—Oshawa North, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today, we have thousands upon thousands, tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands of young Canadians who have done exactly what they were asked to do. They went to school. They studied hard. They gave their best effort on the promise that, at the end of all that, they would be able to get a job and start a career. What they are experiencing right now is a broken promise by their government. They are experiencing a job market that is lacking in jobs and opportunities. In fact, many are feeling overwhelmingly anxious right now when they think about what their future holds.

It is heartbreaking to see and hear, and many of us in the House see and hear that from our constituents on a regular basis. For me, in Bowmanville—Oshawa North, I hear that very often from students at Durham College and Ontario Tech who have worked very hard and gotten good grades. They really should be feeling excited about what awaits them, yet they are anxious every single day.

Routine Proceedings

We know the unemployment crisis facing young people, where we have 460,000-plus Canadians between the ages of 15 and 24 looking for work, has exacerbated many of the issues young people are already facing in this country. Boys and young men in particular are disproportionately shouldering a burden for very many social and cultural problems right now, including opioid overdoses, suicides and homelessness. They are victims of violent crime and dropping out of high school. The unemployment crisis makes all of those things even worse.

I myself was once a young man struggling in the school system, labelled illiterate by the Ontario public schools for failing a literacy test in grade 10. I know for a fact that if not for the chance to work, I might have never finished high school and I might not be standing here right now. For years, I found work in restaurants, at Red Lobster and other places, working as a dishwasher or a line cook. It was not glamorous at all. Scraping seafood off pots and pans is not the stuff people dream about doing one day, but the skills I learned, the personal attributes I gained from working at night made up for all the things I was not able to learn and do during the day in a classroom.

When we see these statistics about young people not having jobs, it is more than just not having a paycheque every week or every two weeks; it is also a sign of young people being robbed of the personal development and growth that is necessary for the future leaders of our country. The research is very clear on this: when one works as a young person, they learn things they might not learn anywhere else in their life. They learn responsibility, time management and conflict resolution. They learn how to be responsible for other people, how to work as a team, social skills and personal development that is essential, personal development that, when it is lacking, becomes a problem for all of us, because we all depend on the young people of today to be leaders for our country in the future.

I have been worried for quite some time that young people would internalize the bad economy created as a result of 10 years of Liberal policy, and they would blame themselves for the lack of opportunity in front of them. I have worried for a long time that young people would think they had made mistakes or think they had made the wrong choices and that is why they are struggling in the economy right now. This is one of the reasons I have been visiting university and college campuses across Ontario and soon the rest of the country. It is precisely to hear them out and hear what is going on, what is weighing on their hearts and their minds, but also to deliver a very clear message: It is not their fault.

In fact, the economy they see before them right now is a result of a series of bad choices and bad policies made by people in positions of power. Liberal politicians, corporate bigwigs on Bay Street and bureaucrats here in Ottawa have consistently put the interests of the next generation of leaders in this country on the back burner to serve all sorts of, frankly, bizarre ideological agendas. Young people need to know this, because we do not want young people to feel discouraged and demoralized.

- (1805)

We want them to know that better choices are possible, a better future is possible and, in fact, how we get to that better future, in

many ways, can depend on their being involved in our democracy and our political process and their gaining the ability to be leaders in this country to make decisions for our institutions that would be forward-thinking and not backward-looking.

I believe that when we talk about the choices made by people in positions of power, it is helpful to be specific. Here today, we have heard about some of the policies that have been enacted by the government for the last decade that have held back our economy from the necessary growth required for young people to have jobs and careers. We have heard about the anti-resource policies, high taxes and heavy red tape. We have heard also about the fact that the labour market has been completely misaligned, not just at the post-secondary level but also when it comes to immigration policy.

When I visit university and college campuses, I hear that young Canadians across this country know that small tinkering at the edges of the status quo is far from enough to create the changes necessary for young people to be optimistic and hopeful about their future. Small programs and small policy changes by a government that is pretending right now that it is different from what this country has had for the last decade are simply not going to get the job done. Young people know that real, serious, substantive changes are required and there may be no better example of that than immigration policy.

We saw here in this very chamber, just a few hours ago, the Liberal government once again double down on irresponsible and unsustainable immigration policy, creating a new system of unlimited chain migration; doubling down on the very policies the Liberals pretend they want to fix. When the time comes to exercise their power to fix the system they have broken, they continually fail and demonstrate that they have learned nothing from 10 years of breaking an immigration system that was once heralded as the envy of countries around the world. This very day, just hours ago, the Liberals once again voted for Liberal immigration policies, not knowing and not being able to answer to the people of this country how many new people would be entering this country as a result of this legislation.

Young people know very clearly, because they have eyes and they have ears, that things have changed dramatically in this country and they feel it every time they apply for a job. They can see that we have too many people, not enough houses; too many people, not enough jobs; and too many people, not enough public services. They are being asked to turn a blind eye to the reality they see in front of them every day and pretend that the government has their best interests in mind, which is simply not true.

Routine Proceedings

I have encountered, on these college and university campuses, people from across the political spectrum, some who voted for us in the last election, some who did not; some who vote regularly and some who have never voted before. However, the common thread among the students with whom I have spoken, a thread that I wish were visible here in the House of Commons, is an understanding that change is required and the status quo simply is not working. Young people are bearing the brunt of failed policy for over a decade and they are asking for something new. They are asking for something different. When we talk about youth employment, job losses and what is happening to the next generation of leaders in this country, we are talking about the need for change. I mean real change; I do not mean changing the leader of a party and pretending that it is a new government.

• (1810)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if we were to look at youth unemployment and go back to 2009 when the current leader of the Conservative Party sat around in the Conservative caucus under Stephen Harper, we would see that the rate of youth unemployment was at 15.2%. Then, going back to 2013, it was 13.7%. Why is that important to recognize? It is important because Stephen Harper and the current leader announced a policy in January 2014 that said they wanted to increase the number of international students to 450,000-plus. I wonder if the member would say that Stephen was Harper wrong to do so.

Jamil Jivani: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member opposite for demonstrating precisely my point earlier, which is that young people across this country are hungry for a political movement and a government that are forward-looking, yet we see quite clearly from the Liberals that they are still looking at the past. They are unwilling to accept any responsibility for 10 years of mismanaging this country and its economy. Instead, Prime Minister Stephen Harper is still occupying their psyche. It is disturbing. The years the member is talking about are times when I was a student working at Red Lobster, yet we are trying to talk about how we plan for the future of young people today.

I look forward to seeing the member at the national forum to end Liberal racism, on November 17.

Grant Jackson (Brandon—Souris, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my colleague's speech was excellent.

Something I would like to point out from the member for Winnipeg North's comments is that he talked about 2008 and 2009 and it's all being the Conservatives' fault that there was youth unemployment at that time. He never mentions the economic conditions that were going on at that time; I believe it was the worst recession since the 1930s, whereas the only excuse for having high youth unemployment now is failed Liberal policy. That is the only reason, and they cannot take accountability for it.

I wonder if my colleague from Bowmanville—Oshawa North has something to add to that discussion.

