



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

House of Commons Debates

Official Report
(Hansard)

Volume 152 No. 051
Wednesday, November 5, 2025

Speaker: The Honourable Francis Scarpaleggia



CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, November 5, 2025

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayer

• (1405)

[*English*]

The Speaker: It being Wednesday, we will now have the singing of the national anthem, with the hon. member for Wellington—Halton Hills North leading us.

[*Members sang the national anthem*]

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*Translation*]

NINETTE PIOUS

Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we had some good news yesterday. No, I am not really talking about the budget. I am talking about the election of Zohran Mamdani as mayor of New York.

Let us return closer to home, to my riding of Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, where we also have some good news. During Black History Month, Ninette Pious, director of the Centre N A Rive, was recognized for her involvement and dedication. For over 40 years, Ms. Pious has been working at the centre, which is a place of learning, integration and recreation. We need only think of all the workshops offered to immigrant women, the organization of the Haitian book festival in Montreal or the creation of the Institut créole et du patrimoine culturel haïtien. As a passionate advocate for social justice and communal peace and harmony, Ms. Pious is a true pillar of La Petite-Patrie.

I want to congratulate Ninette and thank her for working tirelessly to build a better world where everyone can live in dignity.

* * *

[*English*]

VACCINATIONS

Doug Eyolfson (Winnipeg West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, measles was eliminated in Canada in 1998 and we maintained that achievement for more than 25 years. Today, however, we are seeing a resurgence of this disease, driven mostly by misinformation and growing vaccine hesitancy.

In 2025 alone, Canada has reported more cases than in the last 25 years combined, with over 5,000 cases, 169 hospitalizations and, tragically, three infants losing their lives. Measles is a serious disease that can lead to pneumonia, encephalitis, hearing loss, developmental delay and death.

The positive news is that this is entirely preventable. The measles vaccine is safe, effective and life-saving. We all have a role to play in protecting our communities. I encourage Canadians to ensure that they and their children are fully immunized. By working together, sharing accurate information and supporting public health initiatives, we can protect our most vulnerable citizens and restore Canada's status as a measles-free nation.

* * *

SILVER CROSS MOTHER

Michael Barrett (Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands—Rideau Lakes, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this year the Silver Cross mother is Nancy Payne from Lansdowne, Ontario. On Remembrance Day, Nancy will lay a wreath at the National War Memorial in our nation's capital, representing the mothers and families who have lost a daughter or son in military service to Canada.

Nancy's son, Corporal Randy Payne, served proudly with the Canadian Army as a military police officer. He was killed in action on April 22, 2006, while serving in a close protection unit in Afghanistan. Through Nancy, we honour not only Randy's sacrifice but also the legacy of all who have served and fallen in defence of Canada.

The fallen and their families have given so much to our country, and we are forever in their debt.

As the Silver Cross mother, Nancy Payne carries the weight of the personal loss of her son Randy, as well as the grief of so many Canadian families who have lost their loved ones in service of freedom and Canadian values.

We cannot forget that. We must never forget them. We will remember them.

* * *

GURPURAB

Sonia Sidhu (Brampton South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today Canadians from coast to coast join Sikh communities in commemorating the 556th anniversary of the birth of Guru Nanak Dev Ji, the first guru and founder of Sikhism.

Statements by Members

Today we reflect on Guru Nanak Dev Ji's timeless teachings: *naam japna*, meditation; *kirat karni*, honest living; and *vand ke chakna*, sharing with others. These principles are not only central to Sikhism, but they also resonate strongly with Canadian values.

Guru Nanak Dev Ji defended equality and justice, advocating for the rights of women, a message that continues to reflect the values we uphold in Canada today. These teachings are lived every day by Sikh Canadians, whose contributions continue to enrich our country.

May the teachings of Guru Nanak Dev Ji continue to inspire us all. Happy Gurburab to everyone who celebrates it.

* * *

EARLE EASTMAN

John Williamson (Saint John—St. Croix, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as we approach Remembrance Day, I rise to pay tribute to Master Warrant Officer Earle Eastman, retired; sadly, he passed away this year.

Earle served 33 years in the Canadian Armed Forces and completed tours on three continents. After returning from Afghanistan, he dedicated himself to serving veterans as president of the Canadian Army Veterans motorcycle unit, second VP of the Legion's New Brunswick Command and knight commander of the Order of St. George. In 2022, Earle's public service continued when he was elected to St. Stephen's municipal council.

Earle was a dedicated member of our community, but most of all, he was a loving husband to Charlie, a father, a grandfather and my friend.

May Earle Eastman rest in peace.

* * *

● (1410)

[*Translation*]

LINDA DELISLE

Fayçal El-Khoury (Laval—Les Îles, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to highlight the extraordinary work being done in my riding of Laval—Les Îles by Linda Delisle.

Life is a river filled with many explorers and many foundering souls. Sometimes we are lucky enough to encounter someone with a pure heart, a life raft we can cling to. Ms. Delisle is one of those people.

Under her leadership, the Manoir du Ruisseau has become a warm and welcoming place to live, where every resident is treated with respect, attentiveness and kindness. She has created a culture of compassion and dignity, ensuring that seniors receive the care they deserve. Through her leadership, she has made the Manoir du Ruisseau a model of excellence. Her team feels it is an honour to serve our nation builders and care for seniors.

On behalf of all Canadians, all Quebeckers and all Laval residents, I thank Ms. Delisle. I extend my greetings to all the Manoir du Ruisseau residents.

[*English*]

VIC BRANDL

Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies, CPC): Mr. Speaker, a lifelong Conservative and friend, Vic Brandl was born in 1933 in Jeffrey, Alberta, and passed away peacefully at the age of 91 in Vernon, B.C.

Vic quit school during the Depression to work on the neighbour's farm until he went to work in Edmonton in 1950. By the age of 19, Vic had worked at a gas station, on a drilling rig and on a barge moving freight from Yellowknife, to name just a few places. He started V.E. Brandl oil field construction in 1961 when he bought his first D7 dozer, and he grew the company to 100 pieces of heavy-duty equipment.

Vic served on our local Reform Party, Canadian Alliance and Conservative Party boards, finishing as our director emeritus. Over the years, Vic became a good friend, often stopping by for a coffee to talk politics and current events.

Vic was a husband to his beloved Edith; dad to Kevin, Barry and Ron; father-in-law to Marnie and Larisa; grandpa to Noah, Nikita and Eva; and brother to Roger, Bob and Jim.

I thank Vic for everything he did for our riding, community and country. He will be missed.

* * *

GURPURAB

Amandeep Sodhi (Brampton Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Guru Nanak Dev Ji's Gurburab, an important celebration for Sikh Canadians. Today marks the birth of the founder of Sikhism, a spiritual leader who continues to guide millions of Sikhs across the world.

Guru Nanak Dev Ji taught us that there is one creator and that all human beings are equal. He emphasized the importance of living with honesty, integrity and a spirit of *seva*. He called on us to earn an honest living, *kirat karo*; share what we have, *vand chhakko*; and remember the divine in all that we do, *naam japo*.

Through these acts of faith and service, Sikhs reaffirm the core principles of Sikhism: devotion, humility and compassion. We are reminded of our duty to serve humanity and respect the sacred gift of life we are blessed with.

As we honour this day, let us reflect on Guru Nanak Dev Ji's timeless message of inclusion, kindness and service, values that continue to strengthen Canada.

POLIO ERADICATION

Hon. Mike Lake (Leduc—Wetaskiwin, CPC): Mr. Speaker, for decades in Canada, Conservative and Liberal governments alike have been steadfast leaders in the global fight to end polio. Partners include Global Citizen, Results and the Canadian Partnership for Women and Children's Health, but the undisputed leader in this mission is Rotary International, where there is no bigger champion than Canada's own Jennifer Jones, who became its first woman international president just a few years ago.

Rotary's vision statement says, "Together, we see a world where people unite and take action to create lasting change—across the globe, in our communities, and in ourselves." Canadian Rotarians and Rotaractors live this out every single day.

Whether building playgrounds and spray parks in their local communities or eradicating polio worldwide, these friends and neighbours stand shoulder to shoulder, roll up their sleeves and just do the work.

Today, we are closer than ever to ending polio once and for all. Working together, we will win. Along the way, every one of us will be individually better for having taken part in the fight.

* * *

• (1415)

[Translation]

YVAN LOUBIER AND ÈVE-MARY THAI THI LAC

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot—Acton, BQ): Mr. Speaker, today I want to pay tribute to not one, but two of my predecessors, both of whom, by happy coincidence, announced that they were retiring at roughly the same time.

Yvan Loubier represented the riding of Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot from 1993 to 2007. He was the first Bloc Québécois member of Parliament in the region after the party's creation and is known as an experienced and competent parliamentarian.

After he left, Ève-Mary Thai Thi Lac took over in the 2007 by-election. She represented the riding until 2011 and was known for her local involvement, her presence and her close ties with her constituents.

I am extremely fortunate to know these two devoted individuals personally. They are two separatists with unshakeable convictions. It is a true privilege. This is a well-deserved rest for Yvan and Ève-Mary. I thank them for everything they have done for the region and for the nation of Quebec. We will remember your contributions.

* * *

[English]

PUBLIC SAFETY

Gurbux Saini (Fleetwood—Port Kells, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address a matter of grave concern: public safety in Surrey. Residents are deeply worried about their safety and the security of their livelihoods. Seventy-four cases of extortion are currently under investigation. These are not just statistics. They are families, entrepreneurs and neighbourhoods living in fear. With Bill

Statements by Members

C-14, we have an opportunity and a responsibility to work together across all levels of government to restore safety, confidence and peace of mind.

I want the people of Fleetwood—Port Kells to know their voices are being heard, and our government remains firmly committed to ensuring justice and safety for all Canadians.

* * *

COST OF FOOD

William Stevenson (Yellowhead, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Food Banks Canada has given the Liberal government an F when it comes to poverty and food security. With Canadians paying over \$800 more for food this year than they did last year, it is no wonder food bank usage has skyrocketed across the country. The hidden Liberal industrial carbon taxes on fertilizer and farm equipment, along with the so-called clean fuel standard, keep on increasing the cost of food for Canadians due to the need to transport all our food. This has become so unsustainable that more families are going hungry every day.

The Liberal government decided to announce a deficit of \$78 billion, which will continue to drive up the cost of food in Yellowhead and across the country. Every hour, this budget adds \$10 million to our national debt, which means \$5,400 in inflationary spending per household. Imagine the impact \$5,400 would have on Canadian families. It is time for Liberals to scrap the hidden food taxes so Canadians can decide how they want to spend their own money.

* * *

HOPE IN EVERY STEP WALK

Kristina Tesser Derksen (Milton East—Halton Hills South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, November is Woman Abuse Prevention Month. One in four women in Canada report experiencing intimate partner violence in their lifetime, and alarmingly, those numbers continue to rise. In my community of Milton East—Halton Hills South, Halton Women's Place provides critical shelter, counselling and support for women experiencing domestic violence. Last weekend, I joined their annual Hope in Every Step walk, an event that raises funds and sends a clear message of solidarity and hope to every woman seeking safety and support.

Oral Questions

It was deeply inspiring to see survivors, families, advocates, volunteers and many young men who came with their local sports teams, including the Burlington Cougars, Iroquois Ridge Football, the Milton Menace and the U15 Jump Basketball team, led by Milton's own Raheem "the Dream" Chaudhry, who has been walking in this event since he was just seven years old. Their participation is a reminder that ending gender-based violence requires all of us to stand together, challenge harmful attitudes and foster a culture of respect, equality and safety.

* * *

● (1420)

JUSTICE

Mel Arnold (Kamloops—Shuswap—Central Rockies, CPC): Mr. Speaker, private member's Bill C-291 passed with unanimous support in the last Parliament to replace the term "child pornography" in our laws with what it really is: child sexual abuse and exploitation material. Sexual abuse and exploitation of children are some of the most horrendous crimes, and viewing child sexual abuse and exploitation material represents a revictimization of victims traumatized for life.

Last week, the Supreme Court ruled that two men who had possession of hundreds of images and videos of children as young as three years old could not be imprisoned for a mandatory one-year term. For a prolonged period, these two possessed hundreds of images and videos produced by torturing innocent children, but the court applied imaginary scenarios rather than the facts in issuing this disgusting ruling.

I urge the government to do the right thing, stand with children and victims of child sexual abuse material, and invoke the notwithstanding clause.

* * *

BASIL ALIAS ODJICK

Sophie Chatel (Pontiac—Kitigan Zibi, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Private Basil Alias Odjick of Maniwaki, son of William Odjick and Catherine Riel. He served with courage and dignity during the Second World War, giving his life in service to Canada on August 28, 1944, during the Battle of Normandy. His name is commemorated in the Second World War Book of Remembrance, alongside that of his brother, Private Robert Simon Odjick, who also made the ultimate sacrifice while serving the Royal Regiment of Canada.

Today, let us honour the sacrifice and bravery of the Odjick family and of all soldiers from Pontiac—Kitigan Zibi who served and who continue to serve for peace and freedom.

* * *

THE BUDGET

Glen Motz (Medicine Hat—Cardston—Warner, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this fall, my office surveyed southern Alberta residents about their priorities and expectations for the federal budget. An overwhelming 76% of respondents indicated the cost of living is their top concern, and 80% of business owners said the rising costs were hurting their operations. Interestingly, 88% did not believe

Canada's economic situation would improve in the next year. Sadly, they are correct.

The Prime Minister's "spend less" promise has been shattered, with an \$80-billion budget deficit this year alone, the highest ever in Canadian history outside of COVID. This year's interest on the national debt will be a staggering \$55.6 billion, even more than our health transfers. The budget is adding \$10 billion to our debt every hour, which equals approximately \$33,000 for every Canadian and is climbing rapidly.

The Liberals need to realize that every dollar they spend comes out the pockets of hard-working Canadians. My voters are demanding that the Liberals stop the reckless spending that is driving up the cost of everything.

* * *

TEACHERS INSTITUTE ON CANADIAN PARLIAMENTARY DEMOCRACY

Jessica Fancy (South Shore—St. Margarets, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this week we are joined by over 80 outstanding educators from across Canada who are taking part in the Teachers Institute on Canadian Parliamentary Democracy, many of whom are here today.

As a former educator, I know how deeply teachers shape the minds and values of the next generation. Though I now serve in the chamber, I will always see myself as a lifelong learner, a lesson taught to me by many dedicated colleagues over the years. I am especially proud to recognize my former colleague Darcie Moore, from Forest Heights Community School, who is one of the lead organizers of this incredible program.

To the teachers here today, and to those in classrooms from coast to coast to coast, I thank them for the work they do each and every day that inspires, challenges and empowers the next generation of Canadians.

To all the educators, I welcome them to Parliament Hill and thank them for the difference they make in the lives of young Canadians every single day.

ORAL QUESTIONS

● (1425)

[Translation]

THE BUDGET

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, never before in history has a budget forced Canadians to pay so much for so little. Every dollar that the Prime Minister spends comes out of the pockets of Canadians. He broke his promises. He promised to spend less, yet he is increasing net spending by an additional \$90 billion. That amounts to \$5,400 per family. He has doubled Justin Trudeau's deficit and has added more debt than in any year outside of the COVID-19 crisis.

Oral Questions

At a time when Canadians cannot pay their bills, why is the Prime Minister forcing them to pay even more?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada is in a strong fiscal position. We have the second-lowest deficit in the G7, the lowest net debt in the G7 and a budget that is investing in Canada. On this side of the House, we believe in Canada.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this Prime Minister is becoming the most costly Prime Minister in the history of our country, and it is actually the bankers who stand to benefit the most. Now the interest on the national debt is going to cost Canadians \$55 billion. That is more than we spend on health transfers, and it is more than the government takes in from the GST. Every penny that Canadians pay in GST does not go to nurses and doctors, but rather to bankers.

Why does the Prime Minister want to take money that should go to health care and hand it over to bankers instead?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first of all, the debt burden as a share of GDP is lower now than it was when the Conservative government was in power. Second, we are investing in Canada and protecting transfers to the provinces for health care, education and social services.

[English]

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, never before have Canadians had to spend so much to get so little. The budget, with its record deficit outside of COVID, has a deficit twice the size of the one Trudeau left behind and \$16 billion bigger than the Prime Minister promised. It has, in its spending, \$5,400 of extra costs for every family, in more expensive government.

While Canadians are already unable to eat, heat and house themselves, why is the Prime Minister's costly budget making them pay even more?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, 75% of the budget's measures are for our sovereignty: to protect our borders, to protect our communities and to protect our way of life. The balance is for affordability, a middle-class tax cut the member opposite missed because he was not here.

The budget invests in Canada at twice the rate of any budget during this millennium. We believe in Canada.

* * *

CARBON PRICING

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is twice as expensive as any other budget, and it makes generational debt. Speaking of sovereignty, what about food sovereignty? The Prime Minister's budget increases taxes on food production. With the industrial carbon tax on farm equipment, fertilizer, storage bins and food processing plants, Sylvain Charlebois, Canada's food professor, says it is arguably the most damaging aspect of the Liberal carbon tax. It is a tax across the supply chain that undermines the competitiveness of our agri-food sector.

Why is the Prime Minister threatening our food sovereignty and driving up our food prices?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in the spring, the government removed the divisive consumer carbon tax, and that has a consequence for any business, any farm, that emits less than 50 kilotonnes, which is every farm across this country.

The Canadian Climate Institute has done the analysis on the impact of the industrial carbon tax on inflation. It is zero.

• (1430)

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, apparently the Prime Minister is still under the misconception that Canadians do not use steel. Do members remember that interview when he asked the CTV interviewer, Steve, if he used steel? Of course, farmers use steel in order to produce their food and in order to store their grains. Processors use steel in the apparatuses of their conveyor belts.

The tax on fertilizer and equipment drives up the cost of food, not according to Conservatives, but according to Sylvain Charlebois.

Is the Prime Minister going to tell Canadians that an industrial carbon tax on Canadian farmers is not driving up the price of groceries?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the impact of the industrial carbon tax on food prices in Canada is approximately zero.

* * *

JUSTICE

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): The Prime Minister still thinks we use zero steel, Mr. Speaker.

On another subject, unfortunately a much darker subject, last week, the Supreme Court ruled that a one-year prison sentence was too much for possession of child abuse and exploitation materials. That sentence was already far too low for the two dirtbags who had literally hundreds of impressions and videos of children being tortured.

Will the Prime Minister do the right thing and invoke the notwithstanding clause in order to put the rights of children ahead of the rights of those who abuse them?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am sure I join all members of this House in condemning the exploitation of children as the most reprehensible source of crime. That is why this government will be bringing forth legislation to combat these crimes and penalize those who are responsible that works within our Constitution.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

THE BUDGET

Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, you are known for your expertise in financial matters and, in theory, the Prime Minister is as well, so let us be serious and not take people for fools.

I would like the Prime Minister to explain how tax credits for oil companies, the organization of FIFA events and health transfers can be considered government assets.

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, one of the most important aspects of the budget is the investment tax credits for clean electricity, which represents \$4 billion for Quebec, for investment in Quebec.

That is one of the main reasons to support this budget.

Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I did not expect the Prime Minister to want to answer the question.

A tax credit involves paying money to someone who benefits from the tax credit. It comes out of the government coffers. The Liberals cannot claim that it is an investment whose value is kept on their balance sheet.

The Prime Minister is claiming that expenditures are assets. Does he think that accountants are stupid?

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the environment and Hydro-Québec will be among the greatest beneficiaries of this budget.

Finally, with regard to carbon capture, the truth is that Quebec is currently using 350,000 barrels of oil a day. We need to capture the carbon emitted by the production and transfer of these barrels.

Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, that reeks of embarrassment. If money is going to worthwhile projects then that is just great, but we do not yet know who will decide which projects are worthwhile. In any case, it is still an expense. The Prime Minister would fail a third-year math exam with his answers.

Will the Prime Minister admit that he is implementing an austerity budget in order to finance oil companies at Quebec's expense?

• (1435)

Right Hon. Mark Carney (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this budget is a generational investment budget. The pace of investment is twice as high, and this budget will spur \$1 trillion in investment by the end of the decade. It is a budget for growth, it is a budget for Quebec, and it is a budget for Canada.

* * *

[English]

CARBON PRICING

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in addition to cooking the books, the Prime Minister also rigged his GST rebate on housing to make sure that 95% of homebuyers would not qualify for any break at all: zero, zip, zilch. The Prime Minister meanwhile would put a new rising tax on steel, alu-

minum, glass, cement and concrete, all the things that go into making a home. In other words, the industrial carbon tax is a housing tax.

With the Liberals having already doubled housing costs, will the Prime Minister axe the industrial carbon tax so Canadians can afford a home?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again, the leader persists with and doubles down on these fake, imaginary taxes that exist only in his head and in the talking points that he hands out.

What I will tell him is that this is a budget that Conservative-minded voters, people who think of voting Conservative in elections, can like. What do they like about it? They like the hope. They like the ambition. They like the economic growth. They like bringing this country together from coast to coast to coast to invest in our potential, to invest in our young people and to grow this country to be the best in the G7. That is why—

The Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, he says it is imaginary, but it is in his budget. Does that mean the budget is a fictional document? Here it is, on page 106: “Strengthening Industrial Carbon Pricing”—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: The hon. member may continue now that the prop has been put away.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Mr. Speaker, they say their budget is a prop and its contents are imaginary. We are in real trouble today.

Homes take steel. They take aluminum. They take concrete, cement and glass. The industrial carbon tax drives all those things up.

With our youth unable to afford homes, why do the Liberals not get rid of this tax so that we can bring down the cost of housing?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, do members know what this budget does? It builds communities. It builds opportunities for young people in our communities. It ties this country together in a common refrain of hope, optimism and investing in ourselves.

We are going to be investing in new homes. We are going to be investing in housing for young people. We are going to build it with Canadian steel. We are going to build it with Canadian lumber. We are going to build it with the best thing we have: the Canadian ingenuity that exists in the youngest and oldest and in the skilled tradespeople of this country.

We are going to build Canada. Conservatives like that. Liberals like that. Let us build the country together.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after the Prime Minister's depressing speech demanding that young people make more sacrifices, I think the Liberal House leader asked ChatGPT to write him up a little poem about how he could inject hope into his message. It did not work.

Young people need houses for them to have hope. Houses are needed to raise families. Houses are needed to build equity, collateral and credit history, but the Prime Minister insists on applying an escalating industrial carbon tax that will raise the cost of everything that goes into making a home.

With the Liberals doubling housing costs already, why will they not get rid of this tax?

• (1440)

Hon. Gregor Robertson (Minister of Housing and Infrastructure and Minister responsible for Pacific Economic Development Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we know housing is top of mind for young Canadians, and we have heard them loud and clear. Budget 2025 delivers on affordable housing for young Canadians. It focuses on affordable housing and co-ops. It delivers on GST for first-time homebuyers. Up to 47,000 homes will see a big reduction in GST.

Building all of these homes creates jobs for young people in the trades, great jobs for young Canadians. This budget delivers affordability for young Canadians.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government has doubled lineups at food banks to well over two million people, and right now food prices are rising 40% faster in Canada than they are in the United States, which means we cannot blame some global or foreign factor for those rising costs. Sylvain Charlebois, Canada's leading food price expert, says the industrial carbon tax, which not only is still in place but would rise quickly with this costly budget, is partly to blame.