Jamil Jivani: Mr. Speaker, my colleague is precisely right. He has observed the same thing as I and many people across our country have, which is that the Liberals refuse to take any responsibility for their own policies. They have been in government for over a

decade, yet when they speak, one would think they had showed up just yesterday. They take no responsibility. They cannot even have any degree of humility to apologize to the young people in this country for what they have done to their opportunities and for what they have done to the economy in which young people are now entering the labour market.

I would love to see some humility, and I know I am not the only one. Many Canadians would love to see some humility from the Liberals. Unfortunately it is not their strong suit.

Andrew Lawton (Elgin—St. Thomas—London South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member for Bowmanville—Oshawa North's speech was incredible. He and I had a similar experience, starting out working in restaurants. I would rather be scraping crusted lobster off plates than listening to some of the talking points from the member for Winnipeg North.

The reason I bring this up is that my hon. colleague was one of the first people in the chamber to identify how harmful the temporary foreign worker program has become for Canadian youth, and I was hoping he could expand on that and on how we can fix the problem after 10 years of the Liberals' creating it.

Jamil Jivani: Mr. Speaker, the reality is this: There are jobs that traditionally and historically were an entry point for young people to join our economy, to earn their first paycheque, to learn their skills, to find a place where they belong and, from there, to grow in all sorts of different directions. The temporary foreign worker program, over the course of decades, became a way to deny young people jobs they ordinarily would have, to pay people a cheaper wage. That is the reality, and anyone who goes to a Tim Hortons across this country will see the evidence of it themselves.

It is important for the economy to be tied to the young people in this country. It is important for Canada's economy to see its health as tied to the health of our young people, but when large corporations can bypass our young people and bring in people from elsewhere to occupy entry-level positions, it drives down the wages of young people and divorces our economy from young people.

• (1815)

[*Translation*]

Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to this important issue of youth unemployment. To begin, I would like to say to my Conservative colleague who just finished his speech that I agree with him on one of the major points he mentioned: changing leaders obviously does not mean that we have a new government. We agree on that. This is my nod to him in response to his remarks.

Routine Proceedings

We have to be careful when we address this issue. The issue that was raised at the Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities is good and important, but there is no simple or populist solution to this issue. The committee is alarmed by the data on youth employment, which is at a 25-year low. A very low employment rate means that unemployment is very high. In fact, the current unemployment rate is the highest it has been since 2010. The youth unemployment rate reached 14.7%, while the rate for the entire active population was 7.1% in September 2025.

I would like to remind the House that the official unemployment rate always underestimates the actual number of unemployed people. I hope that my fellow MPs are already aware of that but, if not, I am happy to share that information with them. The unemployment rate primarily takes into account people who are registered with EI and who are looking for work. It does not take into account those who are discouraged by, on the sidelines of or disheartened with a job market where the deck is stacked against them. The actual unemployment rate is therefore probably higher than the numbers show.

Of course, it all depends on the age of the young people, but the younger they are, the more likely they are to be in precarious, low-skilled jobs, often in retail or something similar. These are often jobs that people do not want to keep in the long term and end up leaving. There is a relatively normal turnover rate that needs to be taken into account.

At the same time, there is another important phenomenon: The cost of living has been very high for the past two years, food inflation is rampant and wages are not keeping pace. Imagine what it is like to earn minimum wage. These jobs are unattractive. This is also one of the reasons why young people may be refusing to take them. There are a lot of factors involved, and it is quite complex. At the same time, job offers for young people have declined over the past few summers. It is important to look into this further.

However, we should avoid engaging in petty populism by saying, for example, that the temporary foreign worker program must be scrapped and claiming that this will magically fix the youth unemployment rate. This would indeed be a magic formula. Those are nice, empty slogans to throw around but they do nothing. I am reminded of the Conservatives' last catchy slogan: Axe the carbon tax, it will lower the cost of food. People were yelling at each other over it.

However, the carbon tax no longer exists in Canada outside Quebec. Did grocery prices go down? Have grocery prices in Canada outside Quebec gone up less than grocery prices in Quebec? In Quebec, we continue to be responsible, and we still have a price on pollution because we want to see long-term improvement. The answer is no. Grocery prices have not gone down. If axing the tax had really had the impact that the Conservatives have been talking about for months and months, Quebec would have scrapped its tax, too; we are not stupid. We do not want people to fall on hard times. We are capable of taking meaningful action by adopting a long-term vision and acting intelligently.

Let us be statesmen rather than politicians. Does everyone know the difference between the two? A farmer told me this story. I told

him I would remember his example because I liked it so much, and I have been striving to be a statesman ever since. Politicians make decisions based on the next election, whereas statesmen make all their decisions based on and informed by the next generation. That is our job—

• (1820)

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Rivière-des-Mille-Îles on a point of order.

Linda Lapointe: Mr. Speaker, I would like my colleague to include female politicians as well, not just male politicians.

The Deputy Speaker: That is debate.

The hon. member for Berthier—Maskinongé may continue his speech.

Yves Perron: Mr. Speaker, I want to reassure my colleague.

I find her point of order a little strange, since I am talking about myself. I try to be a statesman. I am willing to try to be a stateswoman, but I think that would be difficult. I want to reassure my colleague that I am one of the most feminist members of this Parliament, I assure her, and I always defend women in politics. I will even share a bit of my background with my colleague. Before becoming a member of Parliament, I was the president of the Bloc Québécois, and I worked hard to ensure that the Bloc had the highest percentage of female candidates in every election. Unless I am mistaken, I believe we succeeded again in the last election campaign. She can rest reassured on that point.

I was talking about the fact that the farmer and I were chatting. I try not to be a politician, but a statesman. As for women, they should strive to be stateswomen rather than politicians. Decisions must be made with the next generation in mind. That is our job.

I am sorry, I am not trying to be rude, but to say that abolishing the temporary foreign worker program will solve youth unemployment is a simplistic argument. Can we really tell the agricultural community that we are abolishing the foreign worker program tomorrow morning? Come on.

In fact, it should be even be extended, because the agri-food sector has a problem. We all know the difference: Agri-food processes what agriculture produces. The agri-food sector also has a tremendous need for foreign workers. Generally speaking, these jobs do not appeal to Quebeckers or Canadians. According to the latest polls that I have seen, 7% of Quebeckers and Canadians say they might consider a career in the agri-food industry someday. When people say they “might” consider that as a career “someday”, it means that not everyone in that 7% is likely to actually do it. There are some key sectors like those.

In recent weeks, I met with representatives of a local welding business. They need foreign workers. Locally, there is a severe shortage of welders, of skilled workers.

Routine Proceedings

To score political points, our fine government is going to make quick decisions, such as expecting all sectors other than agriculture and agri-food to drop from 20% foreign workers to 10% overnight. I am not saying that I oppose reducing the number of foreign workers in certain sectors. In some sectors, reducing it is a good thing, and it could go down to 10%.

The message that our critic and the Bloc Québécois want to convey is the need to be careful about how it is done. There should be an adjustment period. We asked for a grandfather clause and a buffer period, and the Quebec government asked for the same thing. It has been about a year, but we have yet to get a response from the federal government. Perhaps it is time to take action.