So that single mothers, small businesses and seniors can feed themselves, will the Liberals get rid of this terrible tax on food?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as a former single mother myself, the kind of thing single mothers and families are looking for is affordability. That is in this budget. Whether it is a middle-class tax cut for 22 million Canadians; protecting \$10-a-day child care, which by the way is a game-changer for women, especially single mothers; making the school food program permanent; or investing in building trades, these are the kinds of infrastructure investments that will lead to good-paying jobs.

We are here for young people and Canadians.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, since they started promising that program, the number of children lined up at food banks has doubled to 700,000, and food prices are actually rising 40% faster in Canada than they are in the United States of America.

Oral Questions

The questions I have been asking are for the Prime Minister. Apparently, he does not have time to answer questions about homes and food when Canadians cannot afford to feed and lodge themselves.

Once again, will the Prime Minister get rid of his regressive industrial carbon tax on Canadian foods so that single moms and seniors can afford to eat?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians do not have time for the kinds of antics the Conservative Party performs every single day. What Canadians want is investment in their families, investment in their children and investment in the infrastructure in small communities all across this country, including in my riding, that is going to make life affordable and build up the kind of infrastructure that allows for us to get ahead. Lots of Conservatives feel that way in my riding. They told me so, and they have donated.

* * *

FINANCE

Hon. Michael Chong (Wellington—Halton Hills North, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the last Liberal budget had a fiscal anchor of deficits of less than 1% of GDP. This budget would double those deficits, averaging 2% of GDP. The last Liberal budget had a fiscal anchor of a declining debt-to-GDP ratio. This budget would increase the debt-to-GDP ratio.

Will the government admit that its fiscal anchor is weaker than the previous Trudeau government's?

Hon. Wayne Long (Secretary of State (Canada Revenue Agency and Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I know they are having a bad week over there, but yesterday we tabled a historic budget to build our economy for Canadians and by Canadians so we will never be reliant on one country again. We will spend less on wasteful spending so we can invest in our country and build our economy into the strongest economy in the G7.

Canadians from coast to coast to coast support our budget. It is time for us to come together in this House, like Canada. It is time for the party opposite to support our budget.

Hon. Michael Chong (Wellington—Halton Hills North, CPC): Mr. Speaker, last July, bond-rating agency Fitch warned that a material rise in the debt-to-GDP ratio and a material rise in our deficit could lead to a credit downgrade. This budget would double deficits and lead to an ever-increasing debt-to-GDP ratio.

Oral Questions

Will the government acknowledge that it is putting this country's credit rating at risk, not to mention that it is saddling younger Canadians with a mountain of national debt?

• (1445)

Hon. Maninder Sidhu (Minister of International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, speaking of young Canadians, they are looking at this budget for generational opportunities. We are unlocking new markets for them.

With budget 2025, we are getting young Canadians and young entrepreneurs export-ready through our SME export readiness program. Once they are export-ready, we will launch the CanExport program to support them in attending trade shows globally to showcase their goods. Once they have orders ready to go out, EDC will step in to support them in getting into new markets around the world.

This is how we are helping young Canadians and young entrepreneurs access new markets and create jobs here at home.

* * *

[Translation]

THE BUDGET

Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, there has been much talk about the \$78-billion generational deficit in the budget, and rightly so. What are the key features of this budget? Military is the top priority, the fight against climate change is over, oil companies are getting more tax credits and tens of thousands of jobs are being cut. All of these choices would have delighted Stephen Harper, because they are conservative. They are so conservative that a Conservative member of Parliament became a Liberal because he identified with them. It is a Liberal deficit with Conservative priorities.

In all this, why is there nothing for Quebec's priorities?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I know my colleague well, and I also know his riding well, and one thing is clear: Talk about military spending and investment has an impact in his riding of Mirabel.

It will have an impact on CAE. It will have an impact on Airbus. It will have an impact on Bell Textron Canada. It will have an impact on thousands of jobs in Mirabel.

Is my colleague saying that this budget does not produce results for Quebec and for Mirabel? I think my colleague is out of touch with reality.

Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, a \$78-billion deficit will affect future generations in my riding. Worse still, the Liberals are increasing the deficit while announcing cuts to health transfers. They are not investing a penny in seniors who are struggling with the cost of living. They are refusing to offer loans at preferential rates to first-time home buyers. They are replacing the only housing construction program in Quebec that worked with Build Canada Homes, which will jam everything up and slow it all down.

How is it possible to create a \$78-billion deficit by failing to meet all of Quebecers' needs?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Quebec asked us to invest more to build hospitals. What did we say? We said, "That is a great idea. Let us put it in our budget." All my colleague has to do is read the budget and he will see that in there.

Quebeckers told us that they wanted us to protect their language and culture, to make investments in that area, because that is important to them. The Minister of Finance and National Revenue and the Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture invested more than ever in arts and culture.

We expected the Bloc Québécois to be in favour of that. Quebeckers support this budget. When will the Bloc Québécois vote in favour of it?

* * *

[English]

FINANCE

Adam Chambers (Simcoe North, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in 2015, six cents of every dollar was used to pay interest on the national debt. Yesterday's budget confirms that that number will double to more than 13¢ of every dollar, which is almost \$76 billion going to bankers and bond holders to pay interest on the national debt. That is even more than the government will receive from taxing and GST.

When the finance minister says that he is making generational investments, is he just saddling the next generation with his unaffordable budget?

Hon. Anita Anand (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member opposite is overlooking that Canada has a AAA credit rating, has the lowest net debt-to-GDP ratio in the G7, has been world acclaimed as a home for direct foreign investment and is top of the G20.

The difference between that side of the House and this side of the House is that we believe in Canada. We believe in Canadians. We are diversifying supply chains, and we are investing in our population so that we become the strongest economy in the G7. We ask them to join us.

Adam Chambers (Simcoe North, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the difference is that every Liberal finance minister seems to keep breaking their fiscal promises. They said that the deficits would be low and temporary, but they were long and very large. They said the deficit would be capped. They said the debt-to-GDP ratio would continue going down. The ratio went up, and the deficits blew through the cap.

Now, we have a new finance minister with a new, weaker fiscal anchor. Will the finance minister confirm that this anchor is weaker? How long will it be before he breaks his promise too?

• (1450)

Hon. Evan Solomon (Minister of Artificial Intelligence and Digital Innovation and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are a nation of builders. We are building for young people. We have the best debt-to-GDP ratio in the G7. We are building affordable homes. We are investing in trades and hospitals. We are creating 100,000 new summer jobs. We are investing in entrepreneurs. Why? It is because this is a budget of resilience. This is a budget of strength. This is a budget of hope.

Why will the Conservatives not join us to build Canada strong?

Dan Mazier (Riding Mountain, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister just delivered one of the most expensive budgets in Canadian history. He promised fiscal responsibility during the last election, but Canadians got a staggering \$80-billion deficit instead. That is \$80 billion in new debt that will drive up the cost of food, housing and everything that Canadians buy.

After hearing all this talk about change, Canadians are left wondering one thing: How is the Prime Minister's out of control spending any different than Justin Trudeau's?

Ryan Turnbull (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance and National Revenue and to the Secretary of State (Canada Revenue Agency and Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians across this country empowered us in the last election and now we are empowering them in budget 2025, a budget that will make generational investments to create the strongest economy in the G7. That is exactly what we are doing. We are building major infrastructure, homes and industries. We are protecting our communities, borders and way of life, and we are empowering Canadians with better careers, strong public services and a more affordable life.

We know a strong country can be even stronger, but it takes vision and leadership. It is too bad the Conservatives have neither.

Dan Mazier (Riding Mountain, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is not investing. He is spending on the backs of future generations. In fact, because of his reckless spending spree, Canadians will be paying over \$55 billion a year in interest alone to service the debt. That is more money being spent on interest payments than on health care transfers that help patients.

Does the Prime Minister realize that his spending is lining the pockets of his banker and bondholder friends, instead of funding our doctors and nurses?

Hon. Mandy Gull-Masty (Minister of Indigenous Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister does not only have a vision for what this country is now, but what it is going to be. That is why he has assigned multiple ministries to work on transforming health care in those critical spaces in the north, spaces that always lacked investment on this side of the House, spaces that never see the light of day with having support on this side of the House. We are inviting them to finally come into those spaces and support indigenous

Oral Questions

people with those critical services. It is something that we know all voters are asking for.

[Translation]

Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable—Lotbinière, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this is a costly budget that is going to make life even more expensive for Canadian families. Yesterday, the Prime Minister presented a budget that will cement his memory in history as the nation's biggest-spending Prime Minister ever.

That is a deficit of almost \$80 billion. He promised to spend less, yet he is spending \$90 billion more. That amounts to \$5,400 per family coming directly out of the pockets of Canadians.

Why is the Prime Minister deliberately driving up the cost of groceries even higher by introducing the worst inflationary budget in Canadian history?

Hon. Joël Lightbound (Minister of Government Transformation, Public Works and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada has a AAA credit rating from the credit rating agencies, the lowest net debt-to-GDP ratio in the G7 and the lowest borrowing rate in the G7. That is Canada's fiscal position.

What is in the budget? Housing is being doubled. Investments in infrastructure are being made. The salaries of the men and women of the Canadian Armed Forces are being increased like never before. We are equipping them to protect Canada's sovereignty. We are lowering the income tax of 22 million Canadians. That is what is in the budget, and I am very proud of it.

* * *

[English]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Shannon Miedema (Halifax, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my riding of Halifax is home to a thriving defence sector with more than 10,000 Canadian Armed Forces members. I know that many of my constituents, including those in uniform, watched yesterday as the Minister of Finance tabled budget 2025.

Can the Minister of National Defence speak to the new defence investments Canada is making?

• (1455)

Hon. David McGuinty (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, through budget 2025, we are investing over \$81 billion over the next five years to rebuild, rearm and reinvest in our Canadian Armed Forces. This is a generational investment in defence infrastructure, capabilities, training and, of course, our incredible personnel.

From Halifax to Latvia, when the brave men and women of the CAF answer the call to serve, they know we have their backs, and they know it is time to build Canada strong.

*Oral Questions***CARBON PRICING**

Scot Davidson (New Tecumseth—Gwillimbury, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this costly budget of broken promises is a disastrous attempt to put out the fire they started. Not only is the Prime Minister fuelling inflation with the largest regular budget deficit in Canadian history, but he is also hiking up the industrial carbon tax and driving up food prices.

Families are already struggling to afford food, housing and everything else, so why does the Prime Minister want to raise the industrial carbon tax and make life even harder for Canadians?

Hon. John Zerucelli (Secretary of State (Labour), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are creating opportunities for Canadians. Budget 2025 is about building Canada and creating opportunities for young people. We are building Saint John strong, Etobicoke strong, Vancouver strong, Halifax strong, Fredericton strong, Winnipeg strong, Bradford strong. City by city, community by community, we are building Canada strong for our young people, for Canadians. Through budget 2025, we are building roads, bridges, hospitals, water systems, community centres, homes that Canadians need and major projects in the national interest. We are doing it with Canadian steel, Canadian lumber and Canadian union workers.

Scot Davidson (New Tecumseth—Gwillimbury, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canada is in this mess because of 10 years of Liberal deficits and taxes. Now this costly budget will make things worse by adding \$10 million to our debt every hour. It is like cranking up the furnace and leaving the windows open. Canada is the only G7 country where food inflation has gone up four months in a row, and by increasing the industrial carbon tax and driving up inflation, this budget will only raise prices higher.

Why is the Prime Minister so intent on making life unaffordable for Canadian families?

Hon. Buckley Belanger (Secretary of State (Rural Development), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I ask the Conservatives to join the rest of the country and love our country. I love Canada. They all seem to call Canada down. On this side of the assembly, we are marketing Canada, something those guys should do. On this side of the aisle, we are defending Canada, something those guys should do as well.

At the end of the day, we are building while they are tearing down Canada. Shame on them. Let us get on the same page. Canadians deserve that.

Costas Menegakis (Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's costly budget is full of broken promises and is the most expensive in Canadian history. It has the largest deficit in history outside of COVID. It will drive up the cost of food, housing and everything else that Canadians buy. The Liberals had a chance to lower food costs for Canadians, but they chose to make food more expensive by increasing the industrial carbon tax, driving up the cost of fertilizer and farm equipment.

Why is the Prime Minister increasing the industrial carbon tax and making food more expensive for Canadians?

Hon. Stephanie McLean (Secretary of State (Seniors), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if they vote against budget 2025, they will be voting against food in schools for children, voting against an income tax

cut for Canadians, voting against \$75 million in apprenticeship training, voting against a refundable tax credit for personal support workers, voting against \$45 million in funding to address violence against women and voting against crucial supports for seniors, such as old age security.

Canadians want to know who these Conservatives are fighting for, because it certainly is not them.

Costas Menegakis (Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we are going to be voting against adding an additional \$300 billion in debt for our future generations.

Food professor Sylvain Charlebois said the food wholesale prices have increased in Canada versus the U.S. and that the one factor driving this is the industrial carbon tax. He also said that he is deeply concerned and expects that food inflation will continue to be a problem moving forward. Experts are warning that food prices will continue to skyrocket.

I will ask this again: Why is the Prime Minister increasing the industrial carbon tax and making food more expensive for all Canadians?

• (1500)

Hon. Anna Gainey (Secretary of State (Children and Youth), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our budget delivers historic investments to build Canada strong. This means strong families and strong communities from coast to coast to coast. That includes supports for youth in building skills to help them find and access high-paying careers. We are investing in training and supports for 20,000 youth facing employment barriers. We are investing in an additional 24,000 Canada summer jobs opportunities this coming year, co-ops, internships, and apprenticeship opportunities for over 55,000 post-secondary students.

Canada's new government has a plan to invest in youth. I encourage the members opposite to support this plan and vote for the budget.

Shelby Kramp-Neuman (Hastings—Lennox and Addington—Tyendinaga, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Canadians got a taste of one of the greatest sins a government can commit: over-promise and under-deliver. The Prime Minister promised a generational and transformational budget crafted by the so-called master of monetary policy. Instead of reducing the deficit and showing fiscal discipline, he produced one of the costliest budget deficits in our nation's history. Rather than providing relief to Canadians by reducing the industrial carbon tax, he chose to increase it.

Oral Questions

Why is the Prime Minister raising the industrial carbon tax and making food even more expensive for Canadians?

Hon. Rebecca Alty (Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this budget is about focusing on youth. Our government is investing in youth, particularly indigenous youth, with investments such as Inuit Nunangat University, which will be a landmark step forward for education and reconciliation in Canada. It will strengthen local economies, build capacity in the north and support Inuit-led research.

We hope the members opposite will support this initiative and vote for the budget.

Shelby Kramp-Neuman (Hastings—Lennox and Addington—Tyendinaga, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Dr. Sylvain Charlebois, the food professor, has said, “That’s been our concern from day one.... The gap between wholesale prices in Canada versus the U.S. food wholesale prices has actually increased, and we believe that one factor driving this is the carbon tax.” It does not take a central banker to figure out that eliminating the industrial carbon tax will help lower food prices.

Why is the Prime Minister choosing to raise the industrial carbon tax when so many Canadians can barely afford groceries?

Hon. Heath MacDonald (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Climate Institute’s most recent research shows that industrial carbon pricing has essentially no effect on the cost of groceries.

In the face of uncertainty, Canadians are going to build the future we want to build for ourselves. As we work to build the strongest economy in the G7, our new government is helping our agriculture sector and fish and seafood sector adapt and respond to the economic challenges. This includes a new trade diversification strategy and \$75 million in AgriMarketing.

I suggest the Conservatives dig out their red and white sweaters, get them on and get on the bus.

Kathy Borrelli (Windsor—Tecumseh—Lakeshore, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this budget proves one thing: The Liberals do not understand how real Canadians live. Every dollar the government spends comes straight out of Canadians’ pockets, and under the Prime Minister, everything costs more. After years of inflation and higher taxes, the Liberals have chosen to raise the industrial carbon tax. This means higher prices at the checkout line.

Why is the Prime Minister increasing the industrial carbon tax and making food more expensive?

Hon. John Zerucelli (Secretary of State (Labour), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when we invest in unions in Windsor, we all win. We are empowering unions in Windsor and across the country to train our young people, because in budget 2025, we invested in and are meeting our campaign commitment to double the union training and innovation program: \$75 million to help young people train and to build Canada with Canadian lumber, Canadian steel and Canadian unionized workers.

• (1505)

[Translation]

Dominique Vien (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal budget is the most costly budget with the largest deficit in the history of the country, outside of the pandemic. We know it is going to drive up the cost of food. It is an attack on our food security, and food banks know it too. They are overwhelmed. Add to that the industrial carbon tax, a hidden tax that increases the cost of producing and transporting food.

When will the Prime Minister stop waging war on farmers and finally come up with a real plan to lower grocery prices?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I must admit that I am a bit surprised by the Conservative member’s question because, when she was an MNA for the Liberal Party of Quebec, she voted in favour of carbon pricing. She should be in a very good position to know that federal industrial carbon pricing does not apply in Quebec, since she voted for a program that is uniquely Quebec-based. There is a great deal of hypocrisy on the other side of the House.

Dominique Vien (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC): Mr. Speaker, while Canadians are tightening their belts, the government is spending recklessly. It is adding \$90 billion in spending. That is an extra \$5,400 per household. According to Professor Charlebois, the gap between wholesale food prices in Canada and the United States has widened, and the industrial carbon tax is a major factor. Canada is the only G7 country to have experienced four consecutive months of rising food inflation.

Why is the Prime Minister increasing the industrial carbon tax, which is already making food much more expensive for all Canadians?

Hon. Joël Lightbound (Minister of Government Transformation, Public Works and Procurement, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will repeat what the Prime Minister said, as I think it could be useful for my colleague. The impact of the industrial carbon tax on food prices is approximately zero.

Now, to pick up on what my colleague was saying, when the Conservatives talk about food insecurity, the hypocrisy shown on the other side of the House does not stop with that one inconsistency, considering that my colleague was part of a Liberal government in Quebec that introduced carbon pricing. It does not stop there because the Conservatives vote every day against initiatives that really help families, things like the national school food program, the Canada child benefit, doubling housing and helping the most vulnerable families in the country. We will take no lessons from the other side.

*Oral Questions***INFRASTRUCTURE**

Fares Al Soud (Mississauga Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, every day, Canadians rely on strong, reliable infrastructure, from safe roads and bridges to clean drinking water and modern, public facilities. They expect the government to build, protect and strengthen communities through historic investments.

Can the minister inform the House of the generational infrastructure investment planned in budget 2025?

Hon. Gregor Robertson (Minister of Housing and Infrastructure and Minister responsible for Pacific Economic Development Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for the question.

Canadians need strong and resilient communities. Budget 2025 makes a generational investment in our communities with the build communities strong fund, which will support infrastructure that promotes access to housing, such as roads, drinking water, waste water treatment, health infrastructure such as hospitals, and much more.

* * *

[English]

JUSTICE

Mark Strahl (Chilliwack—Hope, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court has ruled that a mere one-year mandatory prison sentence for the heinous crime of possessing child sexual abuse and exploitation material is cruel and unusual punishment. The criminals in such cases possess materials depicting evil acts against children as young as three years old.

Conservatives believe it is outrageous that these types of child predators could walk free with less than a year in prison. The court decision must be overturned using the notwithstanding clause, but the Liberals have refused to act.

Why are the Liberals more concerned with protecting the rights of these vile predators than the rights of these innocent victims?

Hon. Sean Fraser (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me be unequivocal: Child abusers are heinous criminals and should be treated as such by Canada's criminal laws. We will be moving forward with legislative solutions that would give clear directions to the courts to ensure that serious crimes are met with serious penalties.

If the Conservatives want not only to ask questions in the House but also to actually achieve progress on this file, they can stop the obstruction on the strong borders act, which is meant to give powers to law enforcement to actually stop child abuse that we know is happening. It is one thing to talk in the House; it is another thing to cast a vote in a way that will make a difference.

I invite the Conservatives to join the cause.

Mark Strahl (Chilliwack—Hope, CPC): Mr. Speaker, criminals who possess child sexual abuse and exploitation material deserve lengthy prison sentences. They cause unimaginable suffering and harm to innocent children. These precious kids will carry the scars of what was done to them for the rest of their lives.

Conservatives and Canadians are calling on the government to invoke the notwithstanding clause and overturn this appalling Supreme Court ruling immediately. The Liberals refuse to do so.

Why are the Liberals more concerned with protecting the rights of guilty pedophiles than standing up for the rights of innocent children?

• (1510)

Hon. Ruby Sahota (Secretary of State (Combatting Crime), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are going to be bringing forward legislation that would address this particular issue, but I would like to ask why the Conservatives have been against every measure we have put forward to protect our children? We brought online harms legislation; they voted against it. We brought lawful access tools for law enforcement; they are against it.

Why are the Conservatives protecting child abusers?

Rachael Thomas (Lethbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, two men pleaded guilty to having hundreds of images of innocent children. The children were sexually abused, they were exploited and they were tortured. The Supreme Court made a decision that a one-year jail sentence was too harsh. Conservatives vehemently disagree with this decision.

The Liberals have an opportunity to use the notwithstanding clause and take a stand for innocent children.

Why is the government concerned with protecting the rights of pedophiles instead of standing up for those children?

Hon. Ruby Sahota (Secretary of State (Combatting Crime), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have been speaking to lots of families that have been victims of crimes, and many have been asking for online harms legislation. We brought legislation like that in the House, but the member was active in voting against it and made sure it did not pass in the House.

Law enforcement is also asking for tools to catch predators, but the Conservatives are against this.

Why are the Conservatives so concerned about the privacy rights of criminals instead of protecting our children?

* * *

NORTHERN AFFAIRS

Emma Harrison (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians elected us to build, protect and empower. In the north, that means reliable partnerships and results people can trust. We have listened at kitchen tables across the north, and budget 2025 reflects those voices.

Could the minister share how this budget delivers with indigent partners so communities see results where they live, and how this approach make the north a driver of Canada's prosperity and a pillar of our sovereignty?

Hon. Rebecca Chartrand (Minister of Northern and Arctic Affairs and Minister responsible for the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, northerners asked for transformative change, and our new government answered with generational plans to build, protect and empower. This means skills, homes and hope for northern youth.

Our budget delivers year-round routes to ports across the Arctic corridor and the Churchill gateway to keep Canada strong and free. Through the Major Projects Office, projects will move faster with indigenous partnership. This means building with the north for the north.

* * *

[Translation]

CARBON PRICING

Joël Godin (Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Liberals tabled a budget with a deficit of close to \$80 billion. Yes, everyone heard me correctly: a deficit of \$80 billion. That is a huge amount and everything is going to cost more.

There is nothing new in this budget. The Liberals had the chance to lower the cost of food by eliminating the industrial carbon tax in their budget, but what did they do instead? They increased that tax and they are not doing anything to counter food inflation.

Will the Prime Minister stop breaking his promises and finally control his inflationary spending?