Local businesses have a pool of 18% or 16% foreign workers. When I meet with them, they tell me they have no problem reducing that percentage to 10%, that they would still be able to operate and that it would be fine. However, they want some time.

Some people have three-year permits that are about to expire, and they have been here for six years. They have learned French, they are doing really well and their children are going to school. However, there are new workers who arrived before the Liberal government's policy change, who have been here for six months or a year, and who have already said that they are not happy, that they do not want to stay and that they want to leave.

However, companies are forced to let their good, skilled employees go because the government has not given them a grace period.

It seems to me that it is not that complicated to be smart about this and act with restraint. The proportion of foreign workers in most sectors needs to come back down to 10%, and there is agreement on that. However, this cannot happen in a year. In some cases, it might be appropriate to tell companies that they have three years to bring their percentage of foreign workers down to 20%. During those three years, that percentage could not increase; it would have to be reduced. This would allow those companies to keep their best employees.

In private enterprise, one of the scarcest commodities, apart from time and money, is skilled labour. Training a worker who can be trusted and who can be delegated responsibilities, giving them the skills they need to keep the business running, is invaluable. Currently, business owners are heartbroken at having to let such workers go.

• (1825)

It is important to act judiciously. That is what I am saying. The Leader of the Opposition has said that young people today are "generation screwed". He says that many foreign workers are flooding the labour market, depriving young Canadians of jobs. However, I do not know any business owner who hires foreign workers when they have access to local labour. I have not met any. Business owners do not do that because it costs them more. There is a ton of paperwork to fill out. Business owners are responsible for those workers and that often includes providing them with housing, or else actively helping them find housing. Most of these employers actually have parallel programs. They pay for French language courses themselves. They have support programs to help with the process of becoming a permanent resident.

Enough with the easy shortcuts. Youth unemployment cannot be entirely blamed on the use of foreign workers. We need to settle this issue. I hope I have made that clear. However, there are challenges. People need to be properly trained, and they need to be informed about the job market. I mentioned agri-food earlier. Not many people want to work in that sector, but there is not a lot of information available either. We also need to ask ourselves whether training programs are accessible to young people.

The Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities heard from Stéphane Pageau, who is a labour and public affairs adviser with the Fédération des chambres de commerce du Québec. He presented his analysis of youth unemployment rates. I think he raised some good points, and I will share them here.

First, he pointed out that the unemployment rate has indeed gone up and that the rise is more pronounced among young men than young women, it seems. That is what the statistics are saying. He wondered if it is because of school dropout rates. Then he provided some explanations. The first factor he talked about was the economic context. With the economic slowdown, there is no doubt that the unemployment rate is going up in all categories. He also mentioned that, in Quebec, the youth unemployment rate is lower than in the rest of Canada. That is good news.

He also talked about the advent of artificial intelligence, which is limiting the number of job opportunities in certain retail and customer service roles. It might be worth considering that aspect as well. There is also a regional breakdown that needs to be taken into account. When the government introduces unilateral measures such as reducing the number of foreign workers everywhere, it does so without analyzing the various economic sectors. It did not analyze regional differences. Perhaps no one thought about the entrepreneurs who keep our economy running on a daily basis. They deserve respect.

It is important not to play politics with issues like this. There is one thing that could help our young people find suitable employment. It is not enough to simply tell a young person that there is a job available and that they should apply for it. They may not like that job. We have economic regulation tools at our disposal, including EI. What is the purpose of EI? If an engineer loses their job and it takes them a while to find another one, thanks to EI, they will not be forced to become a taxi driver, food delivery driver or anything else. Those are noble professions. That is not the issue here. However, those jobs do not match his skill level. I call that a waste of human resources. A guy who can work as an engineer is forced to do something else because there is no coverage for his adjustment period.

Linda Lapointe: It is not just guys.

Yves Perron: Mr. Speaker, may I continue my speech without being interrupted every five seconds? The situation is that someone has taken a dislike to me for no good reason.

Routine Proceedings

● (1830)

As I was saying, EI allows people to work in jobs that match their qualifications. If someone is an engineer or a dentist, they will be more productive for society if they work in that field. However, during the buffer period between two jobs, that person needs to have time to get their bearings, apply for jobs, go to interviews and, a few months later, if they have not found anything suitable in their area, they might start sending out resumé in a neighbouring area. They might move to another region, who knows. However, if that person is unable to pay for groceries, they will work anywhere. Again, whatever job they take will be a noble one, but it will not match their qualifications. At that point, society as a whole loses out. We have been promised EI reform for more than 10 years.

Another group that the Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities heard from was the Mouvement autonome et solidaire des sans-emploi. That was in October. That group submitted a brief with some very interesting recommendations for improving the EI system, including access to EI. As we know, nearly half the workers who contribute to EI will not have access to it if they lose their job. That is shocking.

I have already said this in the House, but I challenge anyone to shop around for home insurance and find an agent who says that, if their house burned down, the company would not pay out half the time. As far as I am concerned, I would not choose that company. I would keep shopping around. If I pay for insurance, I want to be covered. Workers, however, cannot change their insurance. It is a federal program. It needs to be improved, because this is a flagrant injustice. What is more, we know where the EI surpluses go. They go into the consolidated fund. It is like a misappropriation of funds. Let us call a spade a spade. I do not think it is right.

The group recommended that the government “establish an eligibility threshold of 350 hours or 13 weeks” and “abolish total exclusions from EI”. As we know, if someone quits their job, they are not eligible. Perhaps that could be changed, and they could be eligible for a shorter period of time, depending on the context. Sometimes people leave a job because of harassment or something like that. There may be good reasons. Once again, we need to be smart and measured.

Another recommendation was to “provide EI protection regardless of maternity, parental or paternity benefits received”. That problem is appalling. Quebec has a parental insurance plan, and I know of a number of women who went on maternity leave, went back to work and then lost their jobs a few weeks or months later. Then they were told that they had not accumulated enough hours over the past year to qualify for EI benefits. Maternity leave is supposed to be considered employment. It seems to me that this would be easy to fix. That is a serious injustice. There is something wrong with this system.

Next, there was talk of improving the system, granting 50 weeks of benefits regardless of hours worked and trying to address EI's notorious spring gap. That is important, too. The Bloc Québécois also introduced a bill to give people with serious illnesses the right to 50 weeks of benefits, but that has not yet been embraced by the federal government. That is not acceptable either. Another recom-

mendation was to set the benefit rate at a minimum of 70%, with the calculation based the best 12 weeks with a minimum threshold of \$500, because depending on the job, incomes can sometimes be very low, which amounts to having no employment insurance at all and putting people in poverty.

Beyond all that, I urge that we, as parliamentarians, try to come up with long-term solutions for the next generation, that we try to understand the impacts and, for goodness' sake, that we avoid spouting easy rhetoric just for the sake of good Internet sound bites. I could be doing that too, but that is not why I am here. The people who elected me to this place expect me to do my job intelligently and to represent the men and women of my riding properly and decently, setting aside my personal interests to advance their interests and for the betterment of our society. As a sovereignist party, I think we set an example here. Some people accuse us of being separatists and the like. While our mandate is to stand up for Quebec's interests until independence comes, we take our role seriously, without harming the rest of Canada. I think that deserves more appreciation than it seems to get. That is what I wanted to say. I look forward to taking questions from my colleagues.