● (1515)

Hon. Nathalie Provost (Secretary of State (Nature), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my mother understands the difference between an investment and an expenditure and so do my children. This budget is an investment in our young people and in our resources so that we are able to get through the current crisis.

Canadians elected us to do that. They have confidence in us and that is what we are going to do.

* * *

[English]

THE BUDGET

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, a lot of Canadians do not seem to know that between the day a budget is tabled and when it is voted on, the government can make changes to it.

I desperately hope the answer will be “yes” to this question: Are the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance prepared to be flexible, work in the spirit of the national interest and be prepared to make changes to the budget before it comes to a vote?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, of course we are always listening to Canadians.

I would stress to the hon. member that this is a budget that invests historically in climate competitiveness in this country, in getting Canada to net zero by 2050 and in making sure that Canada remains a leader in the worldwide fight against climate change.

Government Orders

I would invite the member to compare us to any country around the world, especially our neighbours to the south, to put this in perspective and to understand, as I know she will, that this is a historic effort on a historic issue, and that it is a historic budget.

* * *

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: I would like to draw the attention of members to the presence in the gallery of the following people.

We have the 2025 Gerhard Herzberg Canada Gold Medal for Science and Engineering prize winner, Dr. David Wishart.

Also with us are the winners of the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council's John C. Polanyi Award; Donna Strickland Prize for Societal Impact of Natural Sciences and Engineering Research; Synergy Awards for Innovation; and Arthur B. McDonald Fellowships.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[Translation]

CITIZENSHIP ACT

The House resumed from November 4 consideration of the motion that Bill C-3, An Act to amend the Citizenship Act (2025), be read the third time and passed.

The Speaker: It being 3:19 p.m., the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at the third reading stage of Bill C-3.

Call in the members.

● (1530)

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

(Division No. 47)

YEAS

Members

Acan	Al Soud
Ali	Alty
Anand	Anandasangaree
Auguste	Bains
Baker	Bardeesy
Battiste	Beech
Belanger (Desnethé—Mississippi—Churchill River)	Bendayan
Bittle	Blair
Blois	Boulerice
Brière	Carney
Carr	Casey
Chagger	Champagne
Chang	Chartrand
Chatel	Chen
Chenette	Chi

Government Orders

Church
Connors
Coteau
Dandurand
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Deschênes-Thériault
Dhaliwal
Diab
Duguid
Earle
El-Khoury
Eyolfson
Fanjoy
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser
Fry
Gaheer
Gasparro
Gerretsen
Grant
Guay
Gull-Masty
Hanley
Hepfner
Hodgson
Housefather
Iacono
Jaczek
Joly
Kayabaga
Khalid
Koutrakis
Lalonde
Lamoureux
Lapointe (Sudbury)
Lauzon
Lavoie
Leitão
Long
MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLean (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke)
Ménard
Michel
Miller
Morrissey
Naqvi
Nguyen
Ntumba
Olszewski
Osborne
Powlowski
Ramsay
Robertson
Romanado
Sahota
Sarai
Sawatzky
Sgro
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Sodhi
Sousa
Sudds
Thompson
Valdez
Vandenbeld
Watchorn
Wilkinson
Zahid

Clark
Cormier
Dabrusin
Danko
d'Entremont
Desrochers
Dhillon
Duclos
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fancy
Fergus
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Fuhr
Gainey
Gazan
Gould
Greaves
Guilbeault
Hajdu
Harrison
Hirtle
Hogan
Hussen
Idlout
Johns
Joseph
Kelloway
Klassen
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles)
Lattanzio
Lavack
LeBlanc
Lightbound
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacDonald (Cardigan)
Malette (Bay of Quinte)
May
McKelvie
McKnight
McPherson
Mendès
Miedema
Mingarelli
Myles
Nathan
Noormohamed
Oliphant
O'Rourke
Petitpas Taylor
Provost
Rana
Rocheffort
Royer
Saini
Sari
Schieffe
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Solomon
St-Pierre
Tesser Derksen
Turnbull
van Koeverden
Villeneuve
Weiler
Yip
Zerucelli

Zuberi— 177

Aboultaif
Albas
Anderson
Arnold
Baber
Baldinelli
Barrett
Beaulieu

Berthold
Bezan
Blanchette-Joncas
Bonin
Borrelli
Brassard
Brunelle-Duceppe
Caputo
Champoux
Cobena
Cooper
Dancho
Davies (Niagara South)
DeBellefeuille
DeRidder
Diotte
Dowdall
Epp
Falk (Provencher)
Kwan
Gallant
Gaudreau
Genius
Gill (Brampton West)
Gill (Windsor West)

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 (Kapusking—Timmins—Mushkegowuk)
Martel
McCauley
McLean (Calgary Centre)
Menegakis
Morin
Motz
Nater
Patzer
Perron
Poilievre
Reid
Reynolds

NAYS

Members

Aitchison
Allison
Anstey
Au
Bailey
Barlow
Barsalou-Duval
Bélanger (Sudbury East—Manitoulin—Nickel Belt)
Bexte
Blanchet
Block
Bonk
Bragdon
Brock
Calkins
Chambers
Chong
Cody
Dalton
Davidson
Dawson
Deltell
Deschênes
Doherty
Duncan
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)
Fortin
Garon
Généreux
Gill (Calgary Skyview)
Gill (Calgary McKnight)
Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan)
Gladu
Gourde
Guglielmin
Hallan
Ho
Holman
Jansen
Jivani
Khanna
Kirkland
Konanz
Kramp-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

Roberts
 Ross
 Ruff
 Scheer
 Seeback
 Simard
 Steinley
 Stevenson
 Strauss
 Thomas
 Tolmie
 Van Popta
 Viersen
 Wagantall
 Waugh
 Zimmer — 163

Rood
 Rowe
 Savard-Tremblay
 Schmale
 Shipley
 Small
 Ste-Marie
 Strahl
 Thériault
 Tochor
 Uppal
 Vien
 Vis
 Warkentin
 Williamson

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed)

[English]

The Speaker: I wish to inform the House that because of the deferred recorded division, the time provided for Government Orders will be extended by 11 minutes.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Hon. Maninder Sidhu (Minister of International Trade, Lib.): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2) and consistent with the policy on the tabling of treaties in Parliament, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, a treaty entitled “Canada-Indonesia Comprehensive Economic Partnership Agreement” done at Ottawa on September 24, 2025.

* * *

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Hon. Maninder Sidhu (Minister of International Trade, Lib.): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2) and in accordance with the enhanced transparency requirements set out in the amended policy on tabling of treaties in Parliament, I am pleased to notify the House of Commons of the government's intent to initiate negotiations for a Canada-Philippines free trade agreement. The Government of Canada intends to commence negotiations with the Philippines no earlier than 90 days from the date of this notice.

* * *

• (1535)

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 responses to three petitions. These returns will be tabled in an electronic format.

Routine Proceedings

[Translation]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Yvan Baker (Etobicoke Centre, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the first report of the Standing Committee on Official Languages, entitled “Implementation of the Official Languages Act”.

[English]

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Chris Bittle (St. Catharines, Lib.): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Orders 104 and 114, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the eighth report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, regarding membership of committees of the House. If the House gives its consent, I intend to move concurrence in the eighth report later this day.

* * *

NATIONAL FRAMEWORK ON SPORTS BETTING ADVERTISING ACT

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Waterloo, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill S-211, An Act respecting a national framework on sports betting advertising.

She said: Madam Speaker, I rise in support of Bill S-211, which was swiftly passed by colleagues in the other place. I believe we can agree it would be responsible to see the same happen here in the House.

Sports betting is legalized in Canada, yet constituents in Waterloo have shared, and every MP has received, concerns regarding the abundance of advertisements, which often overshadow the sport itself. Bill S-211 will add limitations around gambling advertisements to reduce its promotion to youth and vulnerable groups.

As heard through testimonies at the Senate Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, Bill S-211 addresses a growing concern of families and loved ones who feel this pressure in their lives.

Bill S-211 provides a clear path forward. It is time to act before additional harms are caused.

I would like to thank Senator Marty Deacon for her care in crafting this bill, as well as my friend, the MP for Etobicoke—Lakeshore, for his support and for seconding Bill S-211 in this place.

I look forward to working with all colleagues to move the bill forward into law to protect the future of Canadian families and bring back the simple fun of watching sports.

(Motion agreed to and bill read the first time)

*Routine Proceedings***BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**

Hon. Arielle Kayabaga (London West, Lib.): Madam Speaker, there have been discussions among the parties and, if you seek it, I think that you will find unanimous consent to adopt the following motion:

That, notwithstanding any standing order, special order or usual practice of the House, the hours of sitting and the order of business of the House on Thursday, January 29, 2026, shall be those of a Friday, provided that any recorded division deferred to, or requested on, that day in respect of a debatable motion, other than an item of Private Members' Business, be deferred until Monday, February 2, 2026, at the expiry of the time provided for Oral Questions.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): All those opposed to the hon. member's moving the motion will please say nay. It is agreed.

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

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Chris Bittle (St. Catharines, Lib.): Madam Speaker, if the House gives its consent, I move that the eighth report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, presented to the House earlier this day, be concurred in.

• (1540)

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): All those opposed to the hon. member moving the motion will please say nay.

There being no dissenting voice, it is agreed.

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

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

[*English*]

PETITIONS

THE ENVIRONMENT

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Madam Speaker, I rise to present a petition from Canadians who are deeply concerned about ghost gear: abandoned, lost or discarded fishing gear, which is among the deadliest sources of plastics pollution.

The petitioners note that ghost gear kills fish, marine mammals, seabirds and turtles; damages habitats; creates microplastics; and even hinders navigation and active harvesters, hurting coastal communities. They point out that dedicated funding for retrieval, prevention, repair and recycling works. It also creates skilled jobs and partnerships with indigenous communities, small-business fishers, harbour authorities and recyclers, especially in rural and remote regions.

Therefore, the petitioners are calling on the federal government to reinstate and expand a permanent multi-year ghost gear fund with streams for rapid retrieval response, prevention and innovation. This would include gear marking, tracking and whale-safe ropeless pilots; end-of-life management, repair and recycling; and community capacity indigenous guardians programs.

BIRD WELFARE

Scott Anderson (Vernon—Lake Country—Monashee, CPC): Madam Speaker, I would like to present a petition calling on the Minister of Health and Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food to stop the ostrich cull in Edgewood, B.C. This petition also calls for greater transparency from the CFIA.

There are over 40,000 signatures on this petition, almost double the number of signatures on most e-petitions. These petitions are set up so that signers have to take extra steps to do them, so when over 40,000 people sign them, it really means something. I urge the ministers to listen.

SUPPORTIVE HOUSING PROJECT

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Madam Speaker, today, I rise to table multiple petitions for the people of Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford.

My first petition is calling for an alternative location for a supportive housing project planned for Martens Street across from the Abbotsford Traditional School.

Throughout this process, there has been a lack of transparency, public input and consideration of alternative locations, and no disclosure of plans has been provided by BC Housing. This project would be in proximity to vulnerable students, children aged 11 to 18, and would be less than 60 metres from fields and playgrounds. It would also contain a safe consumption room, which would increase the risk of children being exposed to hard drugs such as fentanyl.

These residents call upon the Government of Canada to restrict funding to BC Housing unless an ideal alternative location is selected for supportive housing and the consumption of drugs, not in proximity to a school. The petition also calls upon the Government of Canada to uphold its own rules for preventing children from being exposed to toxic substances that are harmful and deadly.

FLOOD MITIGATION

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Madam Speaker, the second petition I would like to present today is on behalf of residents in my riding who are concerned that existing flood protection infrastructure, including dikes, levies and drainage systems, is aging and inadequate to withstand current and future flood risks. Effective flood mitigation requires substantial investment in modern, climate-resilient infrastructure. The flooding events of 2021, four years ago, caused widespread damage to homes, businesses and agricultural lands such as Canada has never seen in its history.

These residents call upon the Government of Canada to invest in the necessary infrastructure to protect Abbotsford, the Fraser Valley and the entire supply chain of Canada.

IMMIGRATION AND CITIZENSHIP

Salma Zahid (Scarborough Centre—Don Valley East, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I rise today to present a petition signed by concerned Canadians who wish to draw the attention of the House to what they characterize as inconsistencies in the treatment of former members of the Bangladesh Nationalist Party, or BNP, by the IR-CC.

They are asking the government for a review of the process for determinations of inadmissibility, a clear and transparent process, and affirmation of procedural fairness for individuals' applications based on the merits of each case.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, I am rising to present an e-petition that has garnered over 1,424 signatures from concerned Canadians.

The petitioners are asking this House to look to our obligations under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, consider the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the context of the rights and freedoms of the 2SLGBTQIA+ community and consider that the targeting of this group is a form of genocide. In addition, the targeting and removal of federal rights and freedoms from the 2SLGBTQIA+ group constitutes a practice that must be declared illegal and not allowed to take place within Canada. They are asking that Canadian 2SLGBTQIA+ federal human rights be protected from being diminished or revoked with the use of the federal notwithstanding clause. As a community, we understand and accept the petitioners' concerns, but there is growing push-back on basic human rights toward this community.

This federal House is asked by these petitioners to stop this practice and protect Canadian rights.

• (1545)

PUBLIC SAFETY

Dan Mazier (Riding Mountain, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is a privilege to present a petition to voice the concerns of the people of Riding Mountain.

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

The petitioners continue to suffer the consequences of soft-on-crime Liberal policies such as Bill C-5, which repealed mandatory jail time for serious crimes, and Bill C-75, which forces judges to release repeat violent offenders right back onto the streets.

Petitioners in Swan Valley want to see an end to the Liberals' reckless catch-and-release policies so that criminals stay behind bars. This is why the people of Swan River are demanding jail, not bail for repeat violent offenders. I support the good people of Swan River.

Routine Proceedings

[Translation]

CANADA POST

Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am rising to table three petitions.

The first is from people who are concerned about the situation at Canada Post and the upcoming service cuts. They also believe that there is a potential conflict of interest involving the CEO of Canada Post, who sits on the board of Purolator. These people are calling for the Auditor General to undertake an analysis of Canada Post and provide the public with a report detailing categories of expenditures to confirm whether the losses reported as being "operational" are truly so. Investments are not currently considered capital investments. The petitioners are therefore calling for the Public Sector Integrity Commissioner of Canada to investigate possible corporate malfeasance by analyzing the conflicts of interest, dubious capital purchases and decision-making process. Finally, the petitioners are calling for workers to be given a voice regarding costly new methods and unnecessary spending.

INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT

Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): The second petition concerns the fact that the President of the United States signed an executive order imposing a broad sanctions regime on the International Criminal Court, its officials, its staff and their families. This order attacks an institution that is the last international bastion for ending impunity for the gravest of crimes, such as mass atrocities, war crimes, crimes against humanity and genocide.

The petitioners are calling on the Government of Canada to publicly condemn the order made by the United States on February 6, 2025, by promptly issuing a statement of support for the court and its staff, and to fully co-operate with the International Criminal Court, including by executing all arrest warrants issued by the court, such as those for Omar al-Bashir, Benjamin Netanyahu and Vladimir Putin.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): The last petition concerns the fact that people who hold a Palestinian Authority ID or passport are being refused entry at the Ben Gurion International Airport in Israel, even though they have a valid Canadian passport.

Unlike Canada, the United States has successfully secured equal treatment for its citizens with Palestinian Authority ID, but we have not. These people are calling on the Government of Canada to ensure that all Canadian citizens, regardless of whether they hold a Palestinian Authority ID or passport, are granted equal treatment by Israel, including the ability to enter the country via the Ben Gurion Airport.

Privilege

[English]

CANADA POST

Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am speaking today on behalf of the Resort Village of Tobin Lake, in my riding, where 401 individuals have expressed the concern that they do not have a unique postal code. They get their mail in other places. They did not get to vote for me, because they do not have a postal code where they live. This has resulted in frequent mail and parcel delivery issues, confusion by emergency response services, complications with alarm monitoring of home security systems, and difficulties in business operations and address verifications.

They have a need for more accurate and efficient address verification, so they are calling on the Government of Canada and the Canada Post Corporation to assign a dedicated and unique postal code to the Resort Village of Tobin Lake, knowing that this is an issue right across our country.

• (1550)

PUBLIC SAFETY

Fred Davies (Niagara South, CPC): Madam Speaker, I have the sad and unfortunate duty today to present a petition on behalf of constituents of Niagara South and throughout the region of Niagara with respect to the brutal rape and beating of a three-year-old toddler in my riding. On August 31, 2025, this little girl was violently assaulted by a 25-year-old man who had been let out early from a sentence of a previous sexual assault and rape of a 12-year-old boy.

More than 10,400 people in the first tranche of this petition have asked me to present it on their behalf. The undersigned citizens and residents of Canada call upon the Government of Canada to amend the Criminal Code to make bail and early releases more restrictive for repeat violent offenders of sexual offences and sexual offences against children, to protect children and to end the revolving door of justice for crimes targeting the most vulnerable Canadians.

On their behalf, I table this petition.

CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS

Chak Au (Richmond Centre—Marpole, CPC): Madam Speaker, I rise today to present a petition on behalf of Canadians who are deeply concerned about recommendations 429 and 430 of the finance committee's pre-budget report. The petitioners call upon the government to reject these recommendations and to affirm the charitable status of faith-based organizations.

Religious charities play a vital role in meeting needs and supporting our most vulnerable. They operate soup kitchens, organize community outreach, provide Christmas hampers and support families in need during the holiday season.

I have had the privilege of being part of these initiatives and have seen first-hand not only the heart these faith communities bring to their work, but also the significant difference they make in offering disaster relief, feeding seniors, equipping children with school supplies and helping single mothers.

At a time when Canadians are facing a cost of living crisis, undermining the ability of these organizations to serve would be irresponsible. The petitioners therefore urge the government to main-

tain the charitable status of faith-based organizations so they can continue their invaluable service to Canadians.

* * *

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURN

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, if the government's responses to Questions Nos. 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347 and 348 could be made orders for return, these returns would be tabled in an electronic format immediately.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I ask that all remaining questions be allowed to stand.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[For text of questions and responses, see *Written Questions website*]

* * *

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

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

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed

* * *

[Translation]

PRIVILEGE

BUDGET DOCUMENTS DISTRIBUTED TO MEMBERS

Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette—Manawan, BQ): Madam Speaker, I rise today on a question of privilege concerning the proceedings of yesterday's budget lock-up and the budget documents that were distributed to members of Parliament.

It turns out that members of Parliament who consulted the budget in paper format only, as distributed by the government during the lock-up and during the government's economic statement at the end of the day, did not receive all the information in the government's new budget policy. In fact, we have found that the PDF version, in other words, the electronic version, is 559 pages long, while the paper version is more than a hundred pages shorter at 448 pages.

It is also worth raising the issue of fairness in accessing the budget information, since some members who participated in the lock-up were informed by the government that the PDF document was the official and complete version of the budget, while others received this information only after the lock-up.

Worse still, members who received only the paper copy, just before attending the House sitting on the economic statement, were never informed that the paper copy did not contain the full and complete version of the budget. That raises serious concerns, especially since this was the version that most members received.

This situation not only shows how blatantly unprepared the government was, but, in our opinion, it also violates the right of all members to full and fair information and could obstruct members in the performance of their parliamentary duties.

It should be noted that not all members are authorized to take part in budget lock-ups and that only a limited number of people from each political party are allowed to attend.

In our opinion, if the paper copy was missing pages or incomplete information on the government's budgetary policy was distributed, this could compromise the ability of members who received the incomplete version to understand and analyze all of the budget measures and to prepare for debates.

I would like to draw the Chair's attention to the fact that lock-ups give the other parties' critics and economic experts a chance to review all of the government's budget measures. However, failing to provide information in a fair manner, so that all members can have access to the full and complete facts, infringes on members' right to have all the information concerning government affairs. This is essential, particularly when the elected government is a minority government.

Members of the opposition parties must have access to all the information in order to do their job and hold the government accountable on behalf of their constituents.

It is also important to note that not having all the information could, in certain circumstances, mislead members.

On this issue, Bosc and Gagnon point out, in the third edition of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, that parliamentary privilege protects members from any interference with their ability to perform their duties. On page 116, they state that misleading a member or members can be considered a form of obstruction that could hinder the business of the House.

Parliament's right to obtain the fullest information possible on matters of public interest is indisputable. The issue here concerns the importance of the right of members of Parliament to have access to accurate and complete documents in order to exercise their responsibility to hold the government to account.

A ruling by Speaker Regan on March 27, 2018, published in the Debates of the House of Commons at pages 18134 and 18135, appears to recognize that principle. In that ruling, the Speaker referred to a ruling by his predecessor, at page 13868 of the Debates, and emphasized that "access to accurate and timely information is an essential cornerstone of our parliamentary system". The Speaker went on to say:

The Budget

There is not only great truth but also great power in these few words, for they represent a right that is integral to the health of our democracy. They also explain, to some extent, why members take seriously the need to defend their right to access timely and accurate information in order to fulfill their parliamentary duties, particularly their role of holding the government to account.

I therefore ask the Chair to determine whether, in the case before us, there is a prima facie case to find that members who were not informed that the paper documents they received were incomplete have been impeded in the performance of their parliamentary duties and whether there is a prima facie breach of their parliamentary privilege.

● (1555)

If so, I can move the appropriate motion to have the matter studied by the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): I thank the hon. member for calling attention to this matter. The Chair will take it under advisement and will come back to the House as soon as possible.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

THE BUDGET

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF MINISTER OF FINANCE

The House resumed from November 4 consideration of the motion that this House approve in general the budgetary policy of the government.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Madam Speaker, there are times in the life of a Parliament when Canadians are not looking for showy speeches, sound bites for TikTok or corporate buzzwords. Sometimes people look to the House of Commons and wonder whether the people entrusted with power are listening to them, are able to understand them, and are making efforts to solve the real problems in their lives.

Canadians are exhausted. They are tired not because they do not want to work, but because they bear too heavy a load on their shoulders for a government that does not take enough responsibility. The government we have now is too much of a burden. It weighs heavily on the shoulders of the ordinary—no, the extraordinary Canadians who work every day to pay our country's bills. These are people whose names never appear in the credits. They never get famous, but they are the ones building our country, and it is to them that we owe our presence here in the House of Commons. For too long, the government has taken them for granted, taking their money to spend on its own obsessions without delivering any benefits for them.

The Budget

● (1600)

[English]

There are moments in a nation's life when people look to our leaders, not for applause lines, corporate buzzwords or social media clips, but for honesty, humility and seriousness. They look to this chamber and ask whether those entrusted with power truly understand the weight of the burdens on the shoulders of the people.

Now is one of those times, because Canadians are tired. They are exhausted, not because they do not want to work but because they bear the burden of an extremely expensive government that takes too much and returns too little, that focuses on its own obsessions rather than on the needs of the people who pay the bills.

Those Canadians who pay the bills, the ordinary Canadians, no, the extraordinary Canadians who build the homes, swing the hammers, frame our buildings, drive our trucks, invest in our businesses and mortgage their homes to start new enterprises are the silent voices whose murmurs of pain and suffering have grown louder and louder without any heed from government.