● (1835)

Abdelhaq Sari (Bourassa, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his intervention, which I would describe as very eloquent. I also want to commend the intelligence of his remarks. On that, I cannot be against virtue.

I agree with him on several of the points he raised. I completely agree on the fact that there is no correlation between youth unemployment and the temporary foreign worker program.

Far from wishing to contradict my colleague, I would like to add something. Would he and his political party agree that a program alone is not enough and that we need to work on a systemic approach, as he himself said? Would he be willing to support us if we decided to offer training programs to qualified individuals in order to help businesses?

Yves Perron: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my hon. colleague from Bourassa for his kind words and his intelligent question.

We are always willing to collaborate when it comes to implementing good programs. Right now we are talking about training, and this is an area where nuance is important, because it is a matter of provincial jurisdiction. A good way to achieve this is by increasing transfers, not imposing conditions. The same can be said of health care.

The federal government has a role to play, and it can play that role very well if it does so without overstepping the Constitution, which unfortunately is not always the case.

Routine Proceedings

I guarantee that we are here to work. When a bill is presented, we do not ask ourselves whether we like the person speaking or not, but rather whether the bill is good for Quebec. If it is good for Quebec, we vote in favour of it. If it is not good, we will show goodwill and try to amend it to make it better.

Jacques Gourde (Lévis—Lotbinière, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I listened to my colleague's speech. It was very interesting.

I noticed that in 2018, 2019, 2020 and 2021, there was full employment among young people. Now, the further we get into 2025 and almost 2026, the fewer jobs there are for young people. The youth unemployment rate is on the rise. Did he notice the same thing? In other words, did he notice a decline in youth employment? Does he have any solutions? Has the government perhaps failed in its duty to young people in Canada?

Yves Perron: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague and I thank him for his question.

I have indeed noticed the same thing, and yet there is a certain logic to it; it is something to be expected. The job market is not great for everyone. If a unionized company with too many workers operates according to seniority, young workers with less permanent ties to their jobs will leave.

There are solutions. For one thing, we need a decent employment insurance system that allows people to switch to something that matches their skills. There must surely be other positions of the same kind. We need to make it easier for people to get job training, return to school or take one-year reskilling programs. Sometimes, going back to school for three or four years can seem daunting, whereas a year might be just the thing. For that to happen, people need the right information.

Rhéal Éloi Fortin (Rivière-du-Nord, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his speech and for his interesting point of view, despite the rather unpleasant interruptions he was subjected to. That being said, we are accustomed to this kind of interruption from the government benches.

Indeed, the youth unemployment rate is high. However, the national unemployment rate for the same period has come down. Walking down the street in our communities, we see businesses that have closed because they cannot hire staff. Restaurants are reluctant to reopen or are closing at certain times of the week because of the labour shortage. It all seems a bit strange.

Could it be that young people do not want to work in the current conditions, particularly because there is a housing shortage? If they have to pay up to \$2,000 a month for a two-bedroom apartment, they do not want to go work for minimum wage. Could there be a link between our lax federal legislation and young people's lack of interest in the labour market?

• (1840)

Yves Perron: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Rivière-du-Nord for his very good question.

Yes, there is a link, and I touched on it briefly in my speech. Since the cost of living has risen dramatically in recent years, the minimum wage is not enough to pay \$2,000 in rent and buy enough food with decent protein content. Even if it is possible, people

should not eat low-quality products that are not good for their health. Rather than doing that, young people are staying with their parents for a few more years and waiting.

That might factor in. That is why I said earlier that it is important to provide adequate information and support during employment transition periods. When I talk about adequate support during the employment transition, I am referring to EI, which people contribute to but do not qualify for.

[*English*]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that the member made reference to temporary work permits. I will quote a CTV News story from back on September 3: “[The Conservative leader] calls on Liberals to axe temporary foreign worker program”.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, he says, “Hear, hear!” but it was an extreme statement.

I wonder if the member could provide his thoughts as to why it is dangerous to make statements of that nature. In Manitoba, the Minister of Immigration and the premier have communicated with me that in rural communities, there is a great deal of concern in regard to small businesses and the impact of work permits. I believe that to be true. They want to retain temporary workers. They want the national government to renew temporary visas.

I wonder if the Conservative leader is being short-sighted by not listening to what the provinces are saying. Could the member provide his thoughts on that?

[*Translation*]

Yves Perron: Mr. Speaker, I agree that statements like the ones made by the Leader of the Opposition can be dangerous when members of the public who are not fully informed take them for the truth, leading to a polarized society. Unfortunately, too many politicians use polarization to score points.

However, I want to tell my colleague that I also consider it dangerous to radically and suddenly change a policy the way his government just did. I spoke about a transition period, which seems perfectly reasonable to me. I am counting on my colleague to spread the word internally. We need to give our businesses with 20% foreign workers a buffer period to lower that proportion to 10%. All of the affected sectors will comply. They are all going to do it, but they need time so they can retain their most productive workers. I think we owe our businesses that much.

*Routine Proceedings**[English]*

Rhonda Kirkland (Oshawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the member would comment on what he would say to young people in my riding of Oshawa about this. We recently put a post on social media about two fast-food restaurants that had applied for temporary foreign workers, and I simply asked whether it was possible that young people in my riding did not want the jobs. Many folks wrote that it was not true; they had applied and, for some reason, could not get a job.

I wonder how the member would respond to those young people.

[Translation]

Yves Perron: Mr. Speaker, the reality in downtown Oshawa may not be the same as in Berthier—Maskinongé. That could be a true story; it is quite possible. I am not saying that things are perfect. It is like when we talk about agricultural producers who take on foreign workers. There was one example of abuse. The following week, they were all being called villains.

Generally, temporary foreign workers cost employers more. It is not supposed to be their first choice. I assume that what my colleague is telling me is accurate, because I assume she is acting in good faith. However, I do not understand the employer in question. I think he should have advertised the position locally.

• (1845)

Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, youth unemployment is high. It has been said that people need to first get a job in order to gain experience. Often, that is a problem. If people do not have experience, they do not have the required qualifications and they do not get hired. The Canada summer jobs program allows young people to gain that initial work experience.

How does my colleague explain the fact that the government has cut this program in half?

Yves Perron: Mr. Speaker, I am getting some very good questions. I have been asked to explain something. If the government wants to take concrete action in response to what young people are calling for, it can increase the budgets for Canada summer jobs. This program is a great opportunity for young people to get that first work experience. Then they have something to write on their resumé that will get them hired by a second employer, because they have a certain amount of experience.

[English]

Grant Jackson (Brandon—Souris, CPC): Mr. Speaker, what a tragic situation we find ourselves in here in Canada today: record-low employment levels, the worst in 25 years; housing insecurity at dangerous levels; food prices out of control; money printing and deficit spending at unsustainable levels; and a doubling of the national debt in just nine years. Who bears the brunt of this disastrous policy? It is young people.