They needed hope yesterday. They needed relief. They needed evidence that someone in the government had heard them, believed them and respected their sacrifices and was finally prepared to act in their interests instead of the government's interests. Instead, they were met with the most expensive failure in modern Canadian history. The Prime Minister, the figure head the Liberals had paraded in front of Canadians as a new guarantor of discipline, competence and stability, the man we were told would clean up the Liberal mess, has brought a bigger shovel and dug a far deeper hole.

For nearly a year, the Liberals and their supporters told us that the Prime Minister was different from the man he had advised for the preceding five years, that he was smarter and more responsible and that he would be the adult in the room. However, even before the budget was presented, the promises were all broken.

It was revealed that the mythology was false, because this budget confirms the truth: In the government, there is no discipline, restraint or plan, only politics, posturing and pain for the people who do the work, pay the taxes and hold the country together.

[Translation]

The numbers speak for themselves. The Prime Minister is going to add another \$80 billion to our national debt, which is double the deficit Justin Trudeau left behind. It is the largest deficit in the country's history, outside of the pandemic. That is \$16 billion more than the deficit the Prime Minister promised during the election campaign. That is about \$5,000 for every Canadian family. These families will be paying the bill for generations to come, and that is just the debt he is adding in a single year.

The budget calls for \$312 billion to be added to the debt over five years. That is a record and by far the largest amount in the country's history. It represents \$20,000 in additional debt for every Canadian family.

● (1605)

[English]

The Prime Minister is proving to be the most expensive in Canadian history, with a \$78.3-billion deficit. His deficit is twice the size of the one Trudeau left behind. It is also \$16 billion bigger than he promised, the biggest by far outside the COVID period. Over the five years that follow this budget, the Prime Minister expects to add \$314 billion of new debt. That is one-third of a trillion dollars, which is \$20,000 for every family in Canada.

Let us think about that. We were told that the adults were finally here, but instead the bill payers of this country are being told to brace for yet another reckless round of spending: \$10 million of new debt added every single hour. Canadians are trimming their groceries, delaying having children, moving in with their parents and taking on second jobs, while the government indebts them \$10 million an hour. That is not for homes, for prosperity or for any benefit of the people, but for the survival of the government itself.

Where does this indulgence take us? The national debt is now \$1.35 trillion. To put that into perspective, that is by far the highest in Canadian history. A newborn child in this country is born with \$30,000 of debt to their name, and for a family of four, it is \$120,000 of debt. That is a small mortgage for most people, and that is just the debt they owe through the federal government.

[Translation]

Let me be clear: Every Canadian family owes \$120,000 as a result of the national debt, at the federal level alone.

[English]

Our young people are told they have to put their dreams on hold to pay this crushing burden. What do they get for it? Do they get more doctors, more nurses, more homes or more paycheques? No, they get none of the above.

The money goes to interest on the debt, on which the government is now spending \$55.6 billion. That is more than we transfer for health care to the provinces and more than the government collects in GST. When someone pays GST on their next purchase, they should know that every penny is going to paying bankers and bondholders rather than to paying nurses and doctors. That is the human cost.

Every year, Canadian families spend \$3,300 on interest for the federal debt alone. That money will not fund a single MRI machine. It will be waste layered upon waste. While Canadians tighten their belt, eat lower-quality food and less of it, and hold off on their dreams, the Liberals offer one thing in return: decline disguised as virtue.

The Budget

The Liberals promised that the debt-to-GDP ratio would fall; it rises. The Prime Minister promised that confidence would return and that investment would return, but then his own budget graph shows that investment is actually collapsing in real time. Every single quarter that he has been in office in this calendar year, there will have been a serious decline in investment: so much for spending less and investing more.

The Liberals promised stability; they delivered stagnation. They promised the next generation a fair shot; they have delivered them a sentence of slow growth and high costs. That might sound like economist-speak, but there is a real human cost of that.

As Canadians walk into grocery stores, they see that since March, when the Prime Minister was elected on the promise that he would be judged by the prices at the grocery store, strawberries are up 25%, beef sirloin is up 25%, stewing beef is up 20%, coffee is up 20%, chicken drumsticks are up 17%, salad dressing is up 17%, pork ribs are up 15%, chicken thighs are up 14%, and even basic mushrooms are up 13%.

Canadians are not eating gourmet; in fact, many of them are not eating at all some days. A recent survey and study done by a food bank association demonstrated that over 10% of Canadians are now skipping meals for an entire day because they cannot afford to eat. Food bank usage tells the story: It has doubled since 2019, when the Prime Minister became the economic adviser to his predecessor.

One in five Canadians who goes to a food bank has a job, but their paycheque does not buy them food. In addition, while the Liberals keep telling us they are going to bring in a school food program, since they made that promise, the number of children relying on food banks has doubled, to 700,000 a month.

Hanging over every farm, every factory, every trucker who moves goods, and every person who has anything in a modern civilized life is the massive and growing industrial carbon tax. Yes, it is still there. It is true the government has paused the visible, consumer carbon tax, thanks to Conservative pressure, but it has maintained, and in this budget has decided to increase, the industrial carbon tax, which punishes people who produce food and those who build homes.

The food professor warned that the industrial carbon tax is not gone; the worst part is still there. Only the consumer portion was reduced to zero. Processors and growers shoulder heavy costs. He said that the industrial carbon tax remains and that we should pay attention, because it continues to erode competitiveness in the agri-food sector. Most damning of all is that he says, "The U.S. produces food more efficiently and more cheaply than we do. The cost gap is growing, not shrinking."

When experts are practically begging the government to stop harming food production with high taxes on every aspect of the food chain, this is a matter of ideology, not of human need.

Let us be very clear what this tax actually is; it is a levy on the steel in the tractor that rolls across our fields. Every grain dryer that preserves and dries the harvest, every greenhouse heater that helps vegetables grow in the winter, every truck that ships food from farm to table, every bag of fertilizer, every pallet of lumber, every sack of cement, every pound of steel, every piece of rebar, every

roofing truss and every load of drywall becomes more expensive when we apply a carbon tax on the things Canadians make.

It might be a well-concealed tax, but it is an extremely expensive tax, one the Prime Minister plans to more than double over the next several years and keep increasing even after that. It is no wonder that the government is actually increasing food prices in Canada at a faster rate than they are increasing in the United States.

It is not just food; it is also housing. The industrial carbon tax applies on everything for housing. To give a little bit of chump change back to a very small number of people who happen to meet the exact and highly limited definition, the government has provided an unworkable GST rebate, going only to first time buyers who buy new homes.

Here is the problem with that: The Venn diagram intersection of new buyer and new home is next to nothing. New buyers typically buy resale homes, and those never had taxes on them in the first place. Typically, new homes are bought by second-, third-, fourth- and fifth-time homebuyers, because, of course, new homes are more expensive, and buyers already have to have been in the market.

The Prime Minister has successfully engineered a rebate that 95% of Canadians are ineligible to receive. It is basically worthless to almost all people in the country. Meanwhile, he made a promise he would help the municipalities cut their development taxes in half. That promise goes unkept, so today in the province of Ontario, 30% of the cost of a new home is taxes and more taxes, and the Prime Minister has not removed or eliminated those taxes despite the promise he made during the election.

Scott Andison, chief executive officer of the Ontario Home Builders' Association says, "The government's inaction will put 40,000 jobs in Ontario at risk. From architects and engineers to trades and sub trades across the residential construction sector, the estimated direct and indirect economic impact from these job losses on Ontario's economy is \$5.3 billion."

Meanwhile, our tradespeople are losing their jobs because homes are not getting built. Homebuilding is collapsing after the Prime Minister promised he would double it. Yesterday's budget makes the problem worse by failing to remove the taxes that were already there, while piling on the new and more expensive industrial carbon tax.

The Budget

• (1610)

What is most galling of all is the wordplay the Liberals use to justify it all. They say, “We’re not spending; we’re investing”. This sounds like a new buzzword, but it is actually very old. Prime Minister Justin Trudeau claimed that he was going to invest when he promised a small deficit of \$10 billion that would be gone in three years. Do members remember that? He said that the budget would balance itself.

I do not say that derisively, because he actually had a well-thought-out chain of steps that he believed would happen. He said that if we borrow money and spend it in the economy, it will cause economic growth and investment that will then go back into tax revenues, and the budget will balance itself. He did not express it in those sorts of terms, but that is what he meant, and that is exactly what the Prime Minister today is promising; he is claiming that deficits can be converted into investment. Well, there are three reasons that never happens.

By the way, members do not have to take my word for it; the investment numbers themselves are clear. Since the government started new debt, investment in Canada has collapsed. We have had the worst investment per capita of any country in the G7 and its worst drop in Canadian history as the Liberals have doubled deficits.

Therefore there is a negative correlation between deficits and investments. Why is that? First, everything comes from something; nothing comes from nothing. Governments get deficit financing only two ways: They print it, or they borrow it.

If they print it, they increase the money supply faster than the things money buys, and we get inflation, which we have seen; or they borrow it out of the marketplace, but somebody has to lend it, meaning that the money that is lent to the government cannot be put to other more productive uses. Economists call it the crowding out effect; this is when government borrows money out of the economy, depriving the private sector of the investment it needs for more productive activities.

Therefore when government borrows out of the economy in order to spend back into the economy, there is no net increase in economic activity; it is simply redirected to another purpose, away from productive private sector investment towards unproductive government spending. Money is taken away from factories, pipelines, warehouses, tech research and other income-generating assets to give it to bureaucracy, which ultimately devours the money and never produces a return.

The most incredible example of this was, of course, in Israel, which was running massive deficits in the 1990s and paying out 6% interest on its government bonds. This starved the Israeli economy of investment. When the government finally stopped spending and balanced its budget, investment in the tech sector exploded, because bondholders were forced to actually invest in productive R and D rather than passively hand their money over for a government-guaranteed return.

As a result of paying down debt, Israel unlocked more investment, and there was a venture capital boom that meant that right now, Israel has more companies trading on the NASDAQ exchange

than does all of Europe, a continent with 75 times more people than Israel.

If we want to unlock investment, one of the things we need to stop doing is borrowing that investment out of the economy. Instead, we need to leave it in the hands of productive private sector investment that will grow and expand our economy.

• (1615)

[*Translation*]

The second reason why deficits are not investments is that today's deficits are perceived as tomorrow's taxes, and every business and citizen knows that. When people see large deficits in the news, they anticipate future tax increases and begin to save accordingly. Therefore, while the government is injecting funds into the economy, consumers, investors and businesses are reducing their own spending and investment.

[*English*]

The reason the government's deficits do not produce more investment and economic activity as well is that people are not stupid. They know today's deficits are tomorrow's taxes, so businesses and individuals tend to hoard their money in anticipation of future tax increases when they see there are large-scale deficits in the present. This has been borne out by the research of the IMF, which found that high-debt countries, such as Canada, with high deficits tend to have households holding back on investments of their own, and the same goes for businesses.

The only reason money-making projects do not happen in Canada is not because we are not spending and borrowing enough money, but because the government is standing in the way of those very same projects. What it needs to do is get out of the way.

The government needs to get out of the way to let mines be dug in two years' or three years' approval time, get out of the way to approve pipelines that can go to the coast so we no longer have to give all of our oil to Americans at discounts and get out of the way to grant rapid permits for LNG plants, the massive plants that are \$30 billion or \$40 billion, totally funded by the private sector, and massively profitable, because the price for a million metric British thermal units in Canada is three dollars, while in Asia it is over \$10.

The Budget

We can make enormous amounts of money if the government gets out of the way and lets these things happen, but of course that would be no fun for the government. Nobody wants written on their tombstone, "Here lies politician Smith. He got out of the way." They all want to say that he built this thing and he built that thing, with other people's money, so it serves the ego of the politician to take the money out of the economy and put it back somewhere else, even though it costs enormous amounts, or to block this economic activity only to subsidize that same economic activity.

It is like what the great President Ronald Reagan said, which is that, if Liberals see something move, they tax it. If it keeps moving, they regulate it. If it stops moving, they subsidize it. Why not just do none of the above? Why not just get out of the way to let free people, entrepreneurs and workers, unlock their incredible natural potential to build, make, move, fix, develop and invent things for all of us? That would be a much more sensible way to get investment.

The Liberals have offered us nothing but managed decline, but we want national renewal. They have offered excuses, while we, as Conservatives, offer results. They offer debt and drift; we offer discipline and direction. They offer scarcity; we offer possibility. They offer a failed past; we offer a bright future. They trust only in themselves to run the lives of other people; we trust in the Canadian people to make their own decisions for themselves.

● (1620)

[*Translation*]

We, as Conservatives, want to get the government out of the way. We want to lighten the load on our entrepreneurs and our workers in order to unleash the strength and ingenuity of Canadians. We want to allow them to be rewarded for their ambition.

[*English*]

That is the country we want, and we have a very clear plan to do it. We want to lower the taxes on work, investment, homebuilding and energy. Let us cut income taxes for real, not \$83 a year, but a real income tax cut that would actually boost take-home pay and reward hard work. Let us get rid of taxes on energy, such as the industrial carbon tax. Let us get rid of all taxes on homebuilding, which would be enough to reduce homebuilding costs in some provinces by as much as \$200,000. Let us get rid of taxes on investment. If we want more investment, stop taxing investment. No capital gains tax for anybody who reinvests in Canada would be a way to get lots of investment going.

We need to unlock and reward the entrepreneurship of this country, but right now our entrepreneurs are like eagles locked in a bird-cage. They cannot go anywhere because they are hemmed in and blocked from flying by high government taxes and heavy regulatory burden. We want to liberate Canadians to spread their economic wings and fly.

We want this to be the most rewarding place for people to work, start a business, build a home, dig a mine and set up a factory to make stuff again. That is the country we envision. We want sound money so that when hard-working waitresses and assembly line workers get their paycheque and put it in their bank account, it does not lose its value with each passing day. That means we have to

stop the violence the government is doing to our money, stop the money printing and get the Bank of Canada back to its job of core low inflation and ultimately address the real foundational problem, which is that the government is spending money it does not have on things we do not need. Let us control the government's spending so that Canadian people can have strong, sound money again.

The Liberals want a country where the government is rich and the people are poor. We want the people to live with abundance and opportunity, and that, by the way, means we need to unlock energy. There has been no history in the world of defeating poverty that has not involved low-cost and abundant energy. We, on the Conservative side, want to unlock the trillions of dollars of oil and gas, uranium and hydroelectricity in our water, our rocks, our molecules and our atoms to be used for our benefit here in a sovereign and strong Canada. That is our vision.

This is a bright and optimistic vision, and it is one that I think is going to inspire our young people, who are in so desperate need of hope. I want to say to our youth today that we, as Conservatives, see them. We see the heavy bags under their eyes as they work that third shift in a single day or are dropping off Uber Eats because they need it to pay the rent. We hear the stress and the strain in their voices as they wonder how they are going to pay the rent. We also hear the tone of hopelessness as they wonder whether they will ever be able to start a family. We hear them. We see them. We are with them. We are here to offer them homes, jobs and hope.

Our young people will once again be rewarded for their ambition, their hard work, their ingenious activity and their contribution to our country. Their hard work will once again be liberated to their own benefit and to the benefit of all Canadians. We are not here to tell our youth, who have done nothing but sacrifice since their teenage years, that they need to sacrifice more at the altar of a costly, confiscatory and expensive Liberal government. The hard work of our young people should go to their benefit. This should be a land of promise, freedom and opportunity for our youth.

The Budget

We reiterate that what this country needs is an affordable budget for an affordable life for all of our people, in a country that rewards hard work and unlocks entrepreneurs, a nation not of bureaucrats and busybodies, of rulers and rule-makers, of gatekeepers and grandees, but instead, a nation of adventurers and artists, of entrepreneurs and explorers, of workers and warriors, of pioneers and patriots, all united to restore the promise of Canada, which is that anyone from anywhere can do anything and that hard work gets people a great life on a safe street in a beautiful house under our proud flag.

Canada first. Canada forever.

• (1625)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I remember when the leader of the official opposition sat on the government benches and the Conservatives took a multi-billion dollar surplus from Ralph Goodale and turned it into a multi-billion dollar deficit, and that fed through.

In real dollars, if we look at the value of the dollar today compared to what it was in the 2009-10 budget, his budget back then had more of a deficit than this budget, yet they are building their case on an issue that is somewhat surprising because he sat in a government that, in real dollars, had more of a deficit than what is proposed in this budget.

Does the member not see any inconsistency in that?

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Madam Speaker, yes, I do see a lot of inconsistency in the member's question. His leader was elected promising to spend less, and he is spending 100% more in deficits than his predecessor. He promised that he would deliver the fastest-growing economy in the G7, and he has delivered the fastest-shrinking economy. He promised more investment, but the government's own documents in the budget demonstrate that investment is collapsing since he took office as Prime Minister. He promised he would double homebuilding, and homebuilding is expected now, by his own government agency, to drop by 13%.

The Prime Minister has broken every single promise he made, and he is only seven months into his term. Despite the assumption that because he dresses in a more corporate image, he would be better with money, he is more expensive than Justin Trudeau by every objective measure. The debt and the spending is more expensive today.

• (1630)

[*Translation*]

Mario Simard (Jonquière, BQ): Madam Speaker, I want to congratulate the leader of the official opposition on his speech. I hope he has impressed his troops. We want to keep it a minority government.

The budget includes plenty of investments in fossil fuels. It is utterly silent on the energy transition. It includes massive investments in defence. It is a Conservative budget, as my colleague from Mirabel said, so much so that some Conservatives have decided to cross the floor.

I want to give the leader of the official opposition an opportunity to tell us that he is not jealous of what was tabled. I want to give him a bit of time to answer that question.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Madam Speaker, I must admit that I am not jealous at all. In fact, I am a little depressed to see the size of the Liberal deficit.

When the Conservatives were in power, yes, there were some short-term deficits, but we managed to balance the budget a few years later, after the financial crisis in the United States. We left Canada in the best fiscal position of any country in the G7. That is the approach we will take next time, an approach that is all about balancing budgets, eliminating waste and cutting taxes for hard-working folks. I hope the Bloc Québécois will support this excellent idea.

[*English*]

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, it is so rare to have this opportunity. The leader of the official opposition gave a sufficiently long speech that the questions got around to me. I want to thank him for that from the bottom of my heart. I do want to say that I will probably be voting the same way that he will be on the budget unless changes are made.

I wanted to ask a question, because I know that he is a reader and he thinks about issues. I am fascinated by the fact that the Prime Minister appears to be taking his main policy advice from a book called *Abundance*. I am sure he has heard of it. It is big bestseller by Ezra Klein, New York Times columnist. His thesis, and the entire book *Abundance*, comes to this, which sounds like a Conservative speech in Canada but for one thing. The whole book is about the United States. The basic thesis of Ezra Klein and Derek Thompson's book is that one cannot build anything in the United States. There are just too many regulations and too much red tape. Nothing gets built in the United States. The book is not about Canada.

I am fascinated by the fact that this popular book, which is particularly popular with some folks, such as the Prime Minister, is leading us astray in what it really takes to incentivize investment in Canada.

I wonder if the hon. leader of the official opposition has had a chance to have a look at why one cannot build anything in the United States, despite MAGA and all of Trump's efforts.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Madam Speaker, first of all, I have to say that this is the first time that anyone on that side of the House of Commons has congratulated me for speaking for a really long time. I did not expect that.

Second, I have not read the book *Abundance*, but frankly, the member opposite says that one cannot build anything in the United States. The economy there is actually growing. The most recent quarter was up 3.4%. In fact, the budget, published by the government, showed that, if productivity gains had been the same in Canada as they had been in the United States from 2017 to 2023, the average Canadian family would be \$11,000 richer today.

The Budget

Why are we not more productive, even though we have the best workers in the world? It is because our economy is starved of investment. We have the lowest investment per capita in the G7. The worker in Canada gets \$15,000 of investment. The American worker gets \$28,000.

We need to unlock the massive power of free enterprise if we want to change that, to the benefit of the worker and the entrepreneur here in Canada.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, to show some contrast between the Conservatives and the Liberals, let me highlight the fact that the leader of the Conservative Party made reference to the national school food program. We have had members of his own caucus who have said that it is an absolutely garbage program, which is so disrespectful. Since I have been a parliamentarian, I have heard about, and this is for over three decades now, the need to have all children be fed in schools, because children cannot learn on an empty stomach, yet the Conservative Party is saying no to that.

Would the hon. member not agree with Joe Clark, when Joe Clark said that he never left the party, that the party left him and that they are so far to the right? That is what we have seen with the Conservative Party today.

• (1635)

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Madam Speaker, since the Liberals brought in this program, the number of kids relying on food banks has doubled, to 700,000. By the way, according to their own government data, 90% do not get any meals at all from this program. It is not clear what happens with the remaining 10%.

The member uses the term “garbage”. There is a Facebook page called the “Dumpster Diving Network” with Canadians who share tips on how they can literally jump into dumpsters and pull out a meal because they cannot afford groceries after 10 years of the government. That is the garbage policy we were referring to.

Alex Ruff (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound, CPC): Madam Speaker, my question for the hon. Leader of the Opposition is on the concerns that I have about this budget—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): Order. Can I ask the hon. chief government whip to let the hon. member for Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound ask a question?

The hon. member.

Alex Ruff: Madam Speaker, my question for the hon. Leader of the Opposition is about the future and youth.

I have a 12-year-old daughter and I know the hon. Leader of the Opposition has young children, and I am scared of the state our nation will be in in future years with the incredibly large deficits and the national debt that the Liberal government is putting on to our future generations.

I would like the hon. Leader of the Opposition to comment on the impact that this is going to have not only on his children and my daughter, but on youth around the country. What else is he hearing from young people from across Canada with respect to the state of the country?

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Madam Speaker, that is a great and very important question, and I thank the member for serving in the Canadian Armed Forces in a very distinguished way.

He indeed is a proud father, as am I, and we both worry about our kids and what future they will have in this country. A third of Canadian youth believe they might have to leave this country because they cannot afford to live here. That is an astonishing statistic. After housing costs have doubled, we now have by far the most expensive housing in the G7, which is insane because we have the most land to build on.

My message to Canadian youth is that they do not have to live this way. It does not have to be like this. We can do better. We can bring them a life of opportunity and freedom. I look forward to that opportunity.

[*Translation*]

Patrick Bonin (Repentigny, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am somewhat surprised by the leader of the official opposition's reaction to the budget.

The tax cuts should make him happy. There is also talk of extending funding for oil companies and abolishing emissions caps in the oil and gas sector. The budget talks about amending the clean electricity regulations, most likely to weaken them, and the same goes for fossil fuel regulations.

There is no longer any mention of the Paris Agreement or short-term targets, even. The fight against climate change has been sidelined. It has reached the point where one Conservative member of Parliament thought the budget was so good that he decided to join the government.

It makes me wonder whether the leader of the official opposition feels like crossing the floor, considering how the government—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): I must interrupt the member to give the hon. Leader of the Opposition an opportunity to give a brief response.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Madam Speaker, we are indeed going to cross the floor after the election. We are all going to do it.

We are responsible when it comes to money. The idea of an \$80-billion deficit that is going to increase the cost of living and inflation on the backs of Canadians, including Quebeckers, is unacceptable. That is why we cannot support this costly budget.

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 Algonquin—Renfrew—Pembroke, Carbon Pricing; the hon. member for Riding Mountain, Mental Health and Addictions; the hon. member for Nunavut, Indigenous Affairs.

The Budget

Yves-François Blanchet (Beloeil—Chambly, BQ): Madam Speaker, I would like to repeat a word I used yesterday that surprised a few people. It is important to consider what words really mean. In my view, the budget is a sham because it makes claims that are not based on facts, accounting rules or even the content of the budget speech itself. There are some gaps, without any explanations. Some things are added on one page, only to be subtracted on another, bringing the initial figure back to zero. In short, it is a mess worthy of "the place that sends you mad", where even Asterix nearly lost his mind.

I would also like to underscore the extreme arrogance that is reflected not only in the way the budget exercise was conducted, but also in the way a number of people in this Parliament are behaving. The Liberals have been in power for 10 years now. Unfortunately, as history has shown, the Liberals seem to believe that power belongs to them and them alone. They are now fantasizing about convincing stray sheep to come over to their side and create a majority, which would not reflect the will of the people.

What are the issues? What was all over the news during the election campaign in early 2025? No one can tell me it was not tariffs. The all-powerful Prime Minister told us that he was quickly going to make these tariffs disappear. That would have been only natural, since tariffs meant to intimidate have no place between allies, partners and friends like the United States and Canada are supposed to be, and that includes Quebec, whether we like it or not. However, because of some somewhat clumsy flip-flopping, our relationship with the United States is not improving. The tariffs that the Prime Minister was going to sweep away with a wave of his hand, those on cars, trucks, the forestry industry, steel, aluminum, and so on, have actually increased.

The other issue was trade. The Liberals promised that trade talks would resume quickly, culminating in a new free trade agreement in 2026, similar the last one, according to the Prime Minister. To say that the effort was not a success is putting it mildly.

The third issue that inevitably comes with a budget is governance. We are being served up a disgraceful accounting exercise. Thankfully, people and pundits understand that the government cannot insert a column of investments in the federal budget and hope to treat them as assets when they are simply expenses. The Prime Minister must know this. Anyone with a basic understanding of accounting and public finance has to know this. It is clearly a sham.

The government is dropping its elbows, and tariffs are going up. There are no trade negotiations under way, no matter what the ministers may say. This is an austerity budget with a dramatic increase in spending. That takes some doing. There is a dramatic increase in spending, but only a minuscule portion of that will be used to adapt to the tariff and trade crisis. It is in no way proportional to the deficit, which is nearly \$80 billion. Moreover, Liberal governments have gotten us used to year-end deficits that are larger than those announced at the beginning of the year.

When we look at the budget, it seems to us that the Prime Minister and the government are acting like compulsive gamblers. Not only have they over-committed themselves to a series of failures that are dangerous for the economy, but they are also playing dou-

ble or nothing. They are investing more public money in every way imaginable—the classic Liberal approach to running up a deficit—to see whether they will be able to get out of the situation, if not economically, then at least politically. Time will tell.

• (1640)

Is there anything in this budget for the Quebec nation, which the government is ignorant of and perpetually ignores? The government is ignorant of the Quebec nation in that it does not know anything about it. There is no evidence that this government cares at all about the Quebec nation. The government ignores the Quebec nation in the sense that it does not take Quebec into account in its political decisions. As has been the case for the past six months, we are again seeing that the decisions that are being made to adapt to the crisis with the United States favour Ontario, western Canada, and Canada's big banks and oil companies, not Quebec, and Quebecers, especially young Quebecers, do identify with any of this.

Let us review the list. We have already talked about this, because it was one of our demands. We asked for an annual increase in health transfers of 6%, rather than 5%. This would have allowed the inevitable and unavoidable increase in spending in Quebec's health care system to keep pace with the increase in available resources.

Now, we know that, year after year, with a return to 3% in 2028, Quebec taxpayers will have to spend an increasing percentage of the Quebec government's budget on health care or pay higher taxes. This is a gift from the federal government, which is keeping the money for the oil companies.

As for pensions, we have been talking about them for years. There comes a point where pensions are a matter of principle, morality, ethics or responsibility. It is about taking care of our people. It is about doing right by people who worked all their lives, who live on limited incomes and have the misfortune of being between the ages of 65 and 74, meaning they receive 10% less in OAS benefits than people 75 and over. The organizations that represent these people, people under 75 and over 75 alike, all agree with us that such discrimination is unacceptable. To top it off, the government is literally letting these people's purchasing power dwindle, ignoring the fact that maintaining the purchasing power of people who spend what money they have right away is a practical way to adapt to a crisis, especially if a recession were to occur.

Let us talk about home ownership. The government came up with a program that was called Build Canada Homes. Former Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation programs were put under that agency. From that point, things become murky. It is no longer clear who does what, and we see no real distinction in the budget in terms of how Quebec is treated, so there is a hint of interference, that good old Liberal habit. It is as though they were saying: we have the money, Quebec does not. Our fridge is full while Quebec starves. If Quebec wants money for its projects, legitimate projects supported by its citizens who, incidentally, pay their taxes to Ottawa, then it will literally have to give up some of its powers.

The Budget

I want all those fine people across the way to know that building a house does not mean that young families can afford to buy it. There is nothing in all this that will give young people the ability to save the exorbitant amount needed to make a down payment on their first home. We proposed favourable terms under which young households could access government-backed credit or government loans.

I encourage members to talk to young families, to leave the comfort of their bubble and go see ordinary people. These are real young people with jobs, some of whom are in a couple where both people work, and they tell us that they will never be able to buy a home. We had an opportunity to finally provide resources to these people, who would have used them, thus helping to grow the economy. However, the answer was no. We were simply told no. I think young people will remember that.

There is nothing in the budget for forestry except credit support. Forestry companies cannot add interest costs to their expenses in such a crippling economic situation. In fact, solutions do exist, including those proposed by both the sector and the Bloc Québécois, that would address the core problem of the forestry sector's competitiveness at no cost to the government. I want to say that it is still not too late to do the right thing. We would have appreciated a sign. I imagine that the forestry sector would also have appreciated one.

• (1645)

Then there is the \$800-million reimbursement of a tax that was never collected. There are a lot of dimensions to this issue. Since the government is a mix of red and blue, we will call it purple. Every time this purple government talks about carbon pricing in its budget, it is referring to the controversial carbon tax. Carbon pricing, which is an essential tool for fighting climate change, is officially becoming controversial. Carbon pricing has become the scourge of public finances. However, carbon pricing recognizes that carbon emissions have an environmental impact and generate astronomical costs, which will ultimately be borne by the same young people denied the opportunity to buy a house.

Of the \$4-billion carbon tax reimbursement that the government paid to Canadians a week before the election, Quebec received not one penny. Quebeckers paid the tax, but received no reimbursement from the government at all, because the money was not spent by families. It was a flagrant election giveaway that was taken out of the pockets of Quebeckers and put into those of Canadians. This bears repeating because it is still as unacceptable as ever.

There is no hiding the fact that there is no money in the budget for fighting climate change. There is no denying that it is being ignored. Not so long ago, under the previous boss, this government talked about climate change and did nothing about it. I guess now that they have already backed down, they have decided to take one more step back and not mention it at all and just pretend that climate change no longer exists. There must be some people on the other side of the House whose conscience is telling them to hide under their desk, because what is happening with respect to the climate is shameful. This is going to catch up with the government when it snaps out of its denial phase.

We can talk about the end of EV initiatives, the end of the planned extension of funds that were going to total \$83 billion be-

fore 2025 and were extended to exceed \$100 billion in 2030, the end of the carbon tax and the \$800 million that goes along with it, and the end of the emissions cap. I have a whole list. The member for Repentigny has generously provided us with many examples of what this budget contains in terms of the climate.

It seems to me that the government has abandoned a principle that I have not heard about in a long time. I believe this will resonate with people. If the government were to talk to the people of Quebec and ask them whether polluters should pay, I think the vast majority of people would say yes, that it is basic logic, common sense. The polluter pays principle is an expression that has not been used for a long time, and I want to bring it back.

The polluter pays principle means understanding that Ottawa cannot take money from Quebeckers and send it to oil companies. If that happens, the polluter no longer pays: the polluter gets paid, the polluter gets encouraged, the polluter gets rewarded, the polluter gets a boost, the polluter goes unpunished. Quebec, which has clean and renewable energy, is literally subsidizing polluting energy from western Canada. I do not have time to go into it now, but I will come back to the claims the western provinces make about equalization. Quebec gives more money to western Canada in oil subsidies than it gets in return.

Let us talk about asylum seekers. Quebec requested \$700 million because it takes in and is currently hosting twice as many asylum seekers as the Canadian average. Yes, twice as many. By refusing to provide this money to Quebec, which delivers services to these people, the Government of Canada is telling the Government of Quebec to pay twice its share to welcome people arriving in distress from other countries and asking Quebec and Canada for help as they settle in. The Government of Canada is telling the Government of Quebec not to expect to get anything back.

The deficit is a popular topic of conversation. The deficit is not \$33 billion plus investments; it is \$70 billion. The accounting process they used is an embarrassment. This has been discussed before. It is no different than if I walked into my bank and told the bank manager that I wanted to take out a mortgage and then offered up my debts as collateral. It makes no sense, yet that is how the people of Quebec are being treated. As I said before, this is a sham.

• (1650)

For infrastructure, the Liberals are investing \$115 billion over five years. This may sound like good news, but only a small portion of that amount will be used to help companies adapt to the tariff crisis. There is almost nothing for the Liberals' major projects. There is money for defence, tax cuts and the good old Liberal deficit, but at an all-time high.

We are talking about the need to adapt in the negotiations with the Americans, who are not being very nice to us. Let us not forget that the Canadian government wants to revive Keystone XL, which will take western oil and send it to the United States. They call that market diversification? Also, the government just gave Ontario \$2 billion to buy modular nuclear reactors made in the United States that can process only American uranium. So much for diversification.

The Budget

Incidentally, I invite everyone to have a look at the beautiful ship on the cover of budget document. The ship is named *Arvik I* and was built in Japan. That is rather interesting. It illustrates this government's judgment.

Now I am going to talk about austerity. Tens of thousands of jobs are at risk through attrition. That means fewer people doing the same work. The most experienced people leave, and the least experienced people stay on and have to do more work. In the meantime, the Department of Citizenship and Immigration is incapable of doing its job, and the Canada Revenue Agency is not doing its job either. If the government at least tried to cut out overlap or encroachment on Quebec's jurisdictions, it could save a lot of money, but no, the Liberal government is far too committed to its interfering ways.

Cuts to the public service are popular. It is trendy. However, making cuts the wrong way can sometimes be irresponsible. I have already mentioned that the austerity in this budget is being used to fund support for the oil industry. Oil does not serve Quebec and is damaging the planet. We are going to pay while the Prime Minister watches water levels rise because of climate change. He will have retired and will be sitting on his boat, not even realizing what is happening. As the water rises due to climate change, he will rise too. This image is a simple illustration of the total indifference these people feel toward the reality of all the people around the world who are suffering because of climate change.

There are positives, and I will mention them, because people are always saying that we do not talk about the good things. I want to mention some related regional projects where there is a collaborative effort. We have asked for support for these projects. There is the Exploramer museum's shark pavilion. There is the Espace Hubert-Reeves in Charlevoix. There is the Îles-de-la-Madeleine airport runway extension, which will enable the people of the Magdalen Islands to export as far as Ontario, which is a large market for them. There is the Forillon shipyard.

There is the ongoing interest in the Port of Saguenay. There are also the measures we suggested to tackle the Driver Inc. issue. That comes directly from the Bloc Québécois. There is the removal of the luxury tax on business aircraft and the removal of the GST on first homes, and there is money for culture. There are some good things, but overall, it remains an extremely risky and dangerous budget.

I will go straight to the conclusion to say—

● (1655)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): I have to interrupt the hon. member to ask him not to bang his desk with his papers because that can interfere with the work of the interpreters.

I thank the hon. member.

Yves-François Blanchet: Madam Speaker, the government wants to promote major projects to us. I believe that Quebecers should be promoting their own major project. That project is, of course, an independent Quebec. That is the project that deserves our vote. It will be called the country of Quebec. That will be our sole identity.

However, I would like to table the following amendment:

That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word "That" and substituting the following:

"the House reject the government's budget statement, which will hurt Quebec because it fails to:

(a) raise the Canadian health transfer escalator to 6%;

(b) end discrimination against people aged 65 to 74 who did not receive an equitable increase in Old Age Security;

(c) repay the \$814 million to Quebecers who were not compensated for the end of carbon pricing in April 2025; and

(d) propose concrete and effective measures to combat climate change".

● (1700)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): The amendment is in order.

[*English*]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I must say I am a bit disappointed. When I think of Quebec, there would be many gains through this budget. We can look at the expansion through capital projects and the expansion, in terms of the GDP, in our military and industries like the aerospace industry in Quebec. The member made reference to expansion at airports.

There are all sorts of opportunities in this budget for Quebec, and if the members truly represent the interests of Quebec, I do not quite understand why they would not see the value of how this budget would provide so much stimulus for the province, whether it is hydro development, all sorts of opportunities in its manufacturing industries, working with the government.

I do not quite understand why they would vote en masse against the budget.

[*Translation*]

Yves-François Blanchet: Madam Speaker, I could almost hear music in the background. It was so beautiful and uplifting.

If the member had liked my speech and was not disappointed, I would have been worried, because we certainly cannot agree on that.

On the other hand, it seems to me that everyone knows that it is a tired old process that makes no sense. I think even Abraham used it. The government is saying that it is going to give us all kinds of terrible things that we do not want, but it is going to throw in a candy cane as a treat. Then it will ask us why we are not accepting the whole package together with the candy cane.

The government seems to think people are stupid.

[*English*]

Matt Strauss (Kitchener South—Hespeler, CPC): Madam Speaker, I have admired the hon. member's oratory skills for many years, so it is a real delight to get to ask him this question now. One part of his speech that I admired most was his defence of provincial jurisdiction. I think it is important that the people who would be most affected by a policy be the ones who design it, so then I was surprised when he said that he thinks the national carbon tax was critical for fighting climate change.

Does he not find that a bit contradictory with what is otherwise his defence of provincial jurisdiction? Would he maybe provide some comments on the fact that in the United States, carbon emissions per capita have gone down by a greater percentage over the last 10 years that the Liberals have been talking about the carbon tax?

[*Translation*]

Yves-François Blanchet: Madam Speaker, defending Quebec's jurisdiction over the fight against climate change is very important to the Bloc Québécois, to Quebec and to me personally.

The purpose of carbon pricing is not to raise money; it is to encourage companies to improve their practices and develop their technologies, and many are doing just that. I was the one who negotiated the cap-and-trade system for carbon emissions, which links Quebec with California, creating a huge market on the North American continent. This system is in place, it is still working and, thankfully, it is out of the Liberals' reach. They cannot simply decide to cancel or block it just to please the Conservatives.

I am still hearing denial, but it is impossible for Quebec, Canada or the planet to continue with development while denying the existence of climate change caused by carbon emissions and while failing to admit that the effects are costly and catastrophic.

To allow the Conservatives to keep their vision and the Bloc Québécois to keep its vision, we could move this debate to another forum. It could take place on the international stage between an independent Quebec and Canada.

• (1705)

Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Madam Speaker, I would like the leader of the Bloc Québécois to tell us more about the rhetoric we heard this week. The government constantly claimed that it would be the fault of the nasty opposition parties if an election were to be triggered following a consultation process that was, let us face it, rather dubious and practically non-existent.

I would like to hear his thoughts on that.

Yves-François Blanchet: Madam Speaker, I think the narrative about how we might end up in an election is not particularly credible right now, because the government did not try to reach an agreement with any of the opposition parties on budget measures that would achieve consensus in order to ensure that its budget would pass.

Contrary to what the Minister of Finance said, the Liberals did not get a strong mandate. They got a minority mandate. However, the Liberals are doing something else. It is like they have cast all of us in an episode of *House of Cards* with the craziest plot twists imaginable, involving schemes to try to convince other members to cross over to their side through the back door. It is embarrassing to watch. I look forward to the break. They will sort out their little issues. Then we will have a vote. Whatever happens, happens. That is called democracy.

Natilien Joseph (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am not the one who said that if something is good for Quebec, I will vote for it; it was the leader of the Bloc Québécois who said that.

The Budget

Four hundred thousand children in our schools are going to receive meals, and \$25 billion is going to be invested in housing.

Will the leader of the Bloc Québécois finally put his ego to one side and vote in favour of the budget for Quebec?

Yves-François Blanchet: Madam Speaker, I almost want to wait and answer tomorrow so that I can search for an intelligent answer tonight on Instagram, but I will answer now by saying that when the bad outweighs the good, we vote against it.

When a party has 22 members in a Parliament with 343 members, the vast majority of whom hate the idea of independence, having at least one person with an ego is a good thing.

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, I want to thank the leader of the Bloc Québécois because, after the Green Party, the Bloc Québécois is the party most committed to taking action against the climate crisis.

I am not just talking about the leader. I would also like to say a big thank you to the Bloc Québécois members who have never wavered in their commitment. They have never forgotten that we are going through a climate crisis and that the situation is urgent.

I think I live in a world that is truly crazy. We are signatories to the Paris Agreement and we must act immediately to reduce greenhouse gases. As the leader of the Bloc Québécois said, the Liberal government's budget lacks commitment. There is not a single mention of the Paris Agreement. We will not be able to attend COP30, which will be attended by the United Nations and every country in the world except Canada, because we have a budget, a debate, and a vote.

I want to ask the leader of the Bloc Québécois what we can do in the House, as members, to compel the Prime Minister to remember his role. His record suggests that he understands—

• (1710)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): I have to give the leader of the Bloc Québécois the chance to answer the question.

Yves-François Blanchet: Madam Speaker, I understand where my esteemed colleague is coming from.

In Quebec, we are doing our part, but if more members in the House from western Canada shared her point of view, perhaps the government would not get the free pass it hopes to get. I can only commend my colleague's commitment, which will complicate the numbers and ramp up the suspense in the government lobby. I do not see how the member, as the leader of the Green Party, could vote in favour of this budget. This is going to make life a bit more challenging for the government.

That should have been done earlier. If the government truly intended to talk to Canadians, it would have done so one or two months ago, and there would have been pre-budget consultations. Climate issues would have been raised. The members on my right would not have agreed at all, of course, but maybe there would have been some members on the other side who might have said that we could do something about climate change.

The Budget

Instead, they let loose a Prime Minister whose very existence in politics implies a major shift to the right and a denial of environmental issues, which, by the way, will benefit him financially.

[*English*]

Sean Casey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs and Associate Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is always an honour for me to rise in this place to speak on behalf of the good people of Charlottetown, the cradle of Confederation and the birthplace of our nation. Charlottetown is also the only riding in Canada that has both a small population and a small geography. I will come back to that a little later in my remarks. Another unique aspect of the riding that I am so proud to represent is that it is the only place outside of the national capital region that has a national headquarters of a federal department, which is Veterans Affairs, located in downtown Charlottetown.

Hon. Bardish Chagger: Share your time.

Sean Casey: Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the member for Waterloo, who is always way more on top of her game than I am.

I am going to be sharing my time with the member for Vancouver Granville.

Where I left off, I mentioned that Charlottetown was the location of the national headquarters of the Department of Veterans Affairs. This budget is important in that regard because it speaks specifically to another significant investment in Veterans Affairs to deal with the backlog of veterans' claims and the other modernization required to give veterans the services they rightly deserve. That is good news for the people of Charlottetown, for the people who serve veterans and for our veterans community.

The presence of the national headquarters of Veterans Affairs in my riding is particularly important, and the vote of confidence that the riding has received for the work being done there is demonstrated by the investments that have been made in the Daniel J. MacDonald Building and also by the investments in the budget. Unlike with the previous government, there are no deep and disproportionate cuts and there is no closure of district offices, which we reopened immediately upon coming into power.

I want to talk a bit about how the budget would impact my province and my riding.

Prince Edward Island is a place that relies heavily on tourism. We are 180,000 people, but we receive more than 1.7 million visitors a year. That was last year's number. This year's number was way up, and it was up for a few reasons. One, of course, is that Canadians have decided to stay home, and we were the beneficiaries of that. The other is that the weather this year was absolutely incredible for the beaches and all of the activities that people enjoy so much on Prince Edward Island. It was tough for the farmers but good for the tourists, so the tourism industry flourished.

There are two more reasons we had such a good year in tourism in Prince Edward Island this year. One is the decision of the Government of Canada to reduce the tolls on the Confederation Bridge from \$50 to \$20. That had a big impact on the traffic going back and forth across the bridge, and there was a significant increase

there. The other reason, which might surprise members, is the Canada strong pass. The Canada strong pass basically provided for free entry into national parks, and the national park in Prince Edward Island is a major draw for tourists and locals alike. It was good to see in this budget that this success will be repeated, as the Canada strong pass will be around for another year.

Also included in the budget are investments in airport infrastructure. This is critically important as well, and it builds on another investment that was recently made with respect to air travel and Prince Edward Island to provide regional connectivity. Back when COVID struck, the airlines abandoned short-haul regional routes and cut off service from Charlottetown to Halifax. Being able to get from Charlottetown to Halifax opened up the rest of the country and provided many other options. We had not had that flight since the COVID pandemic, until an announcement recently of a program to bring it back through an investment of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency.

● (1715)

The investment in airport infrastructure in this budget is critically important, because my hope and expectation is that increased service will lead to increased numbers. It is already a phenomenon that we have seen irrespective of this investment, but all of this feeds into good news for the tourism sector in Prince Edward Island.

On the subject of infrastructure, since the sunset of the investing in Canada infrastructure program, there has been a pretty significant gap in the availability of infrastructure funds from the Government of Canada for anything other than green-inclusive community buildings or housing. This is something I have heard frequently in my office from hard-working, dedicated, community-minded organizations that have a good project in mind for which there is no fund. Now there is.

This budget has introduced the build communities strong fund. It has specifically indicated that health infrastructure is eligible, that colleges and universities are eligible and that local infrastructure is a key element of it. All of these things are new. All of these things would unlock private investment. All of these things would provide for greater continuity and a greater provision of services within the community. There is a particular synergy as well to the extent that health infrastructure would now be included.

Just within the last couple of days, the Progressive Conservative provincial government in Prince Edward Island introduced its capital budget, which had millions of dollars in health infrastructure in it. This will be a chance for further co-operation and partnership between the two levels of government.

The Budget

[Translation]

There is another point I would like to mention for a number of reasons. Prince Edward Island has a very vibrant Acadian, francophone, francophile and franco-curious community. That vitality was on full show on August 15, when Charlottetown hosted National Acadian Day celebrations.

As part of the budget, we decided to double the funding for this celebration and make it permanent. This is the result of the efforts made by community representatives like Charles Duguay of the Société acadienne et francophone de l'Île-du-Prince-Édouard. They pushed very hard to make their voices heard. We heard their message and we responded. I am particularly proud of that.