As one of just a few members of Parliament under the age of 30 here today, I feel this keenly. It is my generation of Westman residents, the people I grew up with, who are trying to buy their first home and start their family but who are financially broke due to Liberal policies.

Contrary to popular belief, young people in gen Z would work hard if the Liberals' disastrous economic policies would get out of the way so they could actually get a decent job. We do not want to still be living in our parents' basement in our mid- to late-20s; we just cannot actually find a house for which the bank would allow us to take out a loan to buy. This is particularly felt by young people in Westman, home to Manitoba's oil and gas sector and part of our robust agricultural heartland, areas of our economy that have been most depressed by Liberal government policy.

That is not a lack of work ethics; it is devastating failure of government policy. To the people in gen Z, many of whom voted for the Liberals in 2015, it is a brutal betrayal that this is how their support is being rewarded: no chance of a debt-free future, no hope for a good job, and increasingly less likelihood of being able to own their own home. If the Liberals had been paying attention, they would know that this is why more young people under 40 voted Conservative in the last election than have done in decades.

Young people do not want more housing bureaucracies; they want housing built. Young people do not want handouts or food programs; they want affordable food they can purchase themselves. Young people do not want a bloated government bureaucracy in Ottawa; they want good-paying jobs close to home. In short, young people in this country do not want to be forced to rely on government handouts to stay afloat. They want the dignity of being able to build an affordable life for themselves.

Where do we go from here? Conservatives have a youth jobs plan, unlike the Liberals across the aisle, and it is built on four key pillars. Number one is to unleash the economy by cutting taxes, reducing red tape and attracting investment. There are three more important pillars.

The Deputy Speaker: It is my duty to interrupt the proceedings at this time and put forthwith the question on the motion now before the House.

The question is on the motion that the question be now put.

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

• (1850)

Pat Kelly: Mr. Speaker, I ask that the motion be carried.

(Motion agreed to)

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on the concurrence motion.

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

Pat Kelly: Mr. Speaker, we request a recorded division.

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 45, the division stands deferred until Tuesday, November 4, at the expiry of the time provided for Oral Questions.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PETITIONS

ESPACE HUBERT-REEVES

Gabriel Hardy (Montmorency—Charlevoix, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today the people of Charlevoix are sending a clear message to Ottawa by asking me to present this petition to the Liberal government so that Espace Hubert-Reeves can finally become a reality. Espace Hubert-Reeves in La Malbaie is more than just a science centre. It is a gateway to the universe, to the earth and to our future. Located in the heart of the 400-million-year-old Charlevoix crater, Espace Hubert-Reeves will tell the story of our planet, of space in general and of humanity's impact on its environment.

This project combines science, education and tourism. It will inspire our young people, attract visitors from around the world and revitalize our region. The municipalities and RCMs, the Quebec government and the private sector have already indicated that they are on board with the project. The only thing missing is the Liberal government.

By the end of 2025, let us make Espace Hubert-Reeves a symbol of knowledge, pride and the future, because after all, time passes quickly and we are nothing but star dust.

[*English*]

ELECTRIC VEHICLES

Dominique O'Rourke (Guelph, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of residents of Guelph and Wellington County, Ontario.

The petitioners are concerned that Canada may fall behind in the production of affordable, Canadian-made, battery-electric light-duty vehicles. They call upon the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and One Canadian Economy to designate the mass production of affordable, Canadian-made, battery-electric light-duty vehicles as a project of national interest and to make it a reality by 2030.

FIREARMS

Andrew Lawton (Elgin—St. Thomas—London South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as a proud, law-abiding firearms owner, I have the great privilege to present this petition to the House. It comes from law-abiding firearms owners who are concerned about past legislation from the Liberal government and a stream of orders in council that serve no other purpose than to target the law-abiding community of gun owners in this country.

The petitioners say that Bill C-21 notably does nothing to tackle firearms violence; rather, it adds red tape and regulation to law-abiding Canadians.

The petitioners also describe how the bill does not tackle the true sources of firearms used in crime, which are gangs, organized crime and a porous border.

Routine Proceedings

The petitioners are calling on the government to repeal Bill C-21, devote greater resources to policing to combat these sources of illegal firearms and not go after law-abiding Canadian citizens.

FALUN GONG

Pat Kelly (Calgary Crowfoot, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of a number of my constituents. I have a petition signed by hundreds of Canadians, most of whom reside in my constituency of Calgary Crowfoot. They draw attention to the transnational repression of Falun Gong practitioners here in Canada by the Chinese Communist Party. They call upon the Government of Canada to publicly call on the Chinese regime to end its persecution of the Falun Gong and to continue to impose sanctions and take stronger measures to protect the Falun Gong community targeted by the CCP.

I am pleased to table this on behalf of many of my constituents, who have brought this petition to my attention.

MILITARY CHAPLAINCY

Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have a few petitions to present tonight.

The first petition comes from Canadians across the country who are concerned about the treatment of the armed forces chaplaincy. They are concerned about recent reports that have come out saying that chaplains may not pray at Remembrance Day ceremonies. They note that Canada has a long tradition of respecting and honouring the role of faith traditions in the Canadian Armed Forces. These Canadians are calling upon Parliament to reaffirm that the Canadian Armed Forces ought to be free to support servicemen and servicewomen who, through public prayer, keep their hard-won and honourable traditions of the armed forces, especially on Remembrance Day.

FIREARMS

Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the next petition I have to present comes from Canadians across the country who are concerned about the way the Liberal government treats law-abiding firearms owners. They talk about the host of orders in council that the government has put in place targeting law-abiding firearms owners. They talk about Bill C-21, which does nothing to tackle firearm crime, but rather, adds red tape to law-abiding firearms owners and goes after law-abiding firearms owners, and makes them paper criminals. They talk about how this bill does little to tackle the true source of illegal firearms and fails to go after organized crime and gangs.

The petitioners are calling on the government to bring in real legislation to tackle crime in this country and repeal Bill C-21, and devote greater resources to policing so that they can combat these sources of illegal firearms.

Adjournment Proceedings

HUMAN RIGHTS IN INDIA

Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the next petition I have is from Canadians across the country who are concerned about human rights abuses around the world. In particular, they note the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom that pointed out that various actors are supporting and enforcing sectarian policies in India to establish India as a Hindu state.

The petitioners say that Christians in India are being targeted by extremists vandalizing their churches, attacking church workers and threatening or humiliating congregations. They also wanted to point out crimes against the Dalit groups, including Dalit women and girls who are increasingly facing crime in India. The petitioners call on the Indian government and the Canadian government to work together to bring this kind of persecution to an end. They also wanted to point out Indian Muslims are also at risk of assault and sexual violence in India.

The petitioners ask that the government ensure that any trade deal that we may be pursuing with India be premised upon mandatory human rights positions, that extremists be sanctioned and that the government promote a respectful human rights dialogue between Canada and India.

MEDICAL ASSISTANCE IN DYING

Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the next petition I have to present comes from Canadians from across the country who are concerned about the MAID regime in this country.

Choosing medical assistance in dying because of a lack of available services or treatments is not a real choice. That is what the petitioners are pointing out. They also point out that allowing medical assistance in dying for those with disabilities or chronic illness, but who are not dying, devalues their life and tacitly endorses the notion that life with a disability is optional and, by extension, dispensable. They are concerned that offering medical assistance in dying as a solution for a disability or chronic illness reduces the incentives to improve treatment and care for people with these conditions.

These Canadians do not want an ableist health care system where the lives of those with disabilities are not seen as worth living. Many disability advocates from across the country have expressed concern and are opposed to track 2 of the MAID regime.

Therefore, the folks who have signed this petition are calling on the Government of Canada to protect all Canadians whose natural death is not reasonably foreseeable by prohibiting medical assistance in dying to those whose death is not foreseen in the next six months.

FALUN GONG

Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the next petition I have to present comes from people from across the country who are concerned about the treatment of the Falun Gong in China. They note that millions of Falun Gong practitioners have been arbitrarily detained, including family members of Canadians, and they are concerned about the forced labour that is being perpetrated upon the Falun Gong population back in India.

They also call for the Government of Canada to recognize somewhere between 60,000 to 100,000 forced organ harvest transplants that may be happening in China and they are concerned that there may be thousands of Falun Gong practitioners who have been murdered for their organs over the last 15 years.

• (1855)

Since May 2015, thousands of Chinese citizens have filed criminal complaints against the Communist Party leader, who has orchestrated this persecution of the Falun Gong.

The petitioners call on the Government of Canada and Parliament to establish measures to ensure that the products that we buy here are not made with Falun Gong forced labour and that people who are innocently going to China for organ transplants are not being sold organs from Falun Gong practitioners. They call on the government to take every opportunity to call for the end of the persecution of Falun Gong practitioners and urge the Chinese authorities to end that practice in China.

• (1900)

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the last petition I have to present today comes from Canadians from across the country who are concerned about the thousands of Afghans who are still living in vulnerability in Afghanistan given the fall of the Afghan government after the Americans pulled out. Canada has stepped up, but there are still thousands of immigrants left living in concerning situations.

The petitioners are calling on the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship to use her powers to grant a special program to help persecuted minorities in Afghanistan. They call on the Minister of Foreign Affairs to raise the persecution and concern of the—

The Deputy Speaker: Order. We will now move to the adjournment debate.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

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

[*English*]

THE ECONOMY

Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to join this adjournment debate and talk about a question I asked a few weeks ago in question period.

I asked the member from northern Saskatchewan about food bank usage in Saskatchewan. In Saskatchewan, 35.1% of children live in a food-insecure household. However, the answer I got was really found lacking. The member from northern Saskatchewan sometimes goes off on a bit of a rant here and there, and he did not answer the question at all. He talked about what the Liberals were going to do, that they might build houses and that they might do this or that.

Tomorrow, the budget will be presented, and we are asking to have an affordable budget so that Canadians can have an affordable life. The response I got from the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice was interesting, because I talked about the member from northern Saskatchewan leaving his constituents behind. He has been in favour of the firearms confiscation plan. He has been in favour of the industrial carbon tax. He is in favour of food taxes, such as the industrial carbon tax, the packaging tax and the carbon tax 2.0, known as fuel regs. There is no place in Saskatchewan where food is more expensive than in northern Saskatchewan, so he has really done a disservice to his community members, especially the children.

On the topic of children, my son was here with me last week. He came and watched the proceedings. He asked, “Dad, why don't you just say what you want?” In honour of my son's giving me that very good advice, I will take a few minutes and talk about something that hit me very hard as a father over the weekend, and that is the Supreme Court ruling on two despicable human beings who had hundreds of cases of child abuse on video and in pictures. From this graphic material, these kids are never going to be the same. We, as Conservatives, said that we would use the notwithstanding clause and make sure that these dirtbags got the sentences they deserved.

Over there, it is very rare, because we follow, and I had my staff follow every Liberal and NDP member over the weekend, and not one of them commented on this ruling. They will crawl over broken glass to find a microphone on any other cause, but they did not say one thing about this Supreme Court ruling and how these two individuals should be locked up and the key should be thrown away and never recovered. If we are not going to stand up as a group in the House of Commons, as members of Parliament, and say that we need to protect our children, then our country has no hope.

This is something that needs to be changed, and as a father of three beautiful children, I have been struggling with this over the last few days. Even in our small town, we had a case of this. They went to court and got off on bail that day and were back in our community. We need to come together as a group, as members of the House of Commons, and say that these scumbags should never see the light of day.

[Translation]

Jacques Ramsay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Regina—Lewvan changed his question a little, but we will answer it anyway.

Like the member, the Conservatives invariably present the situation as though we live in a binary world. It is always one or the other. It is either the assault-style firearms compensation program or support for food banks. On this side of the House, we have chosen both: support for families as well as the means to keep those families safe, with concrete measures to help and protect Canadians. In other words, the Liberals do both.

The reality is that if the Conservatives had their way, they would do neither. Not only do the Conservatives oppose gun control on military-style weapons, but they call the RCMP despicable, and every time they have a chance to vote for something to support families, they vote against it. Whether it is the national school food program, which is helping us take 400,000 kids out of food bank line-

ups, the Canada child benefit, which has lifted 30% of kids out of poverty, the new Canada disability benefit, the Canadian dental care plan, or child care, they have voted against every single one.

They also voted against the the assault-style firearms compensation program, a program designed to target combat weapons that have nothing to do with hunting or sport shooting. The weapons we are taking out of circulation are tactical military weapons, often with magazines that hold more than 10 rounds. We remain committed to responsible gun ownership, with over 19,000 models still permitted for legal use for all types of hunting and target shooting.

Our government is committed to strengthening gun control and reducing gun violence in Canada, while ensuring that owners of assault-style weapons are treated with fairness and respect.

In 2020, when Gabriel Wortman killed 22 people in Portapique, Nova Scotia, our government responded to Canadians' demands by banning more than 2,000 models of assault-style weapons. These weapons pose a significant risk to public safety and have no place in our communities.

Today, we are determined to offer fair and effective compensation for these weapons. As of April 30, 2025, more than 12,000 prohibited weapons have been recovered from businesses, and approximately \$22 million has been paid out in compensation. Last month, we took the next step by launching a pilot project for individual owners in Cape Breton, Nova Scotia. This is an essential step for a harmonious national rollout.

Later this fall, we are going to launch the nationwide program. The weapons will be collected in early 2026. Participation in the program is voluntary, but compliance with the law is not. These weapons will remain prohibited, and owners will have to deactivate them or turn them in to the police before the amnesty period ends. The program is therefore fair and equitable for these owners. This is their chance to get fair market value for their firearms.

• (1905)

[English]

Warren Steinley: Mr. Speaker, I represent the home of the RCMP depot in my riding, so if the parliamentary secretary wants to debate the RCMP, I will do that every day. I actually go to graduations, and the rank and file support the Conservatives' tougher-on-crime approach. If the parliamentary secretary wants to debate the RCMP, I would love to have him come out to the depot and we can have that debate.