● (1720)

[English]

The other thing I want to touch upon is the national school food program, which is national because of a pilot project done in Prince Edward Island. It was done particularly well; it was particularly well executed, and it was scaled across the country. It is a source of pride that it has now been made permanent. It will provide a savings of \$800 for a typical family with two children and will allow 400,000 more kids to have healthy food.

For me, it is more than that. It is yet another indication that a small place like Prince Edward Island is an ideal location for a pilot project. There are advocates in Prince Edward Island right now pushing for a pilot project for a basic income guarantee. We, as Liberals and elected officials, have an obligation to those who are more vulnerable than us, and I believe we will all be measured by that.

This is a budget that works for my riding, for my province and for my country. I am proud to stand and vote in support of it. I hope members on all sides will not use this budget to force a Christmas election. We will see how much good will and can come of it. Let us support it.

Taleeb Noormohamed (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Artificial Intelligence and Digital Innovation, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I want to thank my hon. colleague for his speech and the thoughts he has shared with us. He comes from a province where the arts and culture are such an important part of the fabric of the island. It is a part of the country I have really come to love.

I wonder if he could share with the House the importance of the support in this budget for culture and the arts, something very dear to his heart, and the impact it is going to have not just in his province but across the country.

Sean Casey: Madam Speaker, there is absolutely no doubt that Prince Edward Island is a hotbed for arts and culture. The anchor tenant, if you will, is one that is very familiar to the hon. member, and that is the Confederation Centre of the Arts. Right now it is undergoing an extensive expansion, thanks to investment from the Government of Canada through the green and inclusive community buildings fund. It will provide a national institute for the study of what Canada is and what it can be. It was initially built in 1967 as a lasting legacy to the Fathers of Confederation.

That is the centrepiece, but we enjoy a vibrant and active arts and culture community. They will be very happy with this budget as well. There is a sizable increase in the Canada music fund, to mention one other example that will make a difference.

Kevin Waugh (Saskatoon South, CPC): Madam Speaker, the budget is a major disappointment for my home province of Saskatchewan. There is nothing for canola, nothing for pulse, nothing for beef and nothing for the cities. I am very disappointed in yesterday's announcement. There is \$260 million for the entire province. There is a bit for the RCMP museum. We do not know how much, but it was mentioned. There is a line in the budget. Then for La Ronge, and nothing else. There is nothing to help our farmers and nothing to help our producers. Yes, the Liberals are putting a lot of money into foreign mining, but that is it.

I want the member to talk about why there is no support for the food producers of this country.

Sean Casey: Madam Speaker, we have supported and will continue to support food producers in this country. I think specifically of the supply-managed sectors, of which we have always been ardent defenders. I have tremendous respect for the Minister of Agriculture, who has been going around the world to open up new markets to be able to respond to the pressures that have been applied from the United States. All of these things have been a factor in many sectors, including food production. The whole system of world trade has been turned on its head. We are particularly focused on it, especially the Prime Minister and our Minister of Agriculture. I have great faith in their ability to do the right thing by food producers and Canadians.

● (1725)

[Translation]

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot—Acton, BQ): Madam Speaker, there is something I would like to understand. How can the government say it is concerned about climate change, or even aware of it, set targets and yet cut back on environmental protections and green energy, while massively subsidizing oil and gas companies? In what world would that lead to a result that makes any sense?

Sean Casey: Madam Speaker, the budget includes a strategy aimed at strengthening Canada's competitiveness when it comes to fighting climate change and protecting the environment. It includes numerous investments to promote private sector participation in this area. These measures are in the budget. I see this as an important aspect, which, incidentally, was not mentioned in my colleague's question. I have every confidence in the strategy we have adopted in this regard.

[English]

Taleeb Noormohamed (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Artificial Intelligence and Digital Innovation, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is such a privilege to rise in this House to speak in favour of the budget that was tabled by the Minister of Finance in the House yesterday.

The Budget

This is a budget that is about building. It is about building the type of Canada that each and every one of us deserves, that our kids deserve. It is about building the economy of the future today, about investing in the future of this country as an economic powerhouse. This is a budget about building and for builders. Whether building a community organization, a community centre or Canada's next great multi-billion dollar business, this is a budget that is focused on creating opportunity, support and value for Canada and for Canadians.

In my home province of British Columbia, this budget is going to be transformative. It is going to help to create thousands and thousands of jobs through support for the Red Chris mine in northern British Columbia and for support of LNG phase two. They are two major anchor projects in British Columbia that come with first nations' support and participation. They come with support from local communities and from the province. They are the types of initiatives that are nation-building exercises. They are the types of initiatives that Canadians are looking for their government to champion in a time of economic uncertainty. Regardless of party affiliation, we should all be able to stand by and support projects and initiatives in this budget that build for the type of future we need, that create the jobs Canadians are looking for in industries that the world needs Canada to lead in.

When I look at the impact of this budget in British Columbia on a macro level, it is transformative. Those two projects are going to represent billions of dollars of value to my home province, not just in the communities where those projects reside but throughout the province, including the Lower Mainland and my riding of Vancouver Granville. We all know that when we support large projects, the spillover benefit to small and medium-sized enterprises is there. It is strong, and it is a critical component of the economic ecosystem of the province. That is what makes this budget so remarkable. It is not just about large projects. It is also about the small projects and small supports in our communities that keep our communities alive and thriving.

In my riding alone, there has been a lot of support for the Filipino cultural and community centre, and I was pleased to see that listed as a single item in this budget. It is going to be a community centre for the Filipino community where they will be able to come together, to share who they are and what they are all about, and bring others along for that journey. This is a community that has become part of the fabric of Vancouver over generations. It represents, in many parts of our community and our province, the silent, quiet workers who care for our loved ones, who are there in the health care system, who do the hard work that is often unseen. For them to have a place that they can call their own is critically important, to show them not only that they are seen but that their request has been heard. That is what this budget seeks to do on this particular matter, and I am so proud to have been able to help champion that.

As colleagues know, I come to this House as a former entrepreneur in the tech sector, somebody who had the privilege of building companies. One of the major complaints from the tech sector has always been that Canada has not supported innovation in the way it could, or should. This budget does that. Boy, does it ever. It takes that challenge head-on. There is now \$1 billion available

through a venture and growth capital fund to support venture in this country, to support early-stage businesses, to make sure the entrepreneurs we are trying to develop and cultivate into the large businesses of the future today have the support and the financial support they need to be able to build higher and remain in this country.

We are going to protect their IP through support to ensure that the IP measures this country needs to see are in place. We are going to make sure that the things entrepreneurs depend on at the early stage, SR&ED credits, and the process of accessing SR&ED credits, is now seamless, is easier and allows entrepreneurs to focus on what they need to be doing, which is building businesses, rather than dealing with red tape in government. By ensuring that we are protecting Canadian IP, we are creating the environment where Canadian innovators can continue to do research where they feel their IP will be secure and where they can continue to innovate without risk of losing that incredibly important asset, which is intellectual property.

On top of that, we have committed \$1.3 billion in this budget to AI and quantum, industries of the future where Canada is already an intellectual leader and now needs to be a commercialization leader. By ensuring that that money is available to support quantum and AI in this country, today's entrepreneurs and innovators, who are building the businesses of tomorrow, will have what they need to be able to stay in this country. All too often, we hear of Canada being an incredible hotbed for great start-ups that flee.

● (1730)

Measures in this budget will make sure these companies not only get to stay here but will be able to grow here, to thrive here and to attract the capital that is required to stay here. By ensuring government is facilitating, by making it easier for that to occur, we are going to see these companies thrive. We are going to see more and more world-class companies like we see across the country and like I see in my own riding, such as Sanctuary AI and Aspect Biosystems. These are Canadian success stories that will benefit from the initiatives in this budget.

This is what this budget is about. It is about building. It is about building tech companies. It is about building entrepreneurial businesses. It is about building in natural resources in this country in a way that is responsible, that respects the environment, respects first nations and respects the wishes of provinces but keeps top of mind the fact that in order to support the things we want to do to protect Canadians in this country, we have to be creating wealth. We have to be creating opportunity. We have to be able to create prosperity for generations to come. This is what this budget seeks to do.

The Budget

This budget is also about building security for Canadians by protecting the programs we care about, ensuring there is money on the table to build health care infrastructure, which this country desperately needs; to make sure we are safeguarding a school food program; to make sure we are safeguarding dental care and child care. These are generationally transformative programs that have made a positive impact across this country from coast to coast to coast. This is why provinces, all provinces of all political stripes, have signed on to these initiatives. Those provincial governments all understand the importance of making sure our most vulnerable are taken care of. That is what we are going to keep doing through this budget.

We talk about building security, but we also talk about building the security framework for this country through investments in national defence. As we have already heard, those investments are going to ensure Canada can protect its borders and play the role it needs to play internationally. This is an important message to be able to say to Canadians in a time of economic uncertainty, but also in a time of political uncertainty around the world: that Canada will be resolute and strong in its support for its allies and in its support for the work we need to do to defend our own borders.

This budget preserves our security by ensuring that industries at risk because of the unjustified tariffs from the United States have the support they need. In my home province of British Columbia, the softwood lumber industry has been in crisis as a result of the crippling tariffs from the United States. This budget allows for businesses and workers in British Columbia to access the supports they need so we can get through this difficult time. It also gives them the supports they need to ensure the industry adapts in a way that is meaningful and thoughtful, so when the demand does come, and boy, will it ever for British Columbia softwood, our mills are ready, our workers are primed, our unions are on board and everybody is there to ensure we are building that prosperity together.

As I said earlier, this is a budget about building. It is about building this country up. It is about building together. It is about ensuring that communities have the support they need, that businesses see the opportunity this country presents and that our workers from coast to coast to coast know that when we are faced with existential threats, the government is able to put forward a program where we are giving not handouts but a hand-up, a hand-up to business, to the private sector, to unions, to Canadians to say that we, in this together, can build the type of country each and every one of us wants to see for our kids.

When we talk about spending less on the things we need to be careful about spending on, and investing more in the things we need to be planning for the future, that is what we mean. We mean making generational investments in the types of things that are going to set this country up for success in the future, while ensuring we are safeguarding who we are today.

I am proud to stand in support of this budget. I look forward to working with all members of the House to ensure we can get this budget passed, so we can go home for Christmas and ensure our constituents can start to see the benefits of this budget immediately instead of going into an election over Christmas.

I want to thank all those who have put the hard work into making this budget come to pass in the way it is. I want to assure my constituents in Vancouver Granville that I will do whatever it takes to ensure this budget gets passed, because this is a budget that is transformative for the residents in my riding, in my community and in my province.

• (1735)

Tako Van Popta (Langley Township—Fraser Heights, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am very happy my fellow British Columbia MP talked about softwood lumber, because that is crucial to British Columbia's economy. Everybody knows that. The solution is not more handouts; it is an open and free market with the United States.

However, after 10 years, the Liberal government has failed to bring home a softwood lumber treaty. Why should Canadians have confidence that it is finally going to do it this time around?

Taleeb Noormohamed: Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend knows well that this problem with softwood predates any Liberal government. This is a problem that governments of all stripes have had to deal with for generations in terms of the United States. That is the reality of having to deal with the United States on the issue of softwood.

That is why, this past Monday, I was there with many of our ministers to ensure that we work with the Province of British Columbia, with the private sector and with unions to put in place a framework for success for the industry in British Columbia, ensuring that support is there to retool the industry and to make sure that economic fibre is available. In that way, we can do the work that is required so that we can sell, not just in British Columbia, not just in Canada, but around the world. That is exactly the work that we are going to do to ensure that the industry has the support it needs.

Ellis Ross (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, CPC): Mr. Speaker, budget 2025 actually highlighted two projects that made the budget a lot less gloomy: the Trans Mountain expansion and LNG Canada in Kitimat, my hometown. The Haisla Nation backed that.

The member talked about building and building, to build, baby, build, but today the Premier of B.C. said no to a pipeline being built.

If Alberta proposes a project, is the project dead based on Premier Eby saying no?

Taleeb Noormohamed: Mr. Speaker, I hope that the hon. member opposite will be voting in favour of the budget to support those projects that are happening in his community.

I sat across from the Premier of British Columbia on Monday. We talked about the importance of projects that are going to make British Columbia's economy move forward, including communities like that of the member opposite.

That is why there is the support for LNG phase two. That is why there is support for Red Chris. These are the projects that are transformative today for British Columbia. Our government has said that we will work with all proponents to make sure that if there is a project that is brought to bear, the project will have the fair chance that it needs.

Private Members' Business

In order for that to occur, a lot of partners need to be at the table. If those partners are at the table, and there is a proposal put forward, with the support of all involved, that is how the process is supposed to go. That is how we build projects as a nation.

[*Translation*]

Mario Simard (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my colleague was a member of the previous government. Like me, he saw the measures that I found insufficient, but that at least partially acknowledged the problem of climate change. He probably noted, as I did, that carbon pricing was in the previous budgets. He probably noted, as I did, that there was an emissions cap.

Now I am wondering how he interprets this budget, which completely ignores climate change and cannot do enough to support the oil and gas industry. Does he think climate change disappeared between the two Parliaments?

• (1740)

Taleeb Noormohamed: Mr. Speaker, climate change is very real for all of us, especially for the people of British Columbia.

There are provisions in this budget for methane regulations and climate regulations that will be in place. I am confident that we will be able to work with the Minister of Environment and Climate Change to ensure that these regulations are in place to protect the environment and fight climate change.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

FISHERIES ACT

Jonathan Rowe (Terra Nova—The Peninsulas, CPC) moved that Bill C-237, An Act to amend the Fisheries Act (Atlantic groundfish fisheries), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the collapse of our cod fishery was over 30 years ago. Stocks are up and even commercial fishing has begun, yet my family and I cannot go out and fish on a Thursday afternoon. Newfoundlanders and Labradorians are fed up and unfed. Other parts of Atlantic Canada can fish seven days a week, yet we are restricted to only weekends. That is why I am here today with Bill C-237, the recreational food fishery equality bill.

This bill does not have a 40-fish limit, but it would do five crucial things. It would apply the same rules to all of Atlantic Canada so that we can catch five fish every day of the week during the season, like the rest of Atlantic Canada. It would encourage the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, commonly known as DFO, to have better enforcement and stricter penalties to eliminate the few bad apples that ruin the bunch. It would tie a season to spawning dates, avoiding arbitrary regulations. It would require DFO to post any new rule changes online at least two months in advance. It would also encourage DFO to organize a monitoring system to better understand how, when and where fish are being caught.

Newfoundland and Labrador was built on the cod fishery, and the Liberals need to recognize that and vote for this bill. They are always talking about the importance of working together to build

Canada strong, so this is their chance and opportunity to show Newfoundland and Labrador that we are moving forward. It is our fish, it is our waters and it is our way of life.

I would like to take a minute to clarify something. Over the summer, I had many constituents tell me they wanted to fish seven days a week. After conversations with industry leaders and locals throughout the riding and province, many of them suggested a system with quotas. Discussions started about what a possible quota would look like. Many conversations led to the number of 40 fish, or about 80 fillets, which sounded like a reasonable number to start the conversation. For a family of three, that is 120 fish, 240 fillets and more than two meals a week.

In August, we created a petition. A petition does not change the law and it does not change policy. It is simply a survey for our district to start conversations. It was evident very early on that the people of Newfoundland and Labrador were dead set against a 40-fish limit. What they really wanted was to be able to fish seven days a week and catch five fish per day during the whole season, like the rest of Atlantic Canada, so I began to work on a bill that would do just that.

On September 22, I tabled this bill. Unfortunately, my petition got caught up in the Canada Post strike and did not land on people's doorsteps until weeks later, causing mass confusion throughout my riding and the province. For the people at home, let me be clear: forget my petition and read my bill. I think they will like it.

Here is a bit of history. For hundreds of years, cod was our life-line. It fed our families, paid our bills and built our communities. The world came to our shores, and the same fish became the cornerstone of North American colonization. From when Humphrey Gilbert landed in 1583 to 1949, Newfoundland had control of its own fishery. That is nearly 400 years with a sustainable fishery.

After 1949, Ottawa took control of our fishery. A city with no ocean decided what was best for Newfoundland and Labrador. It used our fishery as a trading chip, allowing foreign trawlers to wreak havoc on our fishery. By the time John Crosbie became the fisheries minister in 1991, there was nothing left. While he did not take the fish out of the water, Ottawa certainly did. Somehow, Ottawa managed to ruin a 400-year-old sustainable fishery in just four decades.

Although overfishing in international waters did tremendous damage to northern cod, Canada also failed to maintain the sustainable fishery within its 200-mile limit. The government ignored warnings from inshore fishers and university scientists that cod stocks were in danger and chose to maintain quotas instead of scaling back on the fishery.

Whole towns shut down overnight when the cod moratorium was announced. Overnight, 30,000 people, like plant workers, fishers and even truck drivers, lost their jobs. It was the largest industrial layoff in Canadian history. Next to 5% of our province's GDP was lost with the stroke of a pen, overnight.

When the recreational food fishery reopened in 1998, it was a moment of relief. People finally got back on the water, not to sell or get rich, but to provide healthy food to their families.

● (1745)

Since then, the recreational food fishery has become one of the most cherished traditions. Hundreds come from across Canada and around the world to spend a few days on the water. In the early 2000s, a tag system was introduced, requiring us to pay to receive tags. Yes, we had to pay. Imagine that: Ottawa ruins our fishery, then makes us pay them to receive 30 tags. This system was despised by Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, who viewed this as bureaucratic and certainly unfair given our long tradition of fishing to feed our families. After many protests, petitions and outcries, DFO finally allowed us to catch fish on weekends, limiting us to five fish per day. That sounds great until we realize that other parts of Atlantic Canada can fish seven days a week. Here we are, stuck on land during blue skies and calm waters while our families are lined up at food banks.

Here is a glimpse of the current system. In 2025, the food fishery ran for only 45 days, with a daily limit of five fish. With a doctor's note, some seniors and people with mobility issues could get someone to fish their fish for them. This year, a new pilot program was implemented for tour boat operators. Tour boats could provide a licence and two tags, allowing passengers to catch two fish each. Here is where things go wrong.

First, 45 days open does not mean 45 days of fishing. If anyone here ever goes to Newfoundland, they will quickly find out that there is immense fog, high winds and high waves. Many people in my riding are struggling to buy groceries, but they are forced to go out and face that danger because they cannot go out on a Thursday afternoon to catch a codfish to feed their family. We have lost thousands of people in Newfoundland at sea, and we do not need Newfoundlanders and Labradorians continuing to risk their lives just to put food on the table.

Second, the government partially realizes the economic value of tourism fishing, but what is interesting is that these tour boat operators, oddly enough, are allowed to fish seven days a week. To me, this sets a great precedent, a precedent that we should all be allowed to fish seven days a week. In addition, many of our tourists are Newfoundlanders and Labradorians who have moved away to work and want to come home for a week of deep-sea fishing, but they often decide not to come home because finding a weekend with good weather is almost impossible. We can imagine the number of Newfoundlanders who would want to come home from Alberta and everywhere else in this world if they could catch a fish seven days a week. The economic value of that is almost unimaginable.

Third and most importantly, we can catch fish only three days a week while the rest of Atlantic Canada can catch fish seven days a week.

Private Members' Business

Here are the statistics. By the early 1990s, after decades of unsustainable fishing, the northern cod stocks collapsed. The spawning biomass of northern cod had dropped by 93% in only 30 years, from 1.6 million tonnes in 1962 to 100,000 tonnes in 1992, but things are on the rise since the moratorium. By 2024, the cod biomass had moved out of the critical zone and into the cautious zone, the highest levels in decades. Ottawa agrees that there is more fish in the waters, and the evidence is that the northern cod quota has doubled.

The total allowable catch for 2025 northern cod has been set to 38,000 tonnes, which is more than double the 2024 quota of 18,000 tonnes. Meanwhile, the recreational food fishery only consumes 2,500 tonnes a year. Compared to the 38,000 commercial tonnes, it is peanuts. Many people say that more fish are dying from natural causes than what is harvested in the recreational food fishery. The biggest thing to keep in mind is this: The seals are estimated to be eating 9.7 billion tonnes of fish a year. It does not take a calculator to see that the easiest way to restore our fishery is to harvest more seals, not starve more Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.

Let us talk about a monitoring system. The bill would direct the minister to create, within one year, a new monitoring system. It should record the number of fish caught by species, as well as the time and place. It should use modern tools and best practices. It should be funded, where possible, by existing fees and penalties. It should reward compliance, not give out punishment, with incentives for timely reporting. This data can be used to improve science and help determine fish patterns and quantities. We see similar reporting systems in Newfoundland and Labrador with our moose hunting return slips. The monitoring system should be developed by conversations with locals. Too often we see that decisions are made way too far from the wharves and coves that they affect.

Private Members' Business

● (1750)

The bill is not about fish; it is about respect for Newfoundland and Labrador. For far too long, our people have felt like an afterthought in Ottawa's decisions. We have had our shipyards sit idle, our oil projects stall, our mines close down and our seal fishery laughed at. Now even our food fishery, the simplest, most traditional act of all, is tangled up in red tape that no one else in Atlantic Canada has to deal with. The bill does say it all. It says that we would no longer be treated as an exemption. It says that we deserve the same opportunities and the same respect as our neighbours.

I want to talk about another part: stability, predictability and respect. One of the new clauses would add a line to the Fisheries Act, recognizing "the importance of stability and predictability for those who engage in recreational fishing for groundfish". This might sound like a lot of bureaucratic language, but in plain English, it means this: People deserve to know the rules and to know when the season opens.

When a man or woman hauls a boat down to a slipway, they should not have to wonder if this is the weekend the season is going to open. We should all know well in advance. Fisheries management should be rooted in science and fairness, not in politics and not in frustration.

When I travel my district and the province, I see what the fishery means to people. I see grandpas teaching grandsons how to tie lures. I see grandmas teaching grandkids how to filet cod. I see families hanging out together and heading out on the water, just as the sun pulls up over the ocean. We cannot put a price on that. That is culture. That is identity. That is Newfoundland and Labrador, so when Ottawa tries to limit that, it does not just take away our opportunity; it also takes away who we are.

My bill is not a partisan bill. It is not Liberal, it is not Conservative and it is not NDP. It is Newfoundland and Labrador, so I hope, at the very least, I will have my colleagues from Newfoundland and Labrador join me and join us in voting for the bill, because it is about all of Atlantic Canada standing together for fairness.

We talk a lot in the House about the mental health of Canadians. The whole country contributes to important initiatives like Bell Let's Talk and other mental health initiatives that emphasize the importance of people's connecting with one another, and especially of men's connecting with other men. Some of the toughest and warmest conversations men have happen on the water. Many of the toughest conversations, the ones we do not want anyone else to hear, are the ones that happen in between the "I got one" moments. These are the conversations that have guided my life, whether they have been with my father, my grandfather or my uncle.

A good day on the water can change a man, improve a man and improve our outlook on life. In the same way, it is a way for daughters to connect with fathers, and, quite frankly, for the whole family and community to connect. The fish do not care what our problems are, what gender we are or what race we are. Fishing is a safe space where Newfoundlanders and Labradorians get together, sometimes returning from all around the world, to talk, to laugh and to heal.