Adjournment Proceedings

He is the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety. If he cannot stand in his place and say that he thinks that people with 300 cases of child rape should be in jail, he should be ashamed of himself and God have mercy on his soul.

[*Translation*]

Jacques Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, we respect Supreme Court decisions. We will analyze them, and my colleagues in the Department of Justice will handle things from there. In the House, we respect the RCMP. Our leader is not like the Conservative leader, who called this institution despicable. We respect the Supreme Court and we respect our institutions.

When it comes to public safety, we are investing to protect a business climate that will allow the economy to grow, create good jobs and help Canadians cope with economic challenges. When they buy a home, feed their families or send their children to school, Canadians see their safety as being inseparable from the economic recovery they want to see.

• (1910)

[*English*]

THE ECONOMY

Marc Dalton (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, last week I asked whether the Liberal government would rein in reckless spending so that many Canadians could live, eat and own their own homes again. Instead of addressing this, the member deflected to a permanent national food program. I did not mention it; they did.

Days later, the Liberal MP for Vancouver Centre tweeted, “OMG [the Conservatives] just defended their voting against the National School Food Program by saying that parents would prefer to feed their kids themselves rather than have government feed them. [What’s] The logic here?”

The logic is this. Canadian parents want to escape poverty and choose what to feed their kids and they want to provide for their family, not for the government to do so. They do not want to depend on handouts to make ends meet to feed their families. They want good, paying jobs.

It is not clicking with the Liberal government members, with their “government knows best” solution. I hear about the Liberals’ solutions all the time. We hear about auto factories closing down, and forestry mills and businesses moving down to the States. When Liberals do not want to talk about these things, they just say that they will provide, supply and support supports. The workers do not want supports, they want their jobs. It is the Liberals, through their economic policies, who have just been destroying our economy and livelihoods.

The Liberals’ out-of-control deficit has led to spiralling inflation. Food costs are up 25% in the past four years. I can assure members that most Canadians are not making 25% more on their paycheques. Food insecurity now grips 39% of all Canadian households. Food banks have reported a doubling of visits since 2019, and one-third of those coming are children, with 700,000 visiting food banks monthly. An overwhelming 96% of those coming to food banks are saying it is the rising cost of living that is crushing

them. We can point to the Liberals for that, with their out-of-control spending.

We will see what this budget is like tomorrow when it is presented. That out-of-control spending has led to deficits and increased debt. The \$55 billion being spent on debt servicing is more than we are paying for the military. It is more than we are paying for the health transfers to Canadians, and Canadians are so frustrated with the health care system. If the Liberals had more control of their inflationary spending, we would be in a better position for supports.

Conservatives do believe in supports, but we believe in the responsible handling of government finances and programs. I talked with my daughter last night, who is a smart lady with a master’s degree and a well-paying job. She said, “Dad, I’m just struggling.” After paying the rent and all her bills, she is struggling just to get by. She is going paycheque to paycheque and she is making a good salary.

The Prime Minister talked about sacrifices for young people. Will the Liberals not recognize their programs are causing—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry has the floor.

Carlos Leitão (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, obviously, the very high cost of living is a real issue. We understand very well that it has a direct impact on the lives of average Canadians. However, one needs to know where that high cost of living is coming from.

The members opposite may not have realized that we had a COVID crisis in the country and around the world. In the recovery period following COVID, there was a very sharp snap-back in economic activity, and the interruptions to supply chains pushed prices way up. That is where the inflation crisis came from all over the world, not just in Canada. If that was not enough, we have the war in Ukraine, which has led to much higher energy prices and much higher food prices, among other things. There was a global—

Jeff Kibble: No.

Carlos Leitão: Mr. Speaker, yes. There was a global rise in inflation and food prices, and countries around the world reacted to them.

Canada’s reaction brought about positive results. Inflation is now within the 1% to 3% range. The Bank of Canada, which the members opposite do not appear to like, has been one of the most successful central banks in the G7 in bringing inflation back under control.

For the cost of living, however, the price level is still high. That is a problem and it is something we are going to address in our budget, which will be tabled tomorrow. In that budget, we will see a substantial increase in investment in our economy to make sure that it is able to overcome the cost of living crisis, as well as the shock coming from the trade war that was started by the United States. We did not start it.

Our budget will address those issues. We will support Canadians. We will make sure that going forward, young Canadians have jobs to have a decent life.

• (1915)

Marc Dalton: Mr. Speaker, all I am seeing from the Liberals is pointing here and pointing there. They are not pointing to themselves. That is where they need to be pointing. They blame it on COVID. That was worldwide. They blame it on the Ukraine war. Those impacts are felt worldwide. Why is it that Canada's standard of living is declining compared to the rest of the developed nations? It is because of the Liberals and their policies.

I keep hearing about the generational budget from that side. Is it because the Liberals' deficit and the accumulated debt are going to be passed on to the next generation? Is it because the debt they have accumulated will be going on generation after generation? That is what I hear when I hear “generational budget”.

The Parliamentary Budget Officer told the committee, “It's not a funny fiscal outlook. It's a really serious fiscal outlook. We don't lightly use the word ‘unsustainable’.” He said we do not have a couple of years. He is sounding the alarm, and the Liberals are not hearing it. They have earplugs—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry.

Carlos Leitão: Mr. Speaker, budget 2025, which will be tabled tomorrow, will address these issues.

We are going to invest massively in our economy to make sure that we are able to overcome the shocks we are currently suffering. We are going to do that by triggering a wave of private investment, the likes of which the country has never seen. We are going to create the appropriate conditions to lead the private sector to invest heavily. We are also going to make sure that the housing crisis is addressed. We have already announced that we are lowering taxes on the middle class to do that.

Our upcoming budget is ambitious because these times require an ambitious budget.

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

Andrew Lawton (Elgin—St. Thomas—London South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rose in this House a couple of weeks ago in the wake of the terrible news out of southwestern Ontario that 1,200 workers at the CAMI plant in Ingersoll were losing their jobs because of a failure by the government to fulfill a promise to stand up for and save Canada's auto sector.

CAMI is not in my riding, but many of the workers of that plant do live in my riding, in St. Thomas, London and Elgin County. Several of the companies that supply CAMI are in my riding. When we hear that 1,200 figure of plant workers, that is just a fraction of the

overall jobs in jeopardy across the region, not just from the CAMI closure but other declines in the auto sector as well, from Qualtech Seating Systems in London to Formet in St. Thomas and Delta Machine & Design, all dealing with slowdowns or, in some cases, outright halting as a result of the decline in the auto sector.

I do not blame the government for decisions made by the United States, but I do put blame squarely on the Prime Minister for making a very simple promise. I am not even sure if he believed that Canada would have a deal with the United States by July. There is no deal. We have seen tariffs go up continuously. There is no deal and auto jobs have continued to be on the line. The state of manufacturing sector right now in southwestern Ontario, in my riding, is dismal.