To restore equality, we need the Liberals and all members of the House to vote for the bill. Let us pass the bill. Let us give New-

foundlanders and Labradorians the same opportunities as our Atlantic neighbours, because back home the fishery runs deeper than the ocean; it runs through our veins.

It is our fish. It is our waters. It is our way of life.

● (1755)

Serge Cormier (Acadie—Bathurst, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my dad was a fisherman all his life. I am pretty sure he is watching right now, so I say hi to him.

When I look closely at the bill, I see that there are some things in it that Newfoundlanders should maybe ask questions about. Right now there is no fee of any kind on recreational fisheries. The member talked about a monitoring system, and the bill actually proposes a monitoring system for recreational fisheries, which would probably add cost to it. When I think about it, we could actually say that it would be a tax on food, or in this case a tax on fish.

Did the member actually talk to his leader about this new tax on food, a tax on fish?

Jonathan Rowe: Mr. Speaker, this is an imaginary tax. There are no fees on catching codfish right now, nor do I want there to be.

In my speech, which I am sure the member across the way just heard, I said that we should pay for the monitoring system, if it would cost anything, through stricter penalties, more fines and catching the bad apples who are making it bad for the bunch. Perhaps it would not cost anything at all; we can work through that in committee. There is no reason to be forcing people to pay for a monitoring system, and the imaginary tax is nothing more than imaginary.

[Translation]

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot—Acton, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I just want to mention that we in the Bloc Québécois agree with this bill and we will be voting in favour of it. We too have long been opposed to Ottawa's interference in Quebec's jurisdiction. It often ignores the particularities of our ecosystems.

I would like to ask my colleague if he has any knowledge of the fishing industry in Quebec and how this bill would specifically address it.

[English]

Jonathan Rowe: Mr. Speaker, to my understanding, Quebec has the same rules as most of Atlantic Canada right now and people are able to fish seven days a week with a five-fish limit. That is what Newfoundland is asking for, to have the same rules as Quebec and the rest of Atlantic Canada.

I am very happy to hear the Bloc is going to be supporting this bill. I really appreciate the member's support.

Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Mr. Speaker, under the Liberals, fishing has been put at risk across the country through the management areas they have been putting in place across the country.

I know my hon. colleague's bill does not say anything about marine protected areas, but I am wondering if he has any comments about that.

Jonathan Rowe: Mr. Speaker, we are looking at a situation right now where the Liberal government is proposing to take 30% of our ocean by 2030 to turn it into a marine protected area. By 2050, they are planning to turn 50% of our ocean into a marine protected area. That is a lot of ocean.

I want to take a stand and ask that we have a recreational food fishery in all marine protected areas. I am not sure the Liberals have the same commitment, but I would like to see them commit to having food fisheries in those areas, going forward.

Robert Morrissey (Egmont, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I listened intently to the hon. member's speech and he referenced non-partisan speech, so my question is non-partisan. The bill speaks for itself.

Could the member advise the House who he consulted with? Did he consult with fisher organizations prior to drafting the bill, and if so, could he identify them?

Jonathan Rowe: Mr. Speaker, when someone is in Newfoundland and Labrador, they do not have to go very far to cross paths with a fisherman or fisherwoman, and they do not have to go far to find people who participate in the recreational food fishery. Almost everyone in my riding, in my province and in the riding of the member across the way participates, and if they do not, their close family and relatives do.

I have had hundreds of conversations throughout my riding and province with the people who elected me and the other Conservatives about how to go forward. I really appreciate all the people at home who gave us their feedback so we could get here today.

● (1800)

Philip Earle (Labrador, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to private member's bill, Bill C-237, an act that would amend the Fisheries Act. As a Labradorian, I know how important the fishery is to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, Atlantic Canada and Quebec, not just for the livelihoods of harvesters and workers in our province, but also for our economy.

As Labradorians and Newfoundlanders, the recreational food fishery is essential to who we are as a province and as a people. It is more than a tradition; it is a connection we share to the water and those who came before us.

My biggest concern with Bill C-237 is that it ignores fishers and was created without meaningful consultation with those who have invested the most. Our recreational fishers have already spoken up. They have serious concerns with this bill and were not consulted. Why did the member opposite ignore those who would be directly impacted by this particular bill?

Private Members' Business

In the coming days, the Minister of Fisheries will launch the Newfoundland and Labrador food fishery consultations. This was a commitment she made when announcing the food fishery this year. Newfoundlanders and Labradorians deserve to have their say. These planned consultations will offer all recreational fishers the opportunity to share their thoughts on how we can improve the recreational food fishery.

On this side of the house, we listen to fishers and believe in the scientific stock-based management of our fisheries. Scientific stock-based management works and has led to a reopening of the northern cod fishery in Newfoundland and Labrador for the first time since the cod moratorium in 1993. The moratorium is a hurt that everyone in my province still feels deeply, and we cannot risk making that mistake again.

Bill C-237 would create one fishing season across all of Atlantic Canada and change the management of fisheries to species-based rather than stock-based. This would create a potential situation where total allowable catches and bycatch levels for commercial fisheries could be seriously affected.

Bill C-237 threatens the entire commercial fishing industry in Atlantic Canada and, yes, in Quebec, risking thousands of Canadian jobs and billions of dollars to our economy. Let us look at some examples where this is the case. On the west coast of Newfoundland and Labrador, fishers have sacrificed to help rebuild the NAFO area 4R northern Gulf cod stock, which remains under a commercial moratorium today. That moratorium also applies to NAFO area 4S adjacent to the vast Côte-Nord of Quebec.

Bill C-237 would increase fishing pressure on that stock, removing more fish from the water than we currently do. That is a slap in the face to commercial harvesters in Newfoundland and Labrador and Quebec, who have not been able to fish these past number of years. This bill would take away the ability to balance the opportunities for recreational fishers and commercial harvesters. It uses a one-size-fits-all approach that would have serious consequences for our commercial fishers who earn their living from the ocean. For a commercial fishery like Atlantic halibut in the province of Quebec, Gulf cod is caught as bycatch in that fishery. This bill would increase the fishing pressure on that bycatch, and the only place to take it from would be from those commercial fishers.

What would that mean for the \$100-million halibut fishery in Quebec and Labrador? This member's bill does not care about that, because it is one-size-fits-all, according to the member for Terra Nova—The Peninsulas. The bill is an existential threat to the fishery and the harvesters in the coastal communities it supports.

Private Members' Business

Let us also talk about the emerging redfish unit 1 fishery. Northern Gulf cod are also caught as bycatch in that fishery, so like the Atlantic halibut fishery, which is worth \$100 million, we would increase pressure on northern Gulf cod, and our redfish unit 1 fishery would also be impacted. This would also certainly impact my colleagues from Quebec in the Bloc Québécois.

The issues that Bill C-237 would create around bycatch for our commercial fisheries cannot be overstated. At a time when Canadians are looking to their government to grow our economy to help Canadians, Bill C-237 risks one of the largest economic drivers in Atlantic Canada, our commercial fisheries.

• (1805)

By changing to species-based fisheries management and singular seasons across Atlantic Canada and Quebec, Bill C-237 would affect the ability to simultaneously support advancing indigenous fisheries alongside the recreational and the commercial fisheries. That would mean worse outcomes for both indigenous fishers and non-indigenous fishers.

Bill C-237 would create more and new red tape, and its administrative costs would be downloaded to the recreational fishers. It would put those burdens solely on the recreational fishers themselves. The bill would demand an entirely new monitoring system just for recreational fishers, and it would force Newfoundlanders and Labradorians and all Atlantic Canadians to record their catch from the recreational fishery.

How would the bill look to offset these administrative and red tape costs? Fees on the fishers would be passed from the bill and downloaded to the recreational fishers. The bill clearly says that to offset these costs, the government would cover “the administrative costs of the monitoring system by fees and penalties that are required to be paid under the Fisheries Act”. That means licence fees, plain and simple. The bill would be a Conservative tax on food. There are no two ways about it: It would be a Conservative tax on those who are simply looking for a fish to feed themselves and their family, as they have done for generations.

This year, the food fishery in Newfoundland and Labrador, in Atlantic Canada and in Quebec had no licence requirement. There was no licence fee, and there were no reporting requirements. Fishers could just follow the rules, be safe on the ocean and fish for food. After all, it is a huge part of our culture. Under the Conservative “tax on food” bill, food fishers in Newfoundland and Labrador, Quebec and the rest of Atlantic Canada would now need a mandatory licence, would pay a fee to cover the costs of the bill and would be required to report every fish they catch through an unspecific system, which would also cost them money to use, almost like the ELOG system.

While our government is providing tax relief to millions of Canadians and working to build a strong economy, Conservative members are putting forward legislation that would threaten the economy for every Atlantic Canadian and would make Newfoundlanders and Labradorians pay to participate in the food fishery. For those reasons, I cannot support Bill C-237, and I urge my fellow members in the House to vote no to the bill and say no to a Conservative tax on food.

[*Translation*]

Alexis Deschênes (Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Lis-tuguj, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it was a foggy July morning in Sainte-Thérèse-de-Gaspé, back home in the Gaspé region. The boat glided slowly over the calm waters of the Gulf of St. Lawrence. We left the harbour, passing by a Coast Guard vessel. Seagulls watched us from a distance. The cliffs were peaking through the fog as we headed out to sea. The atmosphere on the boat was relaxed. The salty air permeated though us, filling us with happiness. We cast out lines, began fishing and the morning flew by. We were enjoying our recreational cod fishery.

Roughly three months later, I find myself here talking about the same subject. Bill C-237, an act to amend the Fisheries Act with regard to Atlantic groundfish fisheries, was introduced in the House for first reading on September 22. This bill proposes to amend the Fisheries Act to, among other things, provide for the management of the Atlantic groundfish fisheries by harmonizing fishing periods in the Atlantic Ocean, where the recreational groundfish fishery takes place.

This same bill also seeks to amend the minister's reporting obligations in respect of the administration and enforcement of the provisions of the act. Moreover, it would require certain individuals to provide information or keep records or other documents under the act. Finally, the bill requires the minister to develop a monitoring system to record the number of fish caught by species, as well as the time and place where they were caught.

More specifically, this bill proposes to add “the importance of stability and predictability for those who engage in recreational fishing for groundfish” to section 2.5 of the Fisheries Act. This would be another factor that the minister may, but is not required to, take into consideration in making decisions.

In addition, the bill proposes to amend subsection 42.1(1) of the act to read, “The Minister shall, as soon as feasible after the end of each fiscal year, prepare and cause to be laid before each house of Parliament a report on the administration and enforcement of the provisions of this Act.” This amendment affects the part of the act that states, “relating to fish and fish habitat protection and pollution prevention for that year”. Under the proposed amendment, all provisions of the Fisheries Act, and not just those relating to the protection of fish in their habitat, would be covered by the report that the minister would be required to table on the administration and enforcement of this act.

The bill also proposes to add, under the regulations that may be made by the Governor in Council, that under section 43 of that act, the regulations must “provide for the harmonization, across Atlantic provinces, of close times in Canadian fisheries waters of the Atlantic Ocean that are used for recreational fishing of groundfish”. The bill also proposes to add section 43.01 to the act, requiring that “a close time or fishing quota fixed or varied” be published “on the Internet site of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans at least two months before the day on which it comes into force.”

The bill also proposes adding, with respect to persons and entities that must provide information or documents to the department under section 61 of the act, “the number of fish caught by any person each day...and the total number of fish caught by that person”. Finally, the bill proposes that, within one year of the bill being passed, the Minister of Fisheries must, “in consultation with key stakeholders, develop a monitoring system to record, by species, the number of fish that are caught, as well as the time at which and place where they are caught.”

As previously mentioned, the Bloc Québécois will vote in favour of this bill so that it can be debated in committee. However, we will be watchful and will debate the merits of the bill. We still want to allow for debate.

I will now address a few points. I will start with the amendment to section 2.5 of the Fisheries Act, then I will talk about establishing a monitoring system and then, most importantly, the harmonization of recreational groundfish fishing seasons.

Section 2.5 entitled “Considerations”, which the bill seeks to amend, clearly lists the things that the minister may consider, without requiring the minister to do so. It already includes a number of key principles. The bill is proposing to add “the importance of stability and predictability for those who engage in recreational fishing for groundfish”. That will have to be debated. Does this principle deserve all the importance it is being given, over and above all others? The Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans is already debating the idea of restricting the minister's discretionary power and ensuring that section 2.5 require that the minister take these factors into consideration.

• (1810)

Why are we leaning toward this proposal to limit the minister's discretionary power? It is because the principles enshrined in the Fisheries Act are principles that I think everyone supports. Now we have to ensure that the minister is legally obligated to take them into consideration. If she does not and we amend the Fisheries Act to say that she must, Canadians will have the recourse they need to challenge decisions in court. As long as section 2.5 remains in its current form, the addition proposed by Bill C-237 would have a fairly limited impact. We could still debate it, though.

The monitoring system is something that will have to be studied. Obviously, when it comes to fish stocks, we want to make sure that we have objective data so that we can understand the status of the stocks and have recreational fishing catches recorded at the same time. I appreciate the comments of my colleague from the governing party about the current state of the cod fishery, in Quebec at least, where things are quite simple and where cod can be fished

Private Members' Business

recreationally without too much red tape. We can also debate that in committee.

There are several questions around the central point of this bill, namely the harmonization of recreational groundfish fisheries. First, what are the benefits? When my colleague introduced his bill, he explained that the measure was intended to put Newfoundland and Labrador on an equal footing with the other Atlantic provinces for this type of family fishing without affecting commercial fishers. He also expressed his dismay at the Liberal restrictions imposed on Newfoundland and Labrador families, who, he said, could only fish on weekends, while commercial fishing was in full swing during the week right before their eyes.

Again, we will have to look at this in committee. We will see how our colleague defends the advantages, but harmonizing the fishing seasons is an important aspect that will have to be studied seriously. Will harmonizing fishing periods standardize the closing and opening dates in all Atlantic provinces, including Quebec? That is an important question. If so, what are the benefits?

If there is a problem with the regulations that apply to Newfoundland and Labrador, are there not other ways for the member for Terra Nova—The Peninsulas to facilitate recreational fishing in his province without negatively impacting recreational fishing on the Quebec side? The benefits remain to be seen. There are also risks. Could managing recreational fishing by species rather than by stock and region complicate matters?

Currently, in my own riding, recreational fishing seasons vary. If I am in the Gaspé Peninsula for recreational groundfish fishing, I can go from April 15 to June 23, July 9 to 16, and August 8 to October 1. If I am in the Magdalen Islands, still within my riding, the dates are different. Why? From what I understand, fishing seasons are based on stock estimates, on what is happening, on interactions with other species.

What impact would my colleague's proposal have? Will we end up with a single season across the board? What happens if stock conditions are different? Would it be good public policy to take away the flexibility to adapt to the reality of fish stocks? Not all species are present in all areas at the same time, because fish migrate. Generally speaking, I strongly prefer decentralized public policy-making, because it ensures that decisions that apply to individuals are made by officials who are as close as possible to the places affected by those decisions, since they are in touch with local realities.

As I said, the Bloc Québécois will support Bill C-237 so that it can be studied in committee. However, we will need to be convinced of the proposal's merits. This recreational fishery is important to us and to the people back home. It is a tradition, and traditions need to be handled with care. Those beautiful July mornings spent fishing for cod off the coast of Sainte-Thérèse-de-Gaspé are moments when we feel at peace and in touch with nature. We have to protect those moments, because they are precious.

Private Members' Business

• (1815)

[English]

Clifford Small (Central Newfoundland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand here today and second Bill C-237 for my colleague from Terra Nova—The Peninsulas.

This piece of legislation has been long-awaited. The people of Newfoundland and Labrador have been crying out for better access to the recreational food fishery for codfish. It is a massive part of our culture and has been for hundreds of years, as my colleague from Terra Nova—The Peninsulas mentioned earlier.

Newfoundlanders and Labradorians go away to the mainland and then return. They are almost like expats, but they come home for summer migration. They come home to fish for codfish as their families have done for generations. It is in their blood, and it is a massive part of their culture.

Over the last 10 years, we have been up until the end of June before the Minister of Fisheries would even let us know what the dates and regulations for the fishing days of the season would be. A couple of years ago, I sponsored a petition that went on for 30 days. We collected 3,900 names on an electronic petition to remove the regulation that Newfoundlanders and Labradorians were only allowed to fish three days a week, on the weekends.

I heard my colleague from Labrador so vehemently express his opposition to the bill. I would like to remind him that there are a couple of communities on that coast, L'Anse-au-Clair and Blanc-Sablon, that are not too far apart. One community is in Newfoundland and Labrador, and one is in Quebec. There is an imaginary line between them. His constituents are allowed to fish only three days per week. He is quite proud of it, the way that he represents his constituents, that they cannot have the same access as their neighbours down the road. It is very odd to me to hear a gentleman of his stature stand up and make these statements and claims.

The bill would enshrine the rights of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians in legislation to give them fair access in terms of their counterparts throughout Atlantic Canada and in Quebec. What else would it do? Getting rid of the three-day weekends would also add a safety bonus to our fishery. For some reason, fishers tend to feel pressured that they have to go out to fish Saturday, Sunday and Monday if they can, if the weather is good enough and safe enough. Sometimes it is questionable, but they do not know what the next weekend is going to be like. I have seen periods in the summer where they have completely lost three weekends in a row. How is that fair for someone to spend \$5,000 on a vacation to come to Newfoundland to take part in the recreational food fishery and not even get a day? It has happened a lot.

Another aspect the bill includes is that, for the folks who want to catch some fish for food for the table, the south coast is different from the northeast coast and the west coast. The fish migrate to various parts of the coast at different times of the year. On the south coast, there is Hermitage Bay, in the riding that I am so privileged to represent, as well as Placentia Bay, which my colleague represents; these are bays to which the cod migrate in the winter, long past the closure of the recreational food fishery. For these people to have an ample opportunity to catch some cod for the winter, they need to be able to fish at a different time. On the west coast, the

fish migrate to the land in the fall or spring; summer is the worst time of all. On the northeast coast, we have a very proud hunting tradition called turr hunting that starts around November 1. The fellows want to go out and hunt some turrs, drop a jigger overboard and bring home a fresh fish for the table, but they cannot do it. It is unbelievable; it needs to end.

• (1820)

We were promised a review by the minister, now announced by the member for Labrador on her behalf, back in June. People were asking, "Where's the review? When are we going to hear about it?" Even *The Fisheries Broadcast* asked me not long ago when this review was taking place. I said I did not know. It was starting to get into broken promise territory.

Anything we can do to push the minister in the right direction, we always try, but we have seen decisions before. I heard our colleague from Labrador talk about how the Liberals listen to the fishers, but the fishers have been begging for a mackerel fishery all summer. I see the minister over there smiling. Maybe she is going to announce it after I sit down.

An hon. member: Oh, oh!

Clifford Small: Mr. Speaker, I apologize. I did not mean to say that someone was here. Maybe it is a figment of my imagination; who knows?

I also heard the member for Labrador criticize his government's policy on bringing in ELOGs. It was refreshing to see the Liberals do not all agree with the ridiculous policies they have.

My colleague was questioned about the consultations he had. We are consulting with our people all the time. Recreational cod fishers are stakeholders in the recreational cod fishery, but one big beef the Fish, Food and Allied Workers Union have had over the years is that they cannot quantify how much codfish is taken during the recreational food fishery. I do not know why Liberal members would be proud of not knowing how much fish we are taking out of the ocean. How can they manage that if they cannot count? They have to know. Knowledge is power.

The expansion and revision of the fishing period for cod would help fill a gap in science, because people could go out in October or November if it is a nice day, or even in December if that is what they feel like doing. If they wanted to go out on Christmas Eve and catch a fresh fish for their Christmas Eve dinner, if it is a calm day and that is what they feel like doing, they would be able to do it. We would find out how the fish are migrating, when they are there and how long they are there for. All of this data would be wonderful knowledge, if there is any science department left after yesterday's budget.

The threat to biomass would be extremely low. A study just came out of Memorial University's Centre for Fisheries Ecosystems Research that stated 24 times more codfish is eaten by harp seals, never mind the hoods, the greys, the bearded or the harbour, all of these species. If we are just talking about harps, there are 24 times more removals by harp seals alone than the entire fishery. This expansion of fishing opportunity would pose no threat to the cod biomass and its recovery as we move forward.

I call on the member for Labrador, the member for St. John's East, the member for Cape Spear and the member for Avalon to do what their constituents have been begging them to do. The member for Labrador was very adamant that the Liberals listen. Well, if they listen, it is time to do what they have been asked to do. Instead of having eyes that do not see and ears that do not hear, now is the time to do the right thing for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, give fair access, and match access throughout Atlantic Canada and Quebec.

• (1825)

Mike Kelloway (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport and Internal Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss something that many people in my riding have an immense interest in, and that is the Fisheries Act. It is an essential piece of Canadian law that regulates our fisheries. It supports fisheries science, and it is the foundation of coastal communities. Having had the privilege, and it was a privilege, to serve as the parliamentary secretary for fisheries, oceans and the Coast Guard, I can say that it is my contention that this bill is flawed and perhaps dangerous.

This bill could disrupt commercial fisheries across eastern Canada as well as cost harvesters their opportunity to earn a living, and many recreational fishers would have to pay to catch their food. This bill looks to completely change how the fisheries are managed, getting rid of stock-based management and switching to a species-based management. That would threaten all Atlantic commercial fisheries by risking bycatch management, catch levels that our commercial fisheries rely on. Bycatch is based on health of the stock and can act as a backstop for a fishery. If the bycatch is cut, the season ends, regardless of how much quota remains.

If this bill were passed and fisheries decisions become based on species, we could see a reduction in bycatch in many of our fisheries. This bill would impact quite a few fisheries. Let us review them. It would impact redfish, halibut, herring in southwest Nova Scotia, haddock and even the cod fishery, which was recently reopened.

I think we heard it here. Fisheries management is not a one-size-fits-all system. By creating a singular season for recreational fisheries, that would mean that, in my riding of Sydney—Glace Bay, we would have to fish at the same time as those in Newfoundland and Labrador. There is a fundamental question here: Why is the Conservative member telling fishers in my community in Cape Breton when and how they should fish? Fishers in my community were not consulted as part of this bill, and they should not be told what is best for them.

People in my province of Nova Scotia mainly catch haddock. It is a healthier species, so the daily limits are higher. While cod is allowed to be caught, the stocks around Nova Scotia are not as

Private Members' Business

healthy as the northern cod stock. They are not as abundant, and there is a daily limit on how many can be caught. Different parts of the country have different fishery approaches because the places are different, the stock levels are different and their waters are different. We cannot take a one-size-fits-all approach in the fisheries management.

I want to speak a bit to the House with respect to consultation. Consultation is absolutely the foundation for fishery management decisions. That is why advisory committees exist, and that is why we talk to them during commercial season and before it opens up. We want to make sure that the people who are most affected have a voice. They are a partner; they are a stakeholder. When I was parliamentary secretary for fisheries and oceans, there were many instances when I would meet directly with fishers and stakeholders to make sure their voices were being heard. I have seen serious concerns from recreational fishers who were not consulted on this bill. That is not how to make fishery management decisions, or any important decision.

I understand that Newfoundlanders and Labradorians want changes to the recreational fishery. As a Cape Bretoner, I know there is not a lot of difference between Cape Bretoners and Newfoundland and Labradorians, and I respect that, but I would be shocked if Newfoundlanders and Labradorians wanted to risk commercial fisheries, and all the jobs and economic opportunity they create, to make those changes. Quite frankly, the bill would threaten the livelihood of commercial harvesters across Atlantic Canada and risk jobs in my riding. It would tell my community in particular that we can make decisions without consulting them.

If there is an underpinning here in House, and we heard it here, it is consultations. We can unpack that word. That is meaningful, organized discussions. That is focus groups. That is sitting down with people from all over the region to make a fundamental decision that could very well impact the fishery. We need to do better than that, and that is why I will be opposing this bill.

• (1830)

[*Translation*]

Patrick Bonin (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we in the Bloc Québécois strive to be thorough, to work based on science, traditional knowledge and local expertise.

Private Members' Business

We think it would be interesting to study this bill, because it raises a number of rather important questions. For example, we believe that harmonizing fishing seasons across a large ecosystem with regional differences poses risks to some species and could be problematic. A one-size-fits-all management approach could lead to problems.

Our fishers know the resources, the territory and the vulnerable points, but they also need to support and coordination across regions. We are concerned about the application of one-size-fits-all measures, particularly in areas like the Gulf of St. Lawrence, where we are seeing the ecosystem warming quickly. Species are under stress because of water warming, leading them to relocate. We saw that with cod. There are also interactions with other species to consider.

We firmly believe that science must be at the centre of this process. We want the precautionary principle to be applied. The right to nature is also important, so we respect and encourage the presence of fishers and other stakeholders on the ground.

However, when there are too many constraints and they are applied across the board, we really have to wonder. Without question, this type of bill deserves to be studied. For now, however, we have doubts about applying one-size-fits-all measures. As we know, even within Quebec, and I am strictly speaking about Quebec, there are regional differences, specific ways of operating and rapid changes people are noticing that science sometimes struggles to capture. Imagine the implications if the scope is expanded to include the Atlantic region.

The principle behind the bill is certainly interesting. However, in terms of how it would be applied, we question whether it is really necessary. We want to see science at the core of the process, and we want people on the ground to be involved, so we do want to collaborate with our colleagues.

• (1835)

[*English*]

John Williamson (Saint John—St. Croix, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to rise to speak to this fascinating bill. I have to say that every time I hear a group of MPs from Newfoundland and Labrador, my vocabulary always expands a bit. They throw around some terms, whether with respect to fishing or to hunting, that are unknown in the rest of the country, so it is always interesting.

This is what I have noticed since the member for Central Newfoundland came on the scene here in Parliament just four years ago. The Liberal caucus from Newfoundland and Labrador was virtually unknown. Its members hardly ever spoke a word in the chamber, it seemed. However, with the one member, suddenly the debate changed in the chamber, and we began hearing all about important Newfoundland and Labrador issues. I remember that he would stand up in the last Parliament and shame his counterparts on the other side about issues they were not addressing in Parliament.

Then, I see today the member for Terra Nova—The Peninsulas again getting up, and I hear him saying that already he has had some success with his bill. Just by his tabling it, the government has announced a review on this very issue, so we are seeing great

success on an issue that matters to members from Newfoundland and Labrador.

Of course, there is a third member, from Long Range Mountains, who is no shrinking violet either. They are a trio. We can see why the Conservative representation in Newfoundland and Labrador is growing. I know we are going to see strength and growth there in the years ahead because of this representation.

I learned long ago, when I was first elected, that if we want to know what is happening in the fisheries, we do not go to DFO, like the member for Labrador has clearly done; we go down to the end of the dock and talk to the men and women who fish our waters, and we find out what is going on: what is working, what is not and, more importantly, how to fix it. That is exactly what my two colleagues from Newfoundland have done today by bringing forth this important issue, speaking on behalf of their constituents on a matter that is so important to them. I understand that.

What I think a lot of people in this town and in the bureaucracy do not understand is that the weather does not always co-operate, the environment does not always co-operate, and we need flexibility when it comes to not just a resource but something that members in our communities in Atlantic Canada have done long before Canada was Canada, long before the founding of this country, and certainly for hundreds of years before Newfoundland and Labrador came into Confederation.

It is so exhilarating to have members come to this place and make principled and passionate arguments about bills like this and how they impact communities and people back home. We are going through an affordability crisis. What better way to help families back home than to give them the option to go fishing to provide for their family and their community, which is what began to build Newfoundland and Labrador hundreds of years ago.

In that spirit, I have to applaud the members for bringing the bill forward, speaking to and on behalf of their communities, and advancing it. I think we are going to see a win here. We can tell, when the government begins to pre-position a consultation on a bill brought before the House by a new member who has been here just a few months, that he can already score a win. He has forced the government to act.

We are going to keep pushing the bill through Parliament. I think we are going to chip away. I know that my three colleagues from Newfoundland and Labrador will not just debate it here; they are going to take it home, and they are going to fight for it in the towns, the communities and the ridings, and on the air and on social media. They are going to shame their colleagues to convince more of them to vote for the bill. I applaud their hard work.

At some point, if we have more of these debates, we might need a third interpretation channel so we can get all the local terms from Newfoundland and Labrador understood here in the chamber. I look forward to that and to this debate's continuing very soon.

• (1840)

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

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

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

[English]

CARBON PRICING

Cheryl Gallant (Algonquin—Renfrew—Pembroke, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise on behalf of the very real taxpayers of Algonquin—Renfrew—Pembroke. I want to state very clearly that Canadian taxpayers are real, despite the gaslighting by the Liberal secretary of state in her reply to my question on food prices and fuel taxes. The Liberal Party introduced a new fuel regulation that requires all gasoline to be diluted with even more ethanol. Those regulations clearly increase the cost of fuel. The Liberals claim that this price hike is imaginary.

For the benefit of Liberals listening, here is a direct quote from the Liberal regulations: “It is expected that increases in transportation fuel expenses will disproportionately impact lower and middle-[class] households, as well as households currently experiencing energy poverty or those likely to experience energy poverty in the future.”

The government wrote those words. It knows for a fact that its regulations make fuel more expensive for Canadians. Those extra costs are not imaginary. They are real. They will disproportionately harm Canadians with lower and middle incomes.

The Liberals do not care about lower and middle-income Canadians anymore. The Liberal Party's base looks like its cabinet: affluent and privileged. That party has completely lost touch with average Canadians. It keeps saying that its solution to food insecurity is a government-run program for food. Canadians do not want handouts. They do not want to need food programs. The only thing worse than forcing people to rely on food programs is making children pay for it.

There is no such thing as a free lunch. That is probably something we should teach kids in schools. The Liberals borrowed money to fund their new social programs. This means that children eating those Liberal unfunded lunches will be on the hook for the bill in the future. When those kids graduate from school, instead of a diploma, they will receive a tax bill. Borrowing money for today's handouts is the exact opposite of an investment. Instead of generating a return on the money, we pay interest on the debt.

Canada has been here before. Pierre Trudeau needed NDP support for a minority government. They ramped up spending while suffocating the economy in protectionist measures.

Justin Trudeau needed NDP support for his minority government. They ramped up spending while suffocating the economy in woke measures. They always seem to claim that they see a light at

Adjournment Proceedings

the end of the debt tunnel. That is just the headlights of reality hurtling toward them like a freight train.

The government can pretend its expensive fuel regulations, costly food packaging ban and economically damaging industrial carbon tax are make-believe, but for Canadians paying the bill, these taxes are very real.

• (1845)

Wade Grant (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member opposite is suggesting that responsible climate policy is a burden. This is simply not true. Canadians want a secure future, Canadians like my son and my daughter, one where they can earn a good living, put food on the table and breathe clean air. They also want a government that protects them from climate disruption and builds an economy that can win in a world moving toward cleaner energy and technology.

Acting on climate is both a moral obligation and an economic necessity. We are living through a historic global shift. Last year, global clean energy investment reached \$2 trillion, nearly double what went to fossil fuels. Countries are competing fiercely to attract investment in low-carbon industries, because those industries will drive jobs and growth for decades to come.

The newly tabled budget 2025 recognizes that reality. It charts a path to secure Canada's position in the global race, not with prohibitions but by driving investment and prioritizing results. Budget 2025 invests in the infrastructure and technology that will define tomorrow's economy: nuclear expansion, clean electricity grid interties, low-carbon fuels like hydrogen, renewable energy, critical minerals and world-leading industrial innovation. This is how we build prosperity in a changing world.

The member opposite wants to cancel climate tools like industrial carbon pricing, but that would cost Canadian jobs and competitiveness. Industrial carbon pricing, backed by a predictable, long-term price trajectory, is the most efficient and lowest-cost tool to reduce emissions and attract private capital. Independent experts confirm it has almost no impact on household costs, while providing businesses the certainty they need to invest.

Adjournment Proceedings

Budget 2025 strengthens this system by improving the benchmark, ensuring fairness across provinces and expanding tools like carbon contracts for difference so that companies can invest with confidence. This is a policy focused on results and competitiveness. This matters for some of Canada's most important sectors. Lower emissions mean greater competitiveness for steel, oil and gas because global buyers increasingly demand low-carbon products. If we do not modernize, our exports will face barriers, tariffs and lost market share. Cancelling climate policy would not protect Canadians; it would leave workers and industries behind.

Our approach is clear: drive investment, deliver the greatest emissions reductions at the lowest cost, secure access to global markets and build an economy that wins in a low-carbon world. I believe budget 2025 delivers that plan.

Cheryl Gallant: Mr. Speaker, I can see from the parliamentary secretary's recycled talking points that the Liberals do not listen. I accept that the arrogant Liberals will never listen to Conservative voices, but I quoted the words they wrote back to them. They still pretend like somehow this is all imaginary. We get it. They will not listen to Canadians who care about affordability or even reality.

Maybe our self-professed economic genius of a Prime Minister could explain to the parliamentary secretary what happens when someone has to borrow just to make their interest payments. The government has put us into a debt spiral. Claiming we are the best off in the G7 is like claiming to be the least intoxicated person at an Epstein party.

Canadians deserve an affordable budget for an affordable life. What yesterday's budget makes clear is that Liberals only care about themselves.

Wade Grant: Mr. Speaker, yesterday's budget makes our direction unmistakable. It backs industrial carbon pricing with long-term certainty and focuses on measures that deliver the greatest emissions reductions and competitiveness benefits at the lowest cost to Canadians.

These policies are not a tax on Canadians; they are strategic economic tools that reward innovation and protect jobs. They ensure Canadian steel, energy and manufacturing remain competitive in markets demanding low-carbon products. Abandoning this approach would leave workers exposed and investment flowing elsewhere.

Budget 2025 keeps Canada competitive, secure and positioned to lead in the clean economy.

MENTAL HEALTH AND ADDICTIONS

Dan Mazier (Riding Mountain, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my question is very simple: Does the parliamentary secretary for health believe that fentanyl should be smoked in crack pipes beside day cares and schools, yes or no?

Maggie Chi (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague opposite for raising this issue. I know it comes from a place of genuine concern for community safety and public health. These are concerns I share deeply as well.

When it comes to safe consumption sites, I think it is important that Canadians understand how these sites are established and how decisions are made. The reality is that the decision to allow a safe consumption site or other urgent public health need site to operate ultimately rests with the provinces and territories. Each provincial and territorial minister of health has the authority to issue exemptions under the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act.

Health Canada's role is limited to reviewing applications, but the final say on whether these services can operate and how they operate belongs to those jurisdictions. While Health Canada may approve an application, every organization must first demonstrate it has complied with all local laws and regulations, in its municipality, its province or territory and its own community. If it cannot meet these standards, its applications are not approved.

Just as importantly, each applicant must show they have done meaningful community engagement. This includes demonstrating that they have spoken with local residents, law enforcement and service providers; developed strong public safety measures to protect staff, clients and the surrounding community; and built relationships of trust before opening their doors.

We know this is a difficult and emotional issue. The toxic drug and overdose crisis has touched every corner of this country, from large cities like Toronto to smaller communities across Manitoba and beyond. Every lost life is someone's child, someone's friend, someone's neighbour. This is why our government believes we must use every tool available to respond in a way that balances public health with public safety. There is no one-size-fits-all approach. For some communities, that means expanding access to treatment and recovery. For others, it means supporting community-led prevention and harm reduction programs.

Across the board, it means investing in the people and organizations that are saving lives every day through programs like the substance use and addictions program and the emergency treatment fund. Our goal is simple: to keep people alive and to keep communities safe.

• (1850)

Dan Mazier: Mr. Speaker, it is unbelievable. Shame on that member for refusing to protect children. She refuses to say smoking fentanyl beside daycares is dangerous. She refuses to say smoking fentanyl beside schools is dangerous. It is unbelievable. She refuses to say smoking fentanyl beside playgrounds is dangerous. Every parent knows this is insane.

Adjournment Proceedings

Why are the Liberals allowing fentanyl to be used next to children? Why? Why on earth are you doing this?

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): Again, questions through the Chair.

The hon. parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Health.

Maggie Chi: Mr. Speaker, I will close by saying this. Addressing the toxic drug and overdose crisis requires compassion, collaboration and commitment. This means continuing to listen to community voices, to families and to health and safety experts. Anyone proposing to open a safe consumption site must demonstrate that they have spoken to their community and that they have a thoughtful plan in place to address local concerns. It also means working closely with provinces and territories to ensure they have the resources and flexibility they need to respond effectively.

If a province or territory wants to work with us to prevent overdoses, reduce the spread of infectious diseases and save lives, our government is always ready to partner with them. At the end of the day, this is not about ideology or politics. It is about people, families and communities, and we will continue to stand with them in the fight to save lives and build safer, healthier communities for all Canadians.

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Lori Idlout (Nunavut, NDP): *Uqaqtittiji*, on September 19, I asked a question about funding the hunters and trappers organizations in Nunavut, and the government could not provide any answers. Are the Liberals not aware of their legal obligation to ensure that the Nunavut Agreement is implemented and that there is adequate funding for hunters and trappers organizations?

The Nunavut Wildlife Management Board funds the hunters and trappers organizations, whose mandate includes to ensure conservation and the sustainable use of wildlife, to protect the rights and priorities of Inuit, and to regulate access to wildlife. Unfortunately, the hunters and trappers organizations have a lack of resources.

There is one hunters and trappers organization in every community. I have visited them, and what I have seen so far is that most of their offices are in places that should be condemned. They have only one support staff member, and despite the lack of resources, they are expected to help protect Inuit rights to hunting and manage wildlife. They are the voice of the Inuit in the environmental assessment processes.

The federal government's level of funding for the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board was recently reported in its annual report for this year, 2025. It included about \$21 million total for all 25 hunters and trappers organizations, plus the three regional wildlife offices. If we did our math right, that means about \$700,000 per hunters and trappers organization per year.

I can compare that to the federal funding for resource extraction projects in Nunavut. Yesterday, the Liberals tabled their budget, which included new funding for Natural Resources Canada to create a new fund called the critical minerals sovereign fund, which we understand would make strategic investments in critical minerals projects and companies and would include equity investments, loan guarantees and offtake agreements.

When I read the budget, this means \$2 billion over five years, starting next year, and an additional \$50 million over five years for Natural Resources Canada to support the delivery of the fund, which would calculate to roughly \$410 million per year for critical mineral funding. That is an astonishing 585 times more than the Liberals give to local Inuit organizations that are protecting wildlife, the environment and cultural practices.

The Liberals give more to extract natural resources from Inuit land than to support wildlife conservation and cultural practices. This is not a balanced approach. Both Liberal and Conservative governments are good at apologizing, but not at acting on reconciliation.

I challenge the government to stop enforcing colonial policies. Does the government believe keeping hunters and trappers less resourced than extraction companies is keeping Canada strong?

• (1855)

Brendan Hanley (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Northern and Arctic Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for Nunavut for raising serious concerns about funding for Inuit programs and the capacity of hunters and trappers organizations to participate in environmental assessments. She provides continued and very important advocacy for Nunavut. These are valid concerns, and they deserve a clear response.

Article 5.7 of the Nunavut agreement sets out the special features of Inuit harvesting rights. It establishes hunters and trappers organizations in every community and regional wildlife organizations to manage quotas, regulate harvesting and represent Inuit interests in wildlife management. These bodies are not optional. They are treaty obligations and core institutions under the agreement. Again, I thank the member for Nunavut for raising these concerns. For years, organizations in Nunavut have not received sufficient funding, and recent years have seen increased costs.

Canada funds the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board, which, in turn, supports these organizations. This is a legal obligation. These organizations are expected to participate in environmental assessments, manage wildlife sustainably and uphold Inuit harvesting rights. Until recently, funding for these organizations was limited.

Adjournment Proceedings

In March 2025, the Government of Canada signed a renewed Nunavut agreement implementation contract with Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated and the Government of Nunavut for 2024 to 2034. This contract provides \$1.5 billion from 2024 to 2034, plus \$77.6 million annually thereafter, to support NTI, the Government of Nunavut and five institutions of public government, including 27 hunters and trappers organizations and three regional wildlife organizations. This funding will strengthen their capacity to participate in environmental reviews and manage wildlife effectively.

In 2024-25, the Government of Canada provided a renewed base annual budget of more than \$7.5 million for the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board, \$7.1 million for the regional wildlife organizations and \$14 million for the hunters and trappers organizations. Funding is also adjusted annually for inflation. Special attention was paid in the renewal to make sure that these bodies would be sufficiently resourced to carry out their mandate under the Nunavut agreement. This renewed funding base approximately represents a 39% increase for the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board and a 169% increase for the regional wildlife organizations and hunters and trappers organizations. This, I believe, is significant.

Before closing, I would like to take a moment to highlight a few other budget 2025 items that are good news for northerners. Many major projects today include indigenous and territorial governments, northern communities, financial institutions and development corporations in designing, financing and leading. That is reconciliation in action. Our goal is to make certain that federal tools, financing and regulatory systems support indigenous communities in their involvement.

I will briefly mention the \$1-billion Arctic infrastructure fund, to be funded over four years to support economic development and job creation in northern communities while protecting Canada's sovereignty. In addition to protecting and advancing the interests of Canada and Inuit in Nunavut, we are proposing to amend the Territorial Lands Act to support responsible and respectable stewardship of Crown land in Nunavut. I will briefly mention the commitment to Inuit Nunangat University as well. These are just a few measures.

• (1900)

Lori Idlout: *Uqaqtittiji*, I am glad to see the Liberal government understands that it has legal obligations under the Nunavut agreement. Unfortunately, some of the increases in investments are still not enough, as I mentioned earlier. I have met with all 25 hunters and trappers organizations, as I said earlier. Some of them are in offices that should be condemned, and we need to make sure that they have proper resources to participate in the environmental assessment process.

The industry and the HTOs both contribute to that process. Is it any surprise that industry's voice is so much louder, bigger and more influential in that process than that of the hunters and trappers organizations?

I will ask again: Will the Liberal government better fund hunters and trappers organizations so that they can fully engage in the environmental assessment process?

Brendan Hanley: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member again for her concerns about Inuit programs and hunters and trappers organizations, and for meeting directly with these organizations. These bodies are treaty obligations under the Nunavut land claims agreement and are essential for wildlife management and environmental reviews.

Inadequate funding issues did change in March 2025 when Canada signed a renewed 10-year Nunavut agreement implementation contract, providing \$1.5 billion through 2034, plus \$77.6 million annually thereafter. That includes 39% more for the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board and 169% for hunters and trappers organizations and regional wildlife organizations, with annual budgets now indexed for inflation.

There is lots more to say on this topic, and I will certainly be continuing to engage with the member on this important issue.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): The motion to adjourn the House is deemed to have been adopted, and the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 7:04 p.m.)

National Defence	
Miedema	3479
McGuinty	3479
Carbon Pricing	
Davidson	3480
Zerucelli	3480
Davidson	3480
Belanger (Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River)	3480
Menegakis	3480
McLean (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke)	3480
Menegakis	3480
Gainey	3480
Kramp-Neuman	3480
Alty	3481
Kramp-Neuman	3481
MacDonald (Malpeque)	3481
Borrelli	3481
Zerucelli	3481
Vien	3481
Guilbeault	3481
Vien	3481
Lightbound	3481
Infrastructure	
Al Soud	3482
Robertson	3482
Justice	
Strahl	3482
Fraser	3482
Strahl	3482
Sahota	3482
Thomas	3482
Sahota	3482
Northern Affairs	
Harrison	3482
Chartrand	3483
Carbon Pricing	
Godin	3483
Provost	3483
The Budget	
May	3483
MacKinnon	3483
Presence in Gallery	
The Speaker	3483

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Citizenship Act	
Bill C-3. Third reading	3483
Motion agreed to	3485
(Bill read the third time and passed)	3485

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Foreign Affairs	
Sidhu (Brampton East)	3485
Foreign Affairs	
Sidhu (Brampton East)	3485
Government Response to Petitions	
Lamoureux	3485
Committees of the House	
Official Languages	
Baker	3485
Procedure and House Affairs	
Bittle	3485
National Framework on Sports Betting Advertising Act	
Chagger	3485
Bill S-211. Introduction and first reading	3485
(Motion agreed to and bill read the first time)	3485
Business of the House	
Kayabaga	3486
Motion	3486
(Motion agreed to)	3486
Committees of the House	
Procedure and House Affairs	
Motion for concurrence	3486
Bittle	3486
(Motion agreed to)	3486
Petitions	
The Environment	
Johns	3486
Bird Welfare	
Anderson	3486
Supportive Housing Project	
Vis	3486
Flood Mitigation	
Vis	3486
Immigration and Citizenship	
Zahid	3487
Human Rights	
May	3487
Public Safety	
Mazier	3487
Canada Post	
Boulerice	3487
International Criminal Court	
Boulerice	3487
Foreign Affairs	
Boulerice	3487
Canada Post	
Wagantall	3488

Public Safety	
Davies (Niagara South)	3488
Charitable Organizations	
Au	3488
Questions Passed as Orders for Return	
Lamoureux	3488
Motions for Papers	
Lamoureux	3488
Privilege	
Budget Documents Distributed to Members	
Ste-Marie	3488

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

The Budget	
Financial Statement of Minister of Finance	
Motion	3489
Poilievre	3489
Lamoureux	3494
Simard	3494
May	3494
Ruff	3495
Bonin	3495
Blanchet	3496
Amendment	3498
Lamoureux	3498
Strauss	3498
Perron	3499
Joseph	3499
May	3499
Casey	3500
Noormohamed	3501
Waugh	3501

Savard-Tremblay	3501
Noormohamed	3501
Van Popta	3503
Ross	3503
Simard	3504

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Fisheries Act	
Rowe	3504
Bill C-237. Second reading	3504
Cormier	3506
Savard-Tremblay	3506
Viersen	3507
Morrissey	3507
Earle	3507
Deschênes	3508
Small	3510
Kelloway	3511
Bonin	3511
Williamson	3512

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Carbon Pricing	
Gallant	3513
Grant	3513
Mental Health and Addictions	
Mazier	3514
Chi	3514
Indigenous Affairs	
Idlout	3515
Hanley	3515

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>