I will run off a few of the numbers that constitute the Liberal government's record. We do not just have the 1,200 workers in Ingersoll. We have 3,000 in Brampton with Stellantis, we have 700 in Oshawa, 300 in Sainte-Thérèse, Quebec, with Paccar and countless more, as I said, with the spinoff effects of this. I have had conversations with constituents in the last couple of weeks who do not know what they are going to do, who do not know how they are going to provide Christmas presents for their children with the holidays approaching, because of these job losses and uncertainty.

When I asked the government about this, I asked for a plan. Instead, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry gave the Liberal government a pat on the back and said it was doing an exceptional job. Those numbers that I ran off were in just a few weeks of what the Liberal government trumpets as exceptional work on protecting the auto sector in Canada.

My question is very simple. When the government and Prime Minister promised a deal, did he actually believe it?

• (1920)

[*Translation*]

Carlos Leitão (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to respond to my colleague's comments on the Canadian automotive industry. This industry plays an essential role in the Canadian economy and generated roughly \$16 billion in economic activity in 2024. It directly employs more than 125,000 Canadians and supports hundreds of thousands of supplementary jobs across the country, especially in southern Ontario.

Adjournment Proceedings

The auto industry is one of the largest manufacturing sectors in Canada, and the United States' unfair and arbitrary tariffs on Canadian vehicles are driving up costs and threatening good jobs. Our government recognizes the challenges these tariffs pose to the industry and has adopted supportive measures and a proportionate response. We responded by imposing reciprocal tariffs of 25% on vehicles from the United States. We also implemented a performance-based remission framework to protect the auto industry. This framework allows automakers that maintain their production and investments in Canada to import a set quantity of CUSMA-compliant vehicles assembled in the United States counter-tariff-free.

We are also investing in Canadian businesses to help them adapt to these challenges and lay the groundwork for future growth. Our government has announced the creation of a new strategic response fund, which will provide \$5 billion to key sectors, prioritizing those that are highly exposed to and affected by tariffs, including the auto sector. The fund will seek to maintain industrial capacity by offsetting new market access costs, supporting retooling, and facilitating plans by Canada-based firms to expand or secure new markets.

We will also make sure we do not forget which companies are helping us and continuing to believe in Canada and which are not. We will not forget.

[English]

Andrew Lawton: Mr. Speaker, I do sincerely appreciate my colleague's understanding of the significance of the automotive sector in southern Ontario. Virtually every family has someone who has been touched by the sector.

There is not a positive outlook right now and I do not think the people affected, from the conversations I have had, want to hear about supports. They want to hear about a plan for how they can get to work, how they can do what they love, and why the government has not lived up to its promise to protect these jobs in the first place.

I will ask the parliamentary secretary a very simple question. There were 3,000 workers in Brampton, 1,200 in Ingersoll, 700 in Oshawa and 300 Sainte-Thérèse and those are all jobs lost on the Liberal government's watch in the span of a few weeks. Does he still think that is an exceptional job by the Prime Minister?

• (1925)

Carlos Leitão: Mr. Speaker, I highlight the fact that this was started by the United States. The position the industry finds itself in is a direct result of the trade war triggered by the United States. We have said time and time again that we are ready and willing to negotiate an agreement with the United States, and we are still waiting for the United States to come to the table so we can negotiate.

We will not sign just anything. We want a deal that is profitable for all Canadians and ensures much-needed long-term planning. When the Americans are ready, we are ready to talk to them.

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 7:26 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Monday, November 3, 2025

Points of Order

Admissibility of Committee Amendments to Bill C-4 —Speaker's Ruling

The Speaker 3327

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Criminal Code

Lapointe (Sudbury) 3328
Bill C-238. Second reading 3328
Brock 3330
Champoux 3330
Coteau 3330
Brock 3331
Fortin 3332
Lamoureux 3333
Kronis 3334
Champoux 3335

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Bail and Sentencing Reform Act

Bill C-14. Second reading 3336
Aboultaif 3336
Lamoureux 3338
Gaudreau 3338
Kirkland 3338
Sarai 3338
Jansen 3340
Beaulieu 3340
Lamoureux 3340
Kuruc 3341
Coteau 3342
Champoux 3342
Khanna 3343
Thomas 3343
Lamoureux 3344
Beaulieu 3345
Kirkland 3345
Gill (Brampton West) 3345
Coteau 3346
Gaudreau 3347
Mahal 3347
Leslie 3347
Lamoureux 3349
Lemire 3349
Ho 3350
Kibble 3350
Tesser Derksen 3351
Beaulieu 3351
Davies (Niagara South) 3351

Eyolfson 3352
Calkins 3352

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Genetic Aortic Disorders

Gould 3353

National Defence

Dowdall 3353

U18 Women's National Hockey Championship

Connors 3354

Quebec Municipal Elections

Vien 3354

Royal Canadian Legion

Lauzon 3354

Public Safety

Vis 3354

Youth

Khalid 3354

The Budget

Lawrence 3355

Quebec Municipal Elections

Normandin 3355

Selah Panacci-MacCallum

Fisher 3355

Food Security

Jackson 3355

Bernard Grandmaître

Fortier 3355

Justice

Moore 3356

Veterans' Week

Louis 3356

Ethics

Mazier 3356

Toronto Blue Jays

Bittle 3356

ORAL QUESTIONS

The Economy

Poilievre 3357
MacKinnon 3357
Poilievre 3357
MacKinnon 3357

Motion for concurrence	3372	Sari	3396
O'Rourke	3374	Gourde	3397
Ste-Marie	3374	Fortin	3397
Kelly	3375	Lamoureux	3397
Melillo	3375	Kirkland	3398
Lamoureux	3376	Thériault	3398
Genuis	3376	Jackson	3398
Desrochers	3377	(Motion agreed to)	3398
Lamoureux	3377	Division on motion deferred	3399
Motion	3379		
Kelly	3379	Petitions	
Desrochers	3379	Espace Hubert-Reeves	
Genuis	3380	Hardy	3399
Kirkland	3380	Electric Vehicles	
O'Rourke	3380	O'Rourke	3399
Jansen	3380	Firearms	
Desrochers	3382	Lawton	3399
Fortin	3383	Falun Gong	
Holman	3383	Kelly	3399
Genuis	3383	Military Chaplaincy	
Lawton	3383	Viersen	3399
Lamoureux	3385	Firearms	
Allison	3385	Viersen	3399
Thériault	3385	Human Rights in India	
Lamoureux	3385	Viersen	3400
Desrochers	3385	Medical Assistance in Dying	
Lawrence	3387	Viersen	3400
Ste-Marie	3387	Falun Gong	
Chagger	3388	Viersen	3400
Holman	3388	Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship	
Lamoureux	3388	Viersen	3400
Genuis	3388		
Ho	3389		
Joseph	3390		
Thériault	3391		
Konanz	3391		
		ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS	
Questions Passed as Orders for Return		The Economy	
Lamoureux	3391	Steinley	3400
		Ramsay	3401
Committees of the House		The Economy	
Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities		Dalton	3402
Motion for concurrence	3391	Leitão	3402
Jivani	3391	Automotive Industry	
Lamoureux	3393	Lawton	3403
Jackson	3393	Leitão	3403
Lawton	3393		
Perron	3393		

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